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ABSTRACT

An Analysis of the Governance and Administrative Elements of a Public-Private Partnership Approach to Community-Based Education

by

Celia Feres-Lewin

Dr. Teresa S. Jordan, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Dean, College of Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

An Analysis of the Governance and Administrative Elements of a Public-Private Partnership Approach to Community-Based Education is the study of the partnership forged between the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (Kellogg), Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA), and the United States Department of Agriculture Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service (USDA-CSREES) in 1994. The partners launched the Healthy Family America (HFA) model through Cooperative Extension’s delivery system. HFA is a community-based education program for first-time parents in overburdened families. Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, Las Vegas (Clark County), Nevada, and Walworth County, Wisconsin, were the only three pilot sites selected by the partnership to test the HFA model, from 1995 to 1998.

The focus of this study was to address the following
questions: 1) What strategies utilized by administrators at the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be effective?; 2) What strategies utilized by administrators at the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be ineffective?; 3) What new strategies would administrators recommend?; and 4) What strategies or procedures will the study recommend?

The following variables were examined and analyzed in relation to the strategies used by administrators in the partnership: 1) mission and objectives, 2) organizational structure, 3) decision-making processes, 4) conflict resolution processes, 5) policies and procedures, 6) funding mechanisms and authority, and 7) accountability.

Major findings and recommendations include: 1) Partners should acquire knowledge of each others organizational culture, language, operation and purpose; 2) A management style should emerge from the partnership rather than being imposed by a dominant partner; 3) Fiscal authority should be openly discussed and agreed upon by all partners; 4) A process for conflict-resolution and a mediator should be in place; 5) Written role descriptions should be developed, partners need to respect each other’s skills, expertise and experience; 6) A written account of the partnership’s institutional memory should be maintain and be available to new partners; 7) Partners should agree upon a decision-
making process. Additional findings and recommendations are discussed in depth in Chapters IV and V of this study.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Emergence Of Public-Private Partnerships

In recent years the availability of federal and state funding for community-based education and services has diminished. When coupled with a growing federal deficit, "public-private partnerships have become an increasingly popular vehicle for both limiting federal expenditures and leveraging federal funds" (Riggin, Grasso, and Westcott, 1992, p. 40). Jezierski (1990) defined public-private partnerships as a consortium providing flexible, voluntary, cooperative decision-making structures. The federal funding shortage has also shifted local community service responsibilities from Washington to state and city legislative bodies (Sternberg, 1990). Public-private partnerships are becoming the main focus of local state and federal agencies, higher education, and private organizations, amongst others, in the delivery of much-needed educational programs (Sternberg, 1993).

Educational policy issues and community services are in need of new links and coalitions that bring together a broad
range of interest groups and organizations that have transcended traditional supporters (Boyle and Mulcahy, 1996). "No single sector - government, business, nonprofit, or citizen/volunteer - can resolve [community-based educational] issues alone" (Boyle and Mulcahy, 1996, p. 3). Thus, "linking the complementary strengths of each organization" (Harding, 1996, p. i) and community groups is imperative. Bringing together the "expertise available to respond to learning needs, problems or issues identified by such external constituencies as local communities, citizens groups, state, national or other public [or private] sector organizations" is community-based education in its purest sense (The University of Nevada, Reno, Cooperative Extension, 1997, p. 1).

Public-private partnerships are emerging as the "preferred strategy" for the delivery of high-quality, low-cost public services (Phillips, Phillips and Phillips, 1993). Sternberg (1993) contended that "by the turn of the century, the United States will observe the coalescence of a trend that has been in the making for several decades: government and business...are combining to funnel their operations through hybrid 'partnerships'" (p. 11). Given this trend, the long-term impact and effect of public-private partnership arrangements have not been properly evaluated (Jezierski, 1990).

The need to discover new ways of tapping into alternate sources of funding to provide much-needed community
services, specifically educational programs, has led to the search for "existing systems with compatible goals on which to build this [public-private partnership] approach" (Harding, 1996, p. 5). In support of public-private partnerships, former Florida Governor Collins (1978) agreed that such partnerships are effective because of both parties' "insistence upon, and loyal [sic] to the concept of partnerships of government and higher education leadership" (p. 2). "Such partnerships often include government agencies, business, and associations that have discovered common ground in their desire to find workable solutions to pressing [community] problems" (Licht, 1990, p. 70).

The Kellogg-PCAA-Extension Partnership

In 1994, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (Kellogg Foundation) funded the Healthy Family America program developed by Prevent Child Abuse America (formerly known as the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse. The Committee changed its name in August of 1999 (PCAA)). PCAA was created in 1972 to "provide leadership and innovation for the child abuse prevention field through education, research, public awareness and advocacy" (Harding, 1996, p. 6). The Kellogg Foundation and PCAA entered into a partnership with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service (formerly known as the USDA Cooperative Extension System, the agency was reorganized in 1995
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resulting in a name change (USDA-CSREES)), specifically with Cooperative Extension. The University of Nevada, Reno, Cooperative Extension (1997) defines the USDA-CSREES as a "national organization whose main focus is community education, specifically, making research-based educational information available to the community to empower others to take charge of their lives" (p. 3). The newly-formed partnership engaged in a collaborative project with PCAA's Healthy Families America (HFA) initiative. Healthy Families America is "a community-based approach to supporting families that is backed by extensive research. The mission of the HFA initiative is to promote universal services for all new parents" (Harding, 1998, p. i). Harding (1996) reported that the main objective of the partnership was the evaluation of implementing the HFA's educational model through USDA-CSREES's community-based educational delivery system. "HFA was launched in 1992 in partnership with Ronald McDonald House charities...to establish a universal, voluntary, home visitation [educational] support system for all new parents" (Harding, 1996, p. 6). The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership and the HFA program are a good example of a cooperative agreement supported by McKeefery (1978) who proposed that:

The focus of present day interinstitutional cooperative arrangements become clear [sic] through examination of purposes and objectives...Mutual help by sharing resources; preservation of quality; cost efficiency; expanded and more varied educational opportunities for [all]; and [the] offering [of] new services that could not be supported by a single
The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership piloted the HFA project, a community-based education model for first-time parents in overburdened families in only three sites, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, Walworth County, Wisconsin, and Las Vegas (Clark County), Nevada.

This study reviewed, compared and contrasted the theoretical frameworks surrounding public-private partnerships, their formation, and their purposes; specifically, as they relate to community-based education. Issues of governance and administration were the main focus of this study and represented some of the challenges endured by this partnership. The purpose of this study was to identify and determine both the effective and ineffective strategies utilized by administrators at the inception of the public-private partnership forged between the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES from 1995 to 1998 in Pottawatomie County, Walworth County, and Las Vegas (Clark County). The methodology used was primarily qualitative, utilizing information obtained from participant's interviews, documents and other data sources.

Statement Of The Problem

The literature clearly infers that models which consistently identify the critical administrative and governance issues addressing the success or failure of public-private partnerships are lacking. This study
examined the governance and administrative strategies utilized by administrators at the formation of the public-private partnership forged between the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES. This partnership tested the HFA community-based education model for first-time parents in overburdened families. Only three pilot sites were selected for testing of the HFA program, Oklahoma, Nevada and Wisconsin from 1995 to 1998.

Purpose Of The Study

This study identified both effective and ineffective strategies utilized by administrators at the inception of the public-private partnership between the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES in Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, Las Vegas (Clark County), Nevada, and Walworth County, Wisconsin, from 1995 to 1998. There were no other sites selected. The study focused on administrative and governance issues in relation to the partnership's: 1) mission and objectives; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision-making processes; 4) conflict resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanisms and authority; and 7) accountability. The partnership is a pilot initiative. Specifically, the study determined which strategies worked and which did not.

Contrasts, comparisons, successes or failures of the partnership may "add to the development of knowledge and implications for further research" (McMillan, 1997, p. 595)
as "much of the information that is available on partnership projects is promotional in nature" (Riggin, Grasso and Westcott, 1992, p. 41). Further, this study's significance could promote continuity growth and expansion of both the HFA program model and the formation of future public-private partnerships (Harding, 1996, p. ii). This study was necessary because "although partnerships are widely touted as an effective way to stretch scarce public dollars, few attempts have been made to validate their effectiveness" (Riggin, et al, 1992, p. 41).

The methodology used was primarily interpretative, utilizing qualitative data obtained from participant interviews, documents and other data sources. This methodology was chosen because it "refers to research about persons' lives, stories, behavior, but also about organizational functioning, social movements, or interactional relationships (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 17). As McMillan and Schumacher (1997) explained, qualitative research provides an "understanding [of] a social situation from [the] participants' perspectives" (p. 100).

Research Questions

The focus of the study was to address governance and administrative strategies utilized in the formation of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership at its inception, measured against the following variables: 1) mission and
objectives; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision-making processes; 4) conflict resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanisms and authority; and 7) accountability. The study was centered on the following four questions:

1) What strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be effective?

2) What strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be ineffective?

3) What new strategies would administrators in the formation of this public-private partnership utilize in the formation of another partnership?

4) What effective strategies or procedures will be indicated and recommended for use in the formation of future public-private partnerships?

Peters (1998) identified six administrative and governance ingredients necessary for a newly-formed quasi-organization to function effectively. These six ingredients are covered extensively in Chapter II and were the basis of the theoretical framework that was used for this study.

Significance Of The Study

This study identified both effective and ineffective strategies utilized by administrators at the inception of the public-private partnership between the Kellogg
Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES on the issues of governance and administration in relation to the partnership's: 1) mission and objectives; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision-making processes; 4) conflict resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanisms and authority; and 7) accountability. The significance of this study's was presented earlier in this chapter.

This study may serve a theoretical and practical purpose. Jezierski (1990) observed that "the durability of partnerships for initiating and coordinating...change requires constant efforts to institutionalize conflicting interests and construct legitimacy for development policy and for the partnership itself" (p. 218). The data reported on the effective and ineffective strategies may benefit the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES should they wish to continue and expand the public-private partnership to other states. Fitzpatrick (1988) extended the notion that "the involvement of a non-profit organization [in public-private partnerships] may also favorably affect long-term financing via bond issuances, government mortgage insurance, limited subsidies, matching grants, or other vehicles that reduce costs" (p. 66).

Limitations

At its inception the public-private partnership between Kellogg Foundation, PCAA and the USDA-CSREES was designed to
effect the development and implementation of the HFA demonstration model. Only three pilot sites were selected to test the demonstration model, Oklahoma, Nevada, and Wisconsin (Harding, 1996). The outcome of the public-private partnership in these states has dire consequences for this initiative as the project's success or failure may either ensure or retard continuity and growth of the HFA model and the formation of similar partnerships nationwide. Given this, the truthfulness of respondents during the interview process could be one of the relevant limitations of this study (Borg and Gall, 1989).

Another limitation to this study is the risk involved in data collection because of politically sensitive issues. Riggin, Grasso and Westcott (1992) warned that:

> Because the validity of the data may be compromised in a politically sensitive situation, such as the case of a partnership project in trouble, it is important to gather from several different sources in order to converge on the real picture of the partnership's operations (p. 41).

An additional limitation to this study was the researcher's personal biases in favor of the success of the partnership initiative as the researcher is employed by the University of Nevada, Reno, in Nevada. Hence, Borg and Gall (1989) warned that the values and experiences of the researcher could bias the study. This bias was controlled in part by keeping a field log, a field journal and the process identified by McMillan and Schumacher (1997) as "peer debriefer". Bias was also controlled by increasing the
reliability of the data collected, by tape recording all interviews and having respondents review the transcripts for accuracy. McMillan (1997) believed that this method is "generally the most appropriate type of reliability for survey research and other questionnaires in which there is a range of possible answers for each item" (p. 242).

Analysis Of The Data

The data collected in this study was organized into clusters, with the ultimate purpose of comparing and contrasting operational strategies between and amongst the pilot sites at the state and national levels of the partnership. And for establishing relationships or patterns among identified and emerging categories. The process of inductive analysis was utilized for the organization, analysis, and interpretation of the data. McMillan and Schumacher (1997) identified four cyclical phases to the inductive analysis process. These four phases are:

1) Continuous discovery to identify tentative patterns.
2) Categorizing and ordering of data.
3) Assessing the trustworthiness of the data.
4) Writing synthesis or themes and/or concepts (p. 502).

Analysis began as soon as the first set of data from the interviews was collected and proceeded as follows:
1) All interview transcripts were read carefully in an effort to acquire an aggregate sense of the data.
2) An organizational system of topics was developed. The initial system was revised and adjusted as new topics or
subtopics emerged and as new categories are discerned. 3) Data was separated into segments or units of similar or equal, or different meaning. The segmentation of data allowed for similarities and distinctions between the categories to emerge. 4) Identification of data chunk or segments, assignment of a topic name, and clustering of each data segment or chunks by topics into identified categories, was the technique utilized for comparing and contrasting the data. 5) Other data sources (i.e. minutes, grant awards, memos, publications, and reports) were triangulated with the data acquired through interviews. Final presentation of the findings is reported and written in a descriptive-analytical interpretative format.

As stated earlier in this chapter, all interviews were tape-recorded. Each tape recording was transcribed verbatim utilizing Microsoft Word 8.0 on Windows 98 operating system. Coding, search and retrieval, data linking, and theory building was developed using a code-based theory-building software program. Weitzman and Miles (1995) reported that code-based theory-building programs are usually developed by researchers engaged in qualitative studies. These programs "specialize in helping you divide text into segments or chunks, attach codes to the chunks, and find and display all the chunks with a given code (or combination of codes) (Weitzman and Miles, 1995, p. 17). Non-commercial, Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching and Theorizing (NUD.IST) software, version 3.0, was selected for this
study. Windows 98 is the operating system for NUD.IST. NUD.IST "is a program designed for the storage, coding, retrieval, and analysis of text. [NUD.IST] is one of the best-thought-out programs around" (Weitzman and Miles, 1995, p. 238).

Interview transcripts were analyzed for information, occurrences, episodes, or ideas relevant to the study. Data segments were developed from the analysis. Data segments were divided into major topics, unique topics, and leftover topics (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997). A descriptive name or topic was assigned to each data segment. A name and a preliminary definition was developed for each topic. Names of topics were written on the margin of each interview transcript.

A thorough evaluation of the data was conducted to evaluate the quality and level of adequacy of the information collected and its degree of usefulness and to determine how central or close the information was to the study being conducted (McMillan and Schumacher, 1995; Miles and Huberman, 1994). Topical similarities were grouped to form categories, paying special attention to the explicit and implicit meanings in their contents. Identification of the major patterns directed the findings, reporting, and final organization of this study.

Internal validity was established by triangulation of the data, maintaining a field log, a journal and through the process identified as "peer debriefing". The analytical
process included listening to and reviewing all data; verifying the trustworthiness of the data with different sources by utilizing different data collection sources; and by further verifying the findings with either other interviewees or document sources. External validity was established by connecting the conclusions of this study to other cases and existing literature. The literature did not yield studies which assessed the administrative and governance strategies utilized in the formation of public-private partnerships, involving higher education and community-base outreach education. Despite this absence of studies, generalizability can be established by connecting the findings of this study "to theoretical networks beyond the immediate study" (Maxwell, 1994, p. 279). Final presentation of the findings is reported and written in a descriptive-analytical interpretative format.

Definition Of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used:
Administration: Managing the day-to-day affairs of an institution or program.
Administrator: A person who has been appointed or selected to administer an institution or program.
Accountability: Being held responsible; in the present situation the "partners share responsibility for the actions and consequences of the partnership"
Analysis: "Synthesizing the information from observation, interviews, and other data sources" (Wiersma, 1995, p. 265).

Authority: The right and power to command, enforce laws, exact obedience, determine, or judge.

Category: An abstract name representing the "meaning of similar topics" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 513).

Coding: The "process of dividing data into parts by a classification system" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 509).

Community-based education: An educational process that brings together the "expertise available to respond to learning needs, problems or issues identified by such external constituencies as local communities, citizen groups, state, national or other public [or private] sector organizations" (The University of Nevada, Reno, Cooperative Extension, 1997, p. 1).

Conflict resolution: A resolution system that allows the individuals involved to compromise and settle disputes or disagreements in an effective and holistic manner.

Cooperative Extension System: A national land-grant university system whose main focus is on community education, specifically, making available to the community educational information that is research-based with the purpose of empowering others to take
charge of their lives (Harding, 1996; University of Nevada, Reno, Cooperative Extension, 1997).

Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service (CSREES): An administrative agency of the USDA providing leadership and direction to Cooperative Extension and Experiment Stations in land-grant universities across the country and U.S. territories.

Decision-making process: Any process agreed upon by individuals in an institution as the method for discussing, arriving at, and agreeing to decisions (Peters, 1998).

Emic categories: Represent "the 'insiders' view such as terms, actions and explanations that are distinctive to the setting or people" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 516).

Enhance: To increase, highlight or make greater.

Etic categories: Represent "the 'outsiders' view of the situation—the researcher's concepts and scientific explanations" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 516).

External validity: "An analytical synthesis that enables others to understand similar situations and apply these findings in subsequent research (McMillan and Schumacker, 1997, p. 411); confirmation of a study "when they are [sic] measured by more than one 'instrument' measuring the same thing" (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 273).

Field journal: A "continuous record of decisions made during
the emergent design and the rationale at that time" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1998, p. 409).

Field log: Chronological record with dates, times, places and persons surveyed in the field (McMillan and Schumacher, 1998).

Governance: The act, process, or power of governing.

Health Families America (HFA) Model: A model providing "universal, voluntary, home visitation [educational] support system for all new parents" (Harding, 1996, p. 6).

Home visitation: A community-based educational approach in which trained educators disseminate educational research-based information in the homes of the recipients (University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, 1997).

Inductive analysis: Method by which "categories and patterns emerge from the data rather than being imposed on data prior to data collection" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 502).

Internal validity: The "extent to which the results of a research study can be interpreted accurately and with confidence" (McMillan, 1997, p. 162); to "validate the accuracy of your findings" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 52); the "extent to which extraneous variables have been controlled or accounted for" (Wiersma, 1995, p. 6).

Mission: A "common understanding about what should be done by [the partnership] and what actions would tend to
fall outside their common value framework" (Peters, 1998, p. 16).

Objectivity of data analysis: Addresses the "dependability and confirmability of the researcher's interactive style, data recording, data analysis and interpretation of participant meanings" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 408).

Organizational structure: The "allocation of tasks and responsibilities [and] the relationship between roles that create interdependence" (Bolman and Deal, 1984, p. 2); a structure that "provides a language for pinpointing authority, roles and relationships" (Bolman and Deal, 1984, p. 53).

Outreach: An educational institution's commitment to community-based education.

Overburdened families: "Parents who face multiple stresses -- being a teen parent, giving birth to a low birth-weight baby, having a low income or lacking the social support of friends and family" (University of Wisconsin-Extension, 1995, p. 4)

Pattern: A discernable relationship among or between established categories.

Peer debriefer: A "disinterested colleague who engages in discussions of the researcher's preliminary analyses and next methodological strategies in an emergent design" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 409).

Phenomenology: An approach emphasizing "the careful
description of phenomena from the perspective of those experiencing the phenomena" (Wiersma, 1995, p. 250).

Policies and procedures: The set of rules that shape and/or guide individual behavior within the structure of an institution (Peters, 1998).

Public-private partnership: A "consortium providing flexible, voluntary, cooperative decision-making structures" (Jezierski, 1990, p. 217) "linking the complementary strengths of each organization" (Harding, 1996, p. i).

Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA): An organization that provides "leadership and innovation for the child abuse prevention field through education, research, public awareness and advocacy" (Harding, 1996, p. 6).

Qualitative cross-validation: A part of data collection that "cuts across two or more techniques or sources" (Wiersma, 1995, p. 263).

Qualitative research: Any "kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 17).

Quasi-organization: A mutually beneficial and accountable association of two or more entities that is designed to carry out a specific task, activity, or program which is of importance to both the public and the private sectors (Peters, 1989; Beauregard, 1989; Hemmings, 1984; Salyer, 1991).
Segment: Data which is "comprehensible by itself and contains one idea, episode, or piece of information relevant to the study" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 510).

Standardized open-ended interviews: Essentially "vocal questionnaires" (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 263); a process by which an "investigator can ask key respondents for the facts of a matter as well as for the respondents' opinions about events" (Yin, 1989, p. 89); and "participants are asked the same questions in the same order" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 447).

Topic: A "descriptive name for the subject matter of a given segment" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 510).

Triangulation: The "cross-validation among data sources, data collection strategies, time periods, and theoretical schemes" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 520) that "supports a finding by showing that independent measures of it agree with it or, at least, do not contradict [the findings]" (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 266).

USDA: The United States Department of Agriculture.

Variable: A major phenomenon to be studied.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation (Kellogg Foundation): A national philanthropic organization that endeavors to assist people solve their problems through knowledge. This organization was founded by W. K. Kellogg, inventor of
Summary

Public-private partnerships are surfacing as the ideal arrangement for the delivery of quality, cost-effective, and much-needed public and educational services. The diminishing access to and availability of federal and state dollars has given rise to the proliferation of public-private partnerships. Partnerships are being touted as the ideal organizational format for meeting head-on communities' increasing demand for social and educational services. Community-based education has been identified as one of these much-needed outreach educational services.

In 1994 the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (Kellogg), Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA), and the USDA-Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service (USDA-CSREES) entered into a public-private partnership to develop the Healthy Families America initiative. Healthy Families America is a program backed by extensive research that provides support for disenfranchised families through community-based education. HFA program design, development, implementation and design are not the focus of this study. The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES public-private partnership provided an exceptional case for the study of effective and ineffective strategies utilized in the administration and governance of such partnerships.

The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership selected three
pilot sites to test the HFA model. Only three sites were selected as follows: 1) Las Vegas (Clark County), Nevada. HFA was tested in an growing urban setting with a very diverse population base. 2) Walworth County, Wisconsin, a rural setting with a large population of Latino migrant workers. 3) Pattawatomie County, Oklahoma is in a rural area with a very large Native American population.

This study was designed to uncover effective and ineffective strategies utilized by public-private partnerships in the administration and governance of its affairs. The administrative and governance strategies analyzed in this study were in relation to the partnership's mission and goals, organizational structure, decision-making process, process for conflict resolution, policies and procedures, process for and authority to expend funds, and accountability of the partners. The significance of this study is linked to: 1) The increasing demand for social and community-based educational services; 2) The proliferation of public-private partnerships; 3) The shrinkage of public and federal funds; and, 4) The apparent absence of models for analyzing administrative and governance issues affecting the success or failure of public-private partnerships.

Open-ended interviews were conducted with participants in the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership. Data from interviews was triangulated with other data sources. Researcher bias was reduced by maintaining a field log and journal. The study uncovered many governance and
administrative challenges and conflicts endured by the partners. Apparently due to lack of planning, lack of knowledge or familiarity with each other’s organizational culture, language, operation, and purpose. A top-down style of management, lack of formal structure, the absence of a conflict-resolution process and mediation, and a very authoritarian process for making decisions exacerbated conflicts between the partners at the national level and the partners located at the pilot sites. The partnership’s mission and objectives were helpful. Policies and procedures were not instituted. Programmatic accountability was established through written reports. Control issues at some sites added to the partnership’s struggles.

This study corroborated Peters’ (1998) six governance and administrative elements necessary for the effective operation of public-private partnerships. These six elements were the variables in this study. Eleven other findings surfaced as a direct result of this study. The following are recommendations emanating as a direct result of the eleven findings: pre-planning; open discussions with partners about fiscal authority, budget preparation and appointing a budget administrator was recommended; acquire knowledge of each partners organizational culture, language, operation and purpose; develop a process for resolving conflicts and use of a professional mediator; allow the partnership’s style of management to emerge rather than be imposed by another partner; develop written role descriptions for each partner;
it is important that partners trust each others skills, experience and expertise; and maintain a written account of the partnership’s institutional history.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter examines the existing theories about public-private partnerships, specifically, as their formation and operation relate to the administration and governance of the partnership in a community-based education program. Partnerships, as an institutional concept, are often established when a private organization, a public agency, and a non-profit organization join to either solve a problem, address pressing issues, or develop policy. A specific challenge to this study was the absence of data and research that analyzes variables related to the administrative and governance elements in partnerships.

Theoretical Challenges

A review of the literature on public-private partnerships uncovered four challenges. These challenges surfaced in relation to the formation and subsequent administration and governance of partnerships with institutions of higher education. The challenges were: 1) Uncovering a working definition of public-private partnership; 2) Overcoming the lack of a theoretical
framework for public-private partnerships within the concept of outreach and community-based education; 3) Filling the void created by the absence of studies and data analyzing the governance and administration of public private-partnerships, and the effectiveness of the strategies utilized; and 4) Addressing the absence of studies or data analyzing the governance and administration of public-private partnerships specifically involving higher education as it relates to outreach and community-based education.

Governance And Administration

Governance, according to Stoker (1998), is the emergence of new processes and systems for self-governing focusing on an ongoing process of interaction among the partners. Self-governing is "the action, manner or system of governing [,] and the interactive relationship between [the partners]" (Stoker, 1998, p. 38). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, governance includes the following elements of a partnership's organizational structure; vesting of authority to expend public-partnership funds; mechanisms or systems for making decisions; format for conflict resolution; and the accountability of the partners. Stoker (1998) reported that governance, as defined herein, represented an alternative to "a complex, diverse and dynamic social-political world [that] requires forms of governing which are dynamic, complex and diverse" (p. 39).

Administration in public-private partnerships places
the main focus on the appearance of new processes and systems of governing (Stoker, 1998). Thus, for the purpose of this study, administration is defined as the management of the partnership's day-to-day affairs. The management of the affairs do not include programmatic issues such as program design, development, and implementation. Rather, this study analyzed the implementation of operational policies and procedures, the implementation of funding mechanisms and systems, adherence to the organizational structure, and adherence to the partnership's stated mission.

Concepts On Public-Private Partnership

Government agencies, businesses, and community-based organizations have recognized and accepted that they are mutually interdependent and must rely on each other to meet public needs and increasing demands. "Neither the public nor the private sector appears capable of performing well without involvement of the other" (Peters, 1998, p. 11). Public agencies, private organizations, and nonprofit associations joining together to form public-private partnerships appears to be a plausible means of achieving similar objectives and resolving pressing community issues. Interdependence is made further clear and eminent as "both the public and private sectors find their resources constrained and both their demands and opportunities growing" (Peters, 1998, p. 11). Thus, there clearly exists a
need for the formation of partnerships involving diverse institutions.

There is, however, a minority who believes that partnerships are "unworkable because they have been poorly defined and one-sided initiatives that had no clear results" (Hemming, 1984, p.1). Poorly defined partnerships at times serve a pre-determined political agenda. Results may appear unclear. However, this lack of clarify may be precisely the outcome sought after as real action was not intended after all. Rather just the appearance that a process was put in place to address an issue or problem. Another criticism against partnerships is the apparent inability of all partners to share in the authority of the partnership's intended purpose. Mainly because the dominant organization amasses all the power and imposes their own agenda on the other partners. Thus yielding results beneficial to only one partner. Despite its shortcomings, public-private partnerships are still the preferred institutional arrangement which invites and allows the union and participation of completely diverse and dissimilar organizations in their attempt at solving complex community issues. Partnerships are viewed as the preferred quasi-organizational choice for addressing educational, urban development and redevelopment, conservation and other related issues, complex in nature and potentially volatile.

During the 1970s a proliferation of public-private partnerships emerged between and amongst public and
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government agencies, business and nonprofit organizations, and neighborhood groups or community-based organizations (Beauregard, 1998). This proliferation of public-private partnerships, and their interdependence, has created the need for an "accurate understanding of the benefits and costs of using particular institutional arrangements as means of pursuing particular ends" (Brooks, Liebman & Schelling, 1984, p. xiii). While an understanding of the benefits and costs associated with the formation of public-private partnerships is necessary, the existing literature suggests that of utmost priority and importance is developing an understanding of what is meant when the term is used. This becomes important because "it is not entirely clear just what we mean when we say 'public-private partnership'" (Peters, 1998, p. 12).

What Is A Public-Private Partnership?

The literature on public-private partnerships is very diverse and complex and lacks specific criteria for defining and evaluating partnership arrangements (Joy, 1990). Generalizations regarding the different types of public-private partnerships are also lacking in the literature. Additionally, there are no comparisons between previous and current endeavors and their success or failure (Joy, 1990). The literature does provide a general definition and characteristics that appear to be present at, and in some cases necessary for, the formation of most public-
partnership arrangements.

The word, partnership, implies the collaboration of two or more participants. There are, however, a "variety of definitional [sic] problems involved in the use of the term 'partnership'" (Peters, 1998, p. 11). Most of the dissonance found in the literature is in the interpretation and use of the word itself, especially within an identified institutional discipline. For example, the definition of the word "partnership" changes when discussing or evaluating partnerships surrounding policy issues or involving urban development or redevelopment projects, education, conservation issues, economic growth and development, technology transfer, defense, or governmental (federal, state, and local) initiatives. Nevertheless, for the purpose of this study, a public-private partnership is defined as an arrangement that must have at least one partner from the public or nonprofit sector and one partner from the private sector who come together and form a quasi-organization for the purpose of carrying out a specific task, activity, or program which is of importance to both the public and the private sectors (Peters, 1989; Beauregard, 1989; Hemmings, 1984; Salyer, 1991).

It is important to recognize that a true public-private partnership, as described above, needs to be differentiated from contractual and grant relationships. In a "client-supplier relationship", or contractual agreement, the client has complete control over the project and its outcome. In a
grant relationship, the provider of the funds determines the theoretical direction of the grant by specifically defining its tasks (Brooks, Liebman and Schelling, 1984, p. 17). In a true public-private partnership the partners "must be chosen to meet a particular set of problems and circumstances" (Pierre, 1998, p. 25) and because they "possess unique organizational strengths that make the partnership compelling" (Harding, 1998, p. i).

Peters (1998) identified five characteristics necessary for the formation of a public-private partnership:

1) The partnership must be comprised of two or more participants, one of which is from the public sector.

2) Each collaborator or participant must be a principal, that is, each having the ability to negotiate or bargain individually without having to seek approval from other sources. This characteristic may be difficult for public sector organizations as "there are usually multiple levels of control and deliberation" (p. 12).

3) Collaboration should be lasting and durable.

4) Each participant must contribute some form of resources (material or non-material) to the partnership.

5) Each partner is accountable for the outcome of the project (pp. 12-13).

Public-private partnerships can also be understood or identified by other distinguishing features such as the level of complexity involved, the formality or lack thereof of the arrangements, and the purpose for the formation of the partnership (Peters, 1998). Whatever the distinguishing
features or characteristics, participation in public-private partnerships allow the participants to "gain the advantages that different institutions seem to offer" (Brooks, Liebman & Schelling, 1984, p. xiii).

Most of the characteristics mentioned by Peters (1998) were incorporated in the partnerships formed with the Private Industry Council in the management of the Job Training Partnership Act. The partnership involved the National Alliance of Business regarding a project on molding the employment and economic development connection. Hemmings (1984) identified eight steps that must be perfected in order for a public-private partnership to grow and expand. They are:

1) Review the community's context to determine where it stands, what opportunities it can tap, and what obstacles it must overcome before moving in new directions.

2) Define a specific issue on which to focus the partnership. The issue could well be an aspect of a problem the community wants to address.

3) Organize a local team.

4) Determine whether a new vehicle is needed or whether an existing mechanism is acceptable. New vehicles may be especially useful in communities without a strong history of partnership.

5) Analyze the issue.

6) Identify options, once the problem is defined and current approaches have been reviewed.

7) Negotiate agreement.

8) Implement the plan and follow-through on it after
negotiating agreement on the plan of action (pp. 2-3).

The study showed "many positive signs that the partnership is flourishing" (Hemmings, 1984, p. 4), and future analysis will focus on "determine [sic] the strengths, the successes, and the problems facing the job training partnership" (Hemmings, 1984, p. 5). The study, however, did not focus on analyzing governance and administrative strategies in the administration of the partnership even though an initial study revealed that where problems arose, "they appeared to arise from an unwillingness to share authority under mutually defined conditions" (Hemmings, 1984, p. 4). The National Alliance of Business subsequently utilized the above eight steps to measure the growth and success of the partnership arrangements developed with the Private Industry Council in their administration of the Job Training Partnership Act.

**Partnerships As Quasi-Organizations**

A partnership, once established, results in its members forming a quasi-organization that develops vital institutional and structural qualities. These qualities "provide the basis for a continuing exchange within a set of mutually agreed-upon rules" (Peters, 1998, p. 15). In addition to agreed-upon rules and methods of operation, Peters (1998) asserted that "there tends to be a certain
number of shared values among the participants, as well as some common policy goals so that they are symbolic as well as utilitarian components of the relationship" (Peters, 1998, p. 15). Agreed-upon rules, shared values, and common policy goals are all necessary ingredients for the continuity of any partnership.

There are a number of incentives and benefits identified in the formation of public-private partnerships as quasi-organizations. Peters (1998) reports that:

Partnership arrangements tend to be cost-effective when compared to other possible means of achieving the same goals. This means that the cost of providing the same service will be less for each side of the arrangement than it would if it were providing the service alone. Partnerships also enable programs to escape from the political and bureaucratic processes that might bog them down were they totally public sector activities (p. 21).

Who comes to the table and what they bring are other important considerations in the formation of partnerships and are vital to the survival of the quasi-organizational structure. Peters & Beauregard (1998) reported that some of the tangible preconditions and incentives to work together are mutual interests, commitment and dedication to a mutual goal, exchange amongst participants, the need to establish a program or policy, the lack of viable alternatives, and the complex mixture of public, private, and nonprofit associations which can produce results. These preconditions are imperative to accomplish what neither can accomplish separately. Consequently, the partners share in the responsibility for the actions and consequences of the
partnership. Without the partnership the tasks would be much more difficult, less likely to succeed, or impossible. These were the circumstances that brought higher education, a private institution, and a nonprofit organization together to form a partnership arrangement herein identified as the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership.

Peters (1998) identified six governance and administrative ingredients necessary for a newly-formed quasi-organization to function effectively. These are:

1) There needs to be a concrete understanding and agreement of the conditions and ideas [objective and mission] central to the founding of the partnership.

2) The partnership should have a structural and organizational aspect that governs the decision-making process.

3) Partners should develop internal cohesion and logic to guide behavior; thus suggesting a process for decision-making and conflict resolution, as there needs to be agreement before any action can be taken.

4) The partners must developed agreed upon rules and [policies] that shape individual behavior within a given structure. It is preferable that these rules and [policies] be negotiated amongst the members of the partnership, rather than decided upon hierarchically.

5) Partners should establish a system for transaction costs and other aspects of the economics of the quasi-organization. That is, developing a system for managing the budget.

6) The partners need to be accountable and share the responsibility for the outcome of the activities and the partnership's mission (pp. 15-20).

These ingredients can provide a "good explanation of the performance of a [quasi-organization] once it has been established"...and.."provide a useful guidance for a would-be

Institutionalism

The concept of institutionalism is provided as an alternative way of studying public-private partnerships as institutions, an analytical approach often used in political and social sciences. The main point of the institutional concept is that in every arrangement there are structural and organizational considerations borrowed from social life and brought into organizations which then determine and contour behavior, having much influence and impact in the decision-making process (Peters, 1998). Organizational theory was also reviewed as another alternative lens for studying public-private partnerships. Four major schools of organizational thought surfaced while reviewing the literature, the structural approach, the human resources approach, the political approach, and the symbolic approach. The literature revealed the following perspectives: 1) The structural approach places great importance on the formality of roles and relationships. Organizational structure is very hierarchical, emphasizes division of labor, and creates rules and policies in order to run the organization. 2) The human resources approach ascribes to the notion that people inhabit organizations and have skills, needs, feelings, prejudices, and limitations which govern the operation of the organization. 3) The political approach conceptualizes organizations as domains of scarce resources and emphasizes
power and influence as the denominators for allocating resources. 4) The symbolic approach views organizations as cemented by shared values and culture rather than by goals and policies (Bolman and Deal, 1990).

Organizational theory appears to be confined, rigid, and too individualistic an approach for the study of the complex relationships entertained by the formation of partnerships, as "each frame [or concept] has its own vision of reality" (Bolman and Deal, 1990, p. 6). Organizational theory may impose its individualistic vision of reality on the formation of partnerships rather than allowing the partnership to evolve and develop in a natural sense as a quasi-organization. The concept of institutionalism was the theoretical framework chosen for this study because "institutionalism is attempting to build more systematic approaches to understanding the manners in which structures and their characteristics influence [outcomes, and] policy, as well as influence social decision-making more generally" (Peters, 1992, p. 162; see also Giddens, 1981, p. 14).

Harding (1998) also pointed out that:

Until relatively recently much institutional analysis tended to focus inward rather than outward. It concerned itself with the technicalities of organization, with the effects of procedural rules and conventions, for example, rather than with the interaction between institutions [or quasi-organizations] and their environments (p. 72).

Even though the evolution of the institutionalistic perspective has been dramatically influenced by organizational theory (Cohen, March and Olsen, 1971), a more
flexible and holistic approach is required to understand the nature of partnerships. Thus, the choice of institutionalism over the lens of organizational theory as the theoretical framework.

DiMaggio (1988) explored the inherent difficulties in explaining the dimensions of an institution; "just where to draw the line on what counts as an institution is a matter of some controversy in the literature" (Thelen and Steinmo, 1992, p. 2). Indeed, it is more plausible to explain what an institution is not than what it is. The formation of partnerships can be understood within the concept of institutionalism as having "important institutional and structural properties" (Peters, 1998, p. 15) and as having significant involvement in the "interaction between institutions and their environments" (Harding, 1998, p. 72). At the formation of the partnership, its players choose to form an institution or quasi-organization rather than negotiating with individuals for the attainment of objectives and outcomes.

The institution or quasi-organization will "solidify the meta-level bargains made, and provide [sic] the basis for a continuing exchange within a set of mutually-agreed [upon] rules" (Peters, 1998, p. 15). In addition to these rules there appears to be a number of shared values, especially if the partners have similar organizational missions and operational philosophies. Harding (1998) attested that "Academics [sic] have therefore found it more
sensible to ask what institutions do, how they do it and with what effect rather than what triggered them and how they formed" (pp. 71-72). Given the extensive body of knowledge surrounding the conceptual framework of the nature of is an institution, the focus on institutionalism in this study, as another approach to understanding public-private partnerships, will be on value institutionalism, rational institutionalism, and historical institutionalism.

Value Institutionalism

Shared values are the variables that define this approach of institutionalism, placing an intrinsic value on the "symbolic elements of the institution. The values that are embodied within the institution create a logic of appropriateness that guides the behavior of individuals embedded within the institution" (Peters, 1998, p. 16). Control in this institutional approach then is demonstrated by the manipulation of symbols. Peters (1992) pointed out that "the values that any one institution advocates may be more or less desirable as rules of action for society" (p. 162) and "in the case of public-private partnerships the integration of values would enable what might otherwise be a somewhat ill-defined entity to function effectively and to develop greater latitude for independent action than might be expected" (p. 16).
Rational Institutionalism

Rational institutionalism focuses on the rules that determine individual behavior rather than on values. Rules allow the partners to act individually and collectively as a group. Rules are inherent in formal institutions. In the administration of partnerships rules, rather than being hierarchical obstacles, can be the result of negotiation, thus ensuring global participation and buy-in by the partners. Peters (1998) extended the notion that "rather than having to renegotiate the rules by which they will interact with one another to produce collective benefits, the existence of a partnership enables the [partners] to make decisions without having to begin discussions from first principles each time" (pp. 17-18).

Historical Institutionalism

Historical institutionalism supports the notion that philosophies, views, ideas, and conditions in existence at the formation of the partnership are essential in developing an understanding of its partners and their subsequent behavior, especially in the decision-making process (Steinmo, Thelen, and Longstreth, 1992). The initial path will remain their main focus and will have great influence as the partnership evolves. In support of this notion, Peters (1998) argued that the implication of this approach on partnerships is that "negotiating the rules at the inception of an agreement is even more important than it
appears" (p. 19). Peters (1998) further contended that "given the almost inherent complexity of partnership arrangements, their advocates and formulators should attempt to design sets of rules and patterns of decision-making that will maximize their capacity for action" (p. 19).

Public-Private Partnerships

In Higher Education

A review of the literature on public-private partnership arrangements with higher education uncovered very little in the area of community-based education. However, much is written about such partnership arrangements involving higher education and the U.S. Department of Defense as a sponsor and regarding a range of varied research and development endeavors of a scientific nature with business, industry, and manufacturing. Much is also written regarding research and development projects with elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools in both the private and public educational systems. These kindergarten through 12th grade partnership arrangements "vary widely in terms of their activities and levels of interaction, and may include such things as adopt-a-school, teacher training, magnet schools, mini-grants, and the like" (Joy, 1990, pp. 21-22). Nevertheless, the focus of this study is the governance and administrative strategies utilized in public-private partnerships involving higher education, specifically, in community-based education.
Given the specific focus of this study, it is not feasible to generalize across the many types of partnership arrangements found in the literature. Thus, it is difficult to present a broad framework on governance and administrative strategies in partnership arrangements. Most partnerships measure the success or outcome of projects, programs, or implementation of policy. In summary, "these studies have a normative view of what others should do for successful implementation, based on their [own] experience" (Joy, 1990, p. 29). The existing literature did not provide comparative studies that utilized "a common research approach to isolate factors contributing to success [or lack thereof] and build a broader theory from the individual cases" (Joy, 1990, p. 29). Studies contained in the literature do not attempt to compare, contrast, or even focus on the scope of governance and administrative issues associated with the management of a partnership. Most of the focus is on achieving predetermined objectives. Projects described as successful are based on narrow, outcome objectives and not on comparative analysis; therefore, a conceptual framework is not easily discerned. Despite all its limitations, the existing literature on public-private partnerships does provide some essential elements for structuring a framework and guide to understanding partnership arrangements, their formations, and the elements that are necessary for their establishment and continuity.
The apparent lack of partnership arrangements with higher education involving community-based education concerned Fletcher, Hogarth and Schuchardt (1997). They observed that "rarely have teaching and research programs entered into true partnerships with those outside the university to design, implement, and evaluate [outreach] projects" (p. 77). Votruba (1966) argued that "truly excellent outreach efforts not only make a difference in the lives of the intended audience, but also enhance the teaching and research missions of the university" (p.3). Schutjer (1993) further extended the notion that "creating 'universities that matter' will require collaboration among public universities, government, industry and the nation's private foundations" (p. 9). "That is, universities must look outward and engage or connect with society in true partnerships" (Fletcher et al., 1997, p. 72).

Community-Based Education

Land-Grant Universities

Over a century ago politicians recognized the power of education. They acknowledged that this power should not be a privilege earmarked for a select few. Rather, politicians recognized that the nation's future and advancement depended on the availability of education to the country's entire citizenry (Campbell, 1995). The result was the birth of the land-grant colleges and universities, outreach, and community-based education.
In the early 19th century most of America's institutions of higher learning followed the European model of classical teaching, catering almost exclusively to government leaders, the very rich, men, and members of "the professions", i.e., doctors, educators and lawyers. The mid-19th Century brought about a change. Scientific education was gaining recognition and agricultural societies were insisting that colleges offer agricultural programs.

In 1857, Vermont representative Justin Smith Morrill introduced the first College Land Bill in Congress. Despite stiff opposition in the Senate, the bill passed two years later and was signed by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. The Morrill Act (the College Land Bill) gave each state 30,000 acres of public land with the condition that portions of the land be sold and the proceeds of which be used to construct a university. The second Morrill Act, passed in 1890, provided for the creation of 17 historically black land-grant colleges. In 1907, the Nelson Amendment modified the first and second Morrill Acts by providing a permanent annual appropriation per state and territory (National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges [NASULGC], 1994). The Morrill Acts afforded members of the working class the opportunity to engage in classical studies as well as agriculture, military tactics, and the mechanical arts (NASULGC, 1994). Traditional elements of a land-grant system are residential instruction, agricultural research through an experiment station, and dissemination of this...
information through an extension service.

One of the challenges these new universities faced was the establishment of their intellectual foundation. The Hatch Act, passed in 1887, authorized federal grant funds for direct payment to each state that would establish an agricultural experiment station in connection with the land-grant college established under the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862. The main purpose of the Hatch Act was to create an avenue for land-grant universities to actively engage in original research, investigations, and experiments directly dealing with, and contributing to the "establishment and maintenance of a permanent and effective agricultural industry of the United States" (USDA, 1985, p. 16). Congress required two things from agricultural experiment stations once established: 1) Publication of their research findings by way of written reports; and 2) Dissemination of this information to farmers. At the time land-grant institutions did not have an avenue for the dissemination of research findings to farmers.

In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act was passed establishing the Cooperative Extension System. The Act charged land-grant institutions with diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture, home economics and rural energy. The Extension Service was perceived as the perfect venue to disseminate information and impart education to every individual within a state. Extension work consists of the
development of practical applications of research knowledge and giving of instruction and practical demonstration of existing or improved practices (NASULGC, 1994). The Morrill Acts, the Hatch Act, and the Smith-Lever Act established a three-way partnership which provides a "uniquely coordinated nationwide partnership] among federal, state, and county governments that involves three sources of public funds for Cooperative Extension work and three levels of perspectives on [the] mission, goals, and priorities for educational programs" (USDA, 1985, p. 10).

The Kepner Report, published in 1946, was the first Extension System-United States Department of Agriculture (ES-USDA) committee report on the objectives of the Extension Service. The Kepner Report contended that "Extension's responsibility must include all the people [not only farmers], irrespective of their place of residence, age, economic status, group affiliations, or other factors" (USDA, 1985, p. 34). In 1983, the USDA and NASULGC came together and produced a report entitled "Extension in the 80's: A Perspective for the Future of the Cooperative Extension Service". The findings of the report were based on the following societal changes in America:

1. Families in flux, with more single-parent families and working women;

2. Changing residence patterns, increased mobility; more farmers living in cities and villages, more city workers living in villages and the country;

3. More farm people holding part-time and full-time off-farm jobs;
4. Changes in governmental systems, and impacts on people, communities, and institutions;

5. Changes in health and nutrition, and new lifestyles;

6. Different societal values affecting the aspirations of young people;


Reisbeck and Reynolds (1976) revealed that:

Because of the changing needs and the complexity of emerging problems of society, the land-grant universities are discovering that they can best respond to the demands of their clientele by broadening the knowledge base of Extension (p. 51).

The initial mission of the Extension System was changing dramatically and endeavored to include other populations who were disenfranchised much like the farmers were at the turn of the century. As the Extension System changed and adapted its mission to meet changing societal demands, so did land-grant universities because the "primary role of land-grant colleges and universities always has been service to meet people's changing needs" (Campbell, 1995, p. 143) regardless of the risks or the persons in need. Caldwell (1976) stated it best when he pointed out that "land-grant universities are knowledge centers -- generating, testing, analyzing, transmitting, packaging, and dreaming of new possibilities for knowledge, pure and applied, scientific and humanistic -- all of it to advance the human condition" (p. 15).

Colleges and universities, as recipients of public funds, have a greater obligation to extend and deliver the many benefits of education to all citizens. "This is
especially true among land-grant colleges and universities, institutions in which the extension, outreach, public service mission make them unique" (Campbell, 1995, p. 135). The Cooperative Extension System is the gateway between the land-grant institution and the community.

**Outreach**

Outreach is an educational institution's commitment to community-based education. Reilly (1990) defines outreach as "programs offered away from the main campus of an institution of higher learning" (p. 2). This definition of outreach is used by most universities and community colleges. Outreach is seen as "a nontraditional approach to education which is offered off-campus to an adult population" (Reilly, 1990, p. 2), who at the conclusion of the academic program receive an "external degree", suggesting that the degree "was awarded for competencies developed independently of the degree[-]granting institution" (Reilly, 1990, p. 2). McGuire (1988) offers a slightly different perspective to outreach and community-based education in relation to community colleges when he asserts that it is "a unique relationship between the educational institution and the community, a relationship in which the institution determines its direction and develops its programs through interaction with the community" (p. 19).

Lerner, Simon, and Mitchell (1998) equated community
empowerment with outreach and envision outreach as:

Multi-institutional and citizen collaboratives [sic] that define, implement and evaluate community-based programs, engage policy makers and develop a new generation of community leaders dedicated to building—and knowledgeable on how to build—citizens' capacity to use their assets and strengths to promote their own positive development (p. 268).

This definition is consistent with the land-grant university and the Cooperative Extension System organizational missions. As mentioned in this chapter, land-grant universities and Extension's philosophy is manifested in their genuine concern with improving peoples lives, providing and ensuring access to information, and providing educational programs backed by research.

Lerner et al. (1998) distinguished between Reilly's and their visions of community-based education and outreach by inferring that external degree programs are not addressing the social and cultural problems faced by communities; nor is the apparent social service approach presented by McGuire. Rather, Lerner et al. (1998) argued that "the pressure from communities is for the university to use its knowledge to address community-defined problems and focus on outreach scholarship pertinent to the quality of life [of its citizens]" (p. 271). An important implication to Lerner's et al. (1998) claim is that the "university scholar's knowledge must be integrated with knowledge that exists in the communities within which universities are embedded" (p. 270).

Lerner's et al. (1998) definition of community-based
education and outreach is the working definition utilized in this study, as it is congruent with that of land-grant universities and the Cooperative Extension System, partners in the formation of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation—Prevent Child Abuse America—United States Department of Agriculture Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service public-private partnership.

The Healthy Family America Project

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation (Kellogg), Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA) and their state chapters in Wisconsin, Oklahoma, and Nevada, and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service (CSREES), headquartered in each's state land-grant university, came together in late 1994 to form a public-private partnership to develop the Healthy Families America (HFA) project. The funding was provided by the Kellogg Foundation, the Healthy Families America program model was provided by PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES provided the delivery systems into the community. The primary focus of this three-year initiative was to explore the suitability of implementing the HFA program through the prevailing Cooperative Extension community-based education delivery system.

The Healthy Families America Program

Healthy Families America is "an initiative to establish
a universal, voluntary home visitor system for all new parents to help their children get off to a healthy start" (Harding, 1996, Appendix C). The HFA program was developed utilizing extensive research on child abuse and neglect and from the experiences and challenges of the Hawaiian Healthy Start program. The program was established to promote "positive parenting and child health and development, thereby preventing child abuse and other poor childhood outcomes" (Harding, 1996, Appendix C). To ensure the reception, implementation, success, and growth of the program and its home visitation component, early collaborations were established with the following national organizations: the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Hospital Association, the National Head Start Association, and the Cooperative Extension System of the U.S. Department of Agriculture at land-grant universities. The aim and focus of these national organizations is the same as PCAA, the prevention of child abuse and neglect through research and education.

The urgency of these organizations' endeavor is reflected in the alarming trends reported by Brown (1988) who wrote:

In 1985, only 68.2 percent of all women [in the U.S] obtained adequate prenatal care, 23.9 percent had an intermediate level of care, and 7.9 percent of all pregnant women had inadequate care. More troubling is that since 1980, there has been an increase in the percentage of births to women with late or no prenatal care (p. 1).

In February 1996, PCAA reported that:
In 1994, there were more than 3.1 million cases of suspected child abuse report by CPS [Child Protective Services] agencies and more than 3 children a day died from child abuse and neglect. Most physical abuse and neglect occurs among young children under the age of two; almost all child fatalities due to maltreatment occur among children under the age of five with approximately 44 percent occurring to infants under the age of one. Yet, typically more than half of child abuse fatalities are UNKNOWN to child protective services (Harding, 1996, Appendix C).

The HFA program begins with an initial assessment of the families. Harding (1996) described this initial assessment as necessary to:

...determine both the strengths and needs of families, conducted prenatailly or at the birth of a child. Using a two-step assessment process, families are first screened using medical records or a brief interview to determine the presence of demographic factors that pose a risk to positive parenting. If a family screens positive, they are assessed more closely using an in-depth, standardized interview, which obtains information about family history and dynamics. Regardless of the assessment outcome, families are provided with information and resources; a positive assessment qualifies the family for HFA services (p. 8).

The initial and subsequent screening process is one of the alternatives available to the program. During this assessment stage family support workers spend time with pregnant women or new parents talking about issues surrounding positive parenting, their hopes, and expectations. Referrals are received from prenatal care clinics and public schools which allows "expectant mothers [to] be screened and engaged in the program before their lives take on the hectic responsibilities of new motherhood" (Harding, 1996, p. 10). The program targets populations that are extremely vulnerable, "traditionally hard to reach
families who may have limited or negative experiences with other service providers in the past" (Harding, 1996, p. 17). HFA does not claim to meet all the needs of overburdened families; rather, the program's aim is parent-child interaction through a home visitation model to prevent child abuse and neglect and to link parents with available community resources.

Only three pilot sites were selected to test the implementation, applicability, replicability and future growth of the HFA program. The test sites selected were Walworth County in Wisconsin, Pottawatomie County in Oklahoma, and Las Vegas (Clark County) in Nevada. Administration of the HFA program was assigned to the CES land-grant partners. PCAA retained the lead role for developing and implementing the plans for expansion of the program throughout the states. Walworth County is a predominantly rural area. The HFA program was targeted at the largely hidden community of Latin families who come to the county to perform seasonal work in the tourism and agricultural industries (Harding, 1996). Native American families, represented by approximately five Indian Nations, were the group identified in Pottawatomie County as the recipients of the HFA program. This population posed some specific challenges, mainly dealing with the distinct cultures of each Indian nation represented and their individual cultural approaches to parenting and with feelings of distrust and alienation. Families in this group
were challenging to reach. Three zip code areas in the Las Vegas metropolitan area were the focus of the HFA program in Nevada. This area, the fastest growing urban area in the country, has experienced a 65% population growth in the past five years. Many families moving into the area experience lack of employment opportunities, depletion of their savings, few social networks to rely on or to access, and the absence of necessary information to access the assistance needed (Harding, 1996). Disenfranchised families were the focus of the HFA program in Las Vegas.

**Programmatic Objectives**

The primary objective in evaluating the implementation and development of the HFA program through the Cooperative Extension delivery mechanism in the three pilot sites was to ascertain the program's potential for implementation and growth in other states. In funding this project the Kellogg Foundation endeavored to ascertain the:

1) Replicability [sic] of the program;
2) Quality of the HFA program model;
3) Quality of HFA training and technical assistance;
4) Cost-effectiveness and sustainability [sic] of the program;
5) Policy or systems changes resulting from the project (Harding, 1996, p. 1).

Numbers one through four, as well as program evaluation, implementation, and growth potential, were not the focus of this study. Rather, the study focused on governance issues and administrative challenges endured by the public-private partnership at its inception and is more related to number
five above. Specifically, the study determined the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of these strategies which may have been developed by partners with diverse backgrounds, divergent operational systems, and complex administrative structures.

**Administrative Challenges**

The administration of the HFA program in Nevada was unique. While each pilot state employed a full-time Family Assessment Worker, "Nevada chose to position it's Family Assessment Worker and her supervision within PCAA[‘s state] chapter" (Harding, 1996, p. 11). This structural arrangement, while feasible, called for constant and higher levels of communication between the two partners. The structural arrangement created an administrative challenge.

Harding (1996) pointed out the following governance and administrative challenges to the collaborative efforts of the partnership:

1) Partners need to spend more time, up front, getting to know each other and each partner's organization. Knowing the history and experience of each organization provides an understanding of the organizational culture and terminology, thus reducing misunderstanding and duplication of efforts. Further, this process can enhance respect and appreciation of each partner and lead to a clearer and more effective formulation of the roles of each partner in the partnership.

2) Communication, or the lack thereof, emerged as a barrier. Miscommunication [sic] occurs because of what is not said, as there are unspoken assumptions about the meaning of the information being communicated implicit within the culture of each particular organization. Communication is especially...
challenging during the early stages of the formation of the [partnership].

3) Agreements between the [players] should be established early in the [partnership] formation. The agreement needs to spell out, on paper, each partner's respective roles in the collaborative project and how these roles will be carried out, such as: 1) The financial arrangements and responsibilities of each partner; 2) What strategies will be used for problem-solving, communication, and distribution of information; and 3) What types of information will be shared. This written agreement should be revisited at regular intervals.

4) Collaboration as a process needs to be agreed upon initially. Successful collaboration depends entirely on the good faith of each partner toward the other and a commitment to the [partnership] relation. The process of collaboration can make even the simplest tasks complex, and conflicts may arise and feelings may be hurt.

5) Structure has to be established early on. Too much control imposed from any level of each partner's administrative units can harm the developing relationship and impede the adaption of an effort to its community context. [Partnership] efforts require a balance of guidance and flexibility.

6) [Governance and administrative] process must be agreed upon by all partners at the inception of the [partnership.] Partners need to be aware of the time-consuming process of partnership building and to support this phase of project and partnership development (pp. 31-32).

These governance issues and administrative challenges were the focus of this study. The conceptual framework of institutionalism provided an appropriate lens by which to analyze the challenges faced by this public-private partnership.
As stated earlier in this chapter, the Cooperative Extension System (Extension) was established by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which made Extension the outreach community-based education arm of the United States Department of Agriculture. The provisions of the Smith-Lever Act were broad enough that each participant state was able to include their counties in the partnership, thus becoming the "third legal partner" (Rasmussen, 1989). Cooperative Extension is housed in the land-grant universities across the United States and its territories, and is their most significant off-campus educational department. The Extension System is best described by Mayeske (1991):

The Cooperative Extension System is a partnership of Federal, State and County governments. It is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the land-grant universities. Its purpose is to provide educational programs oriented to the needs of local citizenry which are based upon the results of research. The topical areas dealt with are diverse ranging from: enhancing the viability of American agriculture; wise management of our natural resources; improving nutrition, diet and health of our people; helping families cope with changing economic and social circumstances; helping youth become productive and contributing members of society; and, helping to infuse a new vitality into the economic and social life of rural America (p. C-A).

Cooperative Extension does not matriculate students, offer credit courses, give out grades at the end of semesters, or confer degrees. Rather, Extension has the unique and vital outreach role of linking higher education and its research with the people across the nation who are
not on campus. At the core of this linkage are Extension Educators, Area Specialists, and State Specialists who work with citizens in their homes and in their communities to establish local needs and establish possible courses of action (Rasmussen, 1989). Extension faculty "provide access to education through traditional and non-traditional vehicles, including, but not limited to, newsletters, in-home education, mentoring [sic], collaborative processes, seminars, workshops, conferences, exhibits, and demonstrations" (Nevada Cooperative Extension, 1998, p. 1). The old concept of community-based education remains very relevant and important today because as societal needs become more complex people will have a greater need to access knowledge and information. The ease of accessing information, including highly specialized knowledge, becomes even more urgent when decisions affecting peoples lives are taken elsewhere by either government agencies or other regulating bodies (Jones, 1974).

The philosophy of Extension is "to help people identify their own problems and opportunities, and then to provide practical, research-based information that will help them overcome the problems and take advantage of opportunities" (Vines and Anderson, 1976, p. 50). The Cooperative Extension System's mission is "to enable people to improve their lives and communities through learning partnerships that put knowledge to work" (Strategic Framework Team, 1995, p. 3). This mission is the same for rural, urban, and suburban
communities; nevertheless, some of the challenges faced by rural communities are quite different from those faced by urban and suburban communities. Thus, Extension's urban and suburban mission differs slightly from its rural mission in order to remain responsive to each community's needs. The rural mission embodies the mandates of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 which calls for the diffusion "among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects related to agriculture, home economics, and rural energy" (NASULGC, 1994, p. 18). The urban Extension mission, as formulated by the Extension Urban Task Force (1996), "educates by engaging individuals, families, and communities in learning partnerships that result in informed decisions and the application of knowledge to solve critical issues for a sustainable future" (p. 5). Extension's community-based education approach is the educational effort central to its mission. Extension's vision foresees people learning from and with one another as they create knowledge and put it to work and assuming responsibilities for themselves, their families, and their communities.

In 1995 the USDA reorganized its Cooperative Extension and Experiment Station departments. Cooperative Extension being the community-based outreach department and Experiment Station, its research department. Combining both departments led to the a new name Cooperative States Research Education Extension Service. The purpose in combining both of these departments into one was to achieve greater interface
between research and community-based education.

**Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA)**

Donna J. Stone established the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse in 1972. In 1999 the organization changed its name to Prevent Child Abuse America. Stone believed that everyone in the country had a responsibility for providing a safe environment for children. In establishing the PCAA, her main focus was to build a committee at a national level to prevent all forms of child abuse. At the time of PCAA's inception, very little was known by the public about child abuse, its causes and effects on children. PCAA's founder endeavored to educate and inform the general public about the devastating effects of child abuse. As a result PCAA's efforts, "general awareness of the existence of the problem of child abuse has increased from less than 10% in 1976 to well over 90% in 1999" (NCPCA, 1999, p. 1).

Prevent Child Abuse America enjoys national recognition as one of the most innovative organizations in the prevention, awareness, and education of child abuse and neglect. Prevention, awareness, and education programs are backed by research and are implemented through PCAA state chapters. Local chapters in turn funnel the information to the nation's local communities. This educational process, and the PCAA's commitment and dedication to the nation's children, is driven by the vision that "every child [must
be] free from abuse and neglect, safely nurtured by a loving family and supported by a caring community" (NCPCA, 1999, p. 1). This vision is consistent with the mission that the "NCPCA is a nationwide commitment to prevent child abuse in all forms" (NCPCA, 1999, p. 1).

Research efforts are conducted by the National Center on Child Abuse Prevention Research (Center), a branch of PCAA. The Center has worked diligently for the past ten years to build strong and effective links with researchers whose main objective is to investigate and uncover the causes of child abuse and to determine how best to prevent them. The Center has also established links with the practitioners charged with the implementation of preventive programs.

The Healthy Families America (HFA) initiative is recognized by PCAA as one of their most promising efforts. This initiative focuses on the prevention of child abuse and neglect and the diffusion of information to overburdened new parents through a home visitation delivery method. To introduce this program into the community, PCAA entered into a public-private partnership with the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the USDA-Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service. The nature of this partnership and the Healthy Families initiative are discussed at length in this chapter.

The HFA program is based on a preventive approach to child abuse and neglect. In order to develop this program
and many others, PCAA has partnered with the following institutions: the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions (NACHRI), First Steps, the National Indian Child Welfare Association, the National Head Start Association, the National Black Child Development Institute, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service (NCPCA, 1999). Partnerships have also been established with the National Child Abuse Coalition, which is composed of over 40 organizations, to further strengthen PCAA's prevention efforts. Under the Child Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA), PCAA contributes to the continuity of two grant programs: the Discretionary Research and Demonstration Grants and the Community-Based Family Resource and Support Program, both very successful endeavors.

The Kellogg Foundation

Originally known as the W.K. Kellogg Child Welfare Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation (Kellogg) was founded in 1903 by Will Keith Kellogg, a philanthropist pioneer of the cereal industry and inventor of corn flakes. He was born on April 7, 1860 and died on October 6, 1951. The Kellogg Foundation is a nonprofit organization operating under the direction of a board of trustees. Its aim is to assist people solve their problems through the application of knowledge. The Foundation was established under W.K.
Kellogg's belief that "education offers the greatest opportunity for really improving one generation over another" (The Kellogg Foundation, 1999, p. 1). Kellogg's mission is "to help people help themselves through the practical application of knowledge and resources to improve their quality of life and that of future generations" (Kellogg Foundation, 1999, p. 1). The Foundation envisions involvement in:

programming activities center [sic] around the common vision of a world in which each person has a sense of worth; accepts responsibility for self, family, community, and societal well-being; and has the capacity to be productive, and to help create nurturing families, responsible institutions, and healthy communities (Kellogg Foundation, 1999, p. 2).

This vision is consistent with W.K. Kellogg's philanthropic work, as he demonstrated much compassion and care for others and operated under the belief that people will help themselves if they are provided with the opportunity to act on what is most important to them.

Consistent with the Foundation's vision, educational programs are their main focus and, as societal needs change, so does its programmatic direction. In order to remain true to its mission, program development and implementation must be comprehensive, integrated, and community-based. To achieve its programmatic objective, Kellogg brings together research generated from many different disciplines, professions, and all sources of knowledge to enable it to address continuing and emerging social issues. The Foundation supports these programs by providing financial
resources by way of grants. The Foundation funds programs related to "integrative themes of leadership; information systems; diversity; and social and economic community development" (The Kellogg Foundation, 1999, p. 1) as well as other programmatic efforts that reflect its mission.

Driven by its mission, the Kellogg Foundation operates from the following set of values and principles:

1) Those who are most vulnerable in society have voices and should be heard;

2) Diversity and inclusivity [sic] are essential for creativity and innovation;

3) All communities have assets, including history, knowledge, and the power to define and solve their own problems;

4) The nurturance [sic] of individuals and families fosters the growth of healthy communities;

5) Partnerships, collaboration, and civic participation are fundamental to improving organizations and institutions and to assuring sustainable social change;

6) The richness and energy of life are determined by the synergy of mind, body and spirit;

7) A society's future is dependent upon the quality of nurturance [sic] and investment in its children;

8) The human condition can be improved by the appropriate use of knowledge, science, and technology;

9) The fostering of healthy human development emphasizes prevention over treatment; and

10) Long-term sustainability [sic] should be encouraged through the wise use of human and natural resources (p. 2).

Richardson (1999) echoed the Foundation's objectives and commitment to service during the President's Summit for
America's Future when he pointed out that "those in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors with an active interest in the future of service should develop bipartisan, community-driven initiatives to broaden and strengthen the awareness, acceptance, and availability of service opportunities" (p. 1).

Summary

The literature on public-private partnerships is very diverse and complex and displays a lack of specific criteria for defining and evaluating partnership arrangements (Joy, 1990). The literature attempts to establish a definition of public-private partnership and focuses on the elements necessary for the formation of a partnership. The word "partnership" implies the collaboration of two or more participants.

The literature on public-private partnerships revealed four challenges in studying the formation and subsequent governance and administration of partnerships with institutions of higher education. The challenges are: 1) Uncovering a working definition of public-private partnership; 2) Developing a theoretical framework for public-private partnerships within the concept of outreach and community-based education; 3) Filling the void created by the absence of studies and data analyzing the governance and administration of public private-partnerships, and the effectiveness of strategies utilized; and what strategies
proved to be ineffective; and 4) Addressing the absence of studies or data analyzing the governance and administration of public-private partnerships involving higher education as it relates to outreach and community-based education. Most of the focus in the literature is on achieving predetermined objectives.

Organizational theory and institutionalism were reviewed as the theoretical frameworks for this study. The concept of institutionalism was the theoretical framework selected because "institutionalism is attempting to build more systematic approaches to understanding the manners in which structures and their characteristics influence [outcomes,] policy, as well as influence social decision-making more generally" (Peters, 1992, p. 162; see also Giddens, 1981, p. 14). Organizational theory was also reviewed. A review of the literature revealed that organizational theory may be too restrictive as it focuses mainly on the internal structure and operation of institutions.

In 1994, the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES entered into a partnership to implement the Healthy Family America initiative. Walworth County, Wisconsin, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, and Las Vegas (Clark County), Nevada became the only three pilot sites chosen for the implementation, testing, and future growth of the HFA program. The HFA initiative focuses on the prevention of child abuse and neglect and the diffusion of information to
overburdened new parents through a home visitation delivery method. The following administrative and governance challenges to the collaborative efforts of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership were reported: 1) Partners were not familiar with each respective organization (partner); 2) Communication among the partners was severely lacking; 3) The lack of systems and mode of operation between the partners; 4) Collaboration, as a process, was not initially agreed upon; 5) The lack of an organizational structure; 6) Governance and administrative processes were not apparent.

The USDA’s Cooperative Extension is the outreach community-based education arm of the United States Department of Agriculture. Cooperative Extension’s are housed in the land-grant universities across the country. Cooperative Extension has the unique and vital outreach role of linking higher education and its research with the people across the nation who are not on campus. The Kellogg Foundation is a nonprofit organization. The Foundation's aim is to assist people solve their problems through the application of knowledge. PCAA's main focus is to build a committee at a national level to prevent all forms of child abuse and neglect. The formation of the partnership established by the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES and its effective and ineffective administrative and governance strategies were the focus of this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter delineates the methodology used for this study. The formation of a public-private partnership is the focus. The research objective was to identify governance and administrative strategies that contribute to the effectiveness of the administration of the partnership. A statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the population, the research design, and analysis of the data are discussed in this chapter.

Statement Of The Problem

The literature clearly infers that at present there is an absence of models which consistently identify the critical governance and administrative issues addressing the success or failure of public-private partnerships. This study addressed this void by examining the governance and administrative strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership forged between the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA), and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Cooperative States Research Education Extension.
Service (CSREES). This partnership applied the HFA community-based education model for first-time parents in overburdened families in Oklahoma, Nevada, and Wisconsin from 1995 to 1998.

Purpose Of The Study

This study identified both effective and ineffective strategies utilized by administrators at the inception of the public-private partnership between the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES which established pilot sites in Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, (Clark County) Las Vegas, Nevada, and Walworth County, Wisconsin, from 1995 to 1998. These were the only three sites established by the partnership. The study focused on the governance and administrative issues in relation to the partnership's: 1) mission and objectives; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision making processes; 4) conflict resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanisms and authority; and 7) accountability. The partnership was a pilot initiative. Specifically, it determined which approaches were effective and which were not.

Success or failure of the partnership will "add to the development of knowledge and implications for further research" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 595) in as much as "much of the information that is available on partnership projects is promotional in nature" (Riggin et al, 1992, p. 41). Further, this study's significance may promote
continuity, growth, and expansion of the HFA program model and the formation of future public-private partnerships (Harding, 1996, p. ii). This study was necessary because "Although [sic] partnerships are widely touted as an effective way to stretch scarce public dollars, few attempts have been made to validate their effectiveness" (Riggin, et al, 1992, p. 41).

The methodology used was primarily interpretative, utilizing qualitative data obtained from participant interviews, documents, and other data sources. This methodology was chosen because it "refers to research about persons' lives, stories, behavior but also about organizational functioning, social movements, or interactional relationships" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 17). As McMillan and Schumacher (1997) explained, qualitative research provides an "understanding [of] a social situation from [the] participants' perspectives" (p. 100).

Research Questions

The focus of the study was the governance and administrative strategies utilized in the formation of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership measured against the following variables: 1) mission and objective; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision-making processes; 4) conflict-resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanisms and authority; and
7) accountability. The study was centered on the following four questions:

1. What strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be effective?
2. What strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be ineffective?
3. What new strategies would administrators in the formation of this public-private partnership utilize in the formation of another partnership?
4. What effective strategies or procedures will be indicated and recommended for use in the formation of future public-private partnerships?

Peters' (1998) identified six governance and administrative ingredients necessary for a newly-formed quasi-organization to function effectively. These six ingredients are covered extensively in Chapter II and are the basis of the theoretical framework that was used for this study.

Population

The formation of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES public-private partnership in 1994 established only three pilot sites in the states of Oklahoma, Nevada, and Wisconsin. Included in this partnership were PCAA state chapters and the USDA-CSREES Cooperative Extension units in each state’s land-grant university. These states will be the only three
participants in the study, specifically:

1. Las Vegas (Clark County), Nevada;
2. Walworth County, Wisconsin; and
3. Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma.

This study utilized data collected through the use of open-ended conversational style interviews with administrators and staff in all three states who were actively involved in the formation of the partnership, including county and statewide Cooperative Extension representatives, W.K. Kellogg Foundation representatives, and Prevent Child Abuse America national and state level representatives.

Participants with location, dates and times of interviews are listed in Appendix I. All available documents and correspondence generated since the formation of the public-private partnership were reviewed in an effort to provide background information and a historical perspective on the formation of the partnership.

Sample Size

The sample size, though small, provided vital information to this study; indeed, "A [sic] study which probes deeply into the characteristic of a small sample often provides more knowledge than a study that attacks the same problem by collecting only shallow information on a large sample" (Borg and Gall, 1979, pp. 236-237). Miles and Huberman (1994) pointed out that "qualitative researchers work with small samples of people nested in their context..."
and studied in-depth" (p. 27). Borg and Gall (1979) attested that utilizing small samples are [sic] at times preferable over a larger sample, especially when extensive interviews are conducted. Selecting the appropriate sample is "critical to the whole research process" (Borg and Gall, p. 215). HFA program recipients were not included in this study since program impact and evaluation was not the focus of this study. Rather, the dynamics of partnering and collaborating in the formation of the public-private partnership -- its difficulties and successes, obstacles and facilitation were the focus of this study.

**Interviewing Protocol**

All participants were notified that "since interviews involve one person talking with another, anonymity is not possible" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 264); nevertheless, confidentiality, when requested as to specific quotes, could not be always honored. McMillan and Schumacher (1997) warned that since anonymity cannot be guaranteed, the "potential for faking or for being less than forthright and candid [is always of real concern, mainly] because the subjects may believe that sharing certain information would not be in their best interest" (p. 264). In order to minimize this risk and ensure optimum accuracy of responses, the researcher must strive to establish a good rapport with the interviewee since "once the respondent accepts the interview as a non-threatening situation, respondents are..."
more likely to be open and frank. This openness adds to the validity of the interview" (Sax, 1979, p. 233). Also, every effort was made to convey the potential value the study could have on future benefits to children and families.

All respondents received a letter explaining the purpose of the study (Appendix II) an Informed Consent Statement (Appendix III), a Synopsis on Public-Private Partnerships (Appendix IV), and the Interviewing Instrument (Appendix V). Respondents were afforded the opportunity to review their responses to the interview questions. "The respondents can [sic] then read the answers and make additions and corrections where appropriate. An additional advantage to this approach is that it helps build a positive relationship between the interviewer and the respondent" (Sax, 1979, p. 264). Respondents received a written copy of the study upon its conclusion.

Research Design

This study is a descriptive, qualitative study because "qualitative research is more concerned with understanding the social phenomenon from the participants' perspectives" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 16), thus allowing for the description of situations and events (Babbie, 1995). Further, "Descriptive [sic] research is concerned with the current or past status of something. A descriptive study asks what is or what was; it reports things the way they are or were" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 445).
Interviewing Techniques

Data was collected in the form of "standardized open-ended interviews" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 447). Researchers "use interviews to help classify and organize an individual's perception of reality (Fetterman, 1989, p. 50). Sax (1979) stated that "as a research method...interview [sic] is more than an exchange of small talk. It represents a direct attempt by the researcher to obtain reliable and valid measures in the form of verbal responses from one or more respondents" (p. 232). Yin (1989) found that the "investigator [or interviewer] can ask key respondents for the facts of a matter as well as for the respondents' opinions of events" (p. 89). McMillan and Schumacher (1997) further pointed out that "interviews result in a much higher response rate than questionnaires" (p. 263).

McMillan and Schumacher (1997) found that the "interview technique is flexible and adaptable. It can be used with many different problems and types of persons" (p. 263). Fowler (1988) asserted that "self-administered approaches to data collection place more of a burden on the reading and writing skills of the respondent than do interviewer procedures" (p. 63). Papillon (1978) observed that "the greatest advantage of the interview over the questionnaire and the Check-List, however, is its flexibility. Responses may be revised, follow-up questions to answers may be explored, and clarification of answers may be secured" (p. 52). Sax (1979) indicated that during the
interview the researcher can secure and surmise "personal information, attitudes, perceptions, or beliefs by probing for additional information...[, and] inconsistent or vague replies can be [immediately] questioned" (p. 233). Further, interviewing allows the researcher to "change the mode of questioning if the occasion demands" (Sax, 1979, p. 233).

Interviewing As A Research Method

One important characteristic of interviewing as a research method is that "nonverbal as well as verbal behavior can be noted in face-to-face interviews, and the interviewer has an opportunity to motivate the respondent" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 263). This process allows the researcher to "observe both what the respondent has to say and the way in which it is said [and, unlike] highly structured pencil-and-paper instruments [''] do not allow respondents the freedom to enlarge upon, retract, or question items presented to them" (Sax, 1979, p. 233).

Papillon (1978) stated that to "capitalize on the advantages of the interview, the [researcher] must be able to motivate the interviewee and to establish rapport with him[/her]" (p. 53). Interviewing, as an approach to data collection, provides the researcher with the unique opportunity to probe, follow up, clarify, elaborate, and achieve specific accurate responses (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997) or to "describe what people think by listening to what they say -- not an unreasonable assumption" (Fetterman, 1989, p. 16).
The open-ended, unstructured question format was chosen as a data collection method because open-ended questions provide the participants with questions they can interpret from their own perspective (Fetterman, 1989). "Respondents like the opportunity to answer some questions in their own words" (Fowler, 1988, p. 87), and open-ended questions help the researcher "discover and confirm the participant's experiences and perceptions" (Fetterman, 1989, p. 50). Fowler (1988) further found that open-ended questions "permit the researcher to obtain answers that were unanticipated [and] may describe more closely the real views of the respondent" (p. 87).

**Interviewing As A Mode Of Data Collection**

The data collection instrument developed for this study contains some structured but mainly standardized open-ended unstructured questions which "allow [sic] the interviewer great latitude in asking broad questions in whatever order seems appropriate" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 265). Since "the goal [in using this method] is to have respondents all answering the same questions, then it is best if the researcher writes the questions fully" (Fowler, 1988, p. 76). Even though each question is in written form the "interviewer (or respondents) will have to add words or change words in order to make an answerable question" (Fowler, 1988, p. 76).

Sax (1979), McMillan and Schumacher (1997), Papillon...
(1978), Fowler, (1988), and Babbie (1995) cautioned that interviewing as a mode of data collection poses its own problems. "The interview is subject to the same evaluative criteria as are other data collection methods. The flexibility of the interview generates its own special difficulties" (Sax, p. 233). One of "the most difficult problem associated with interviewing is recording and tabulating the responses" (Papillon, 1978, p. 53). Babbie (1995) supports this caution when he stated that "unstructured interviews allow the respondent more freedom but make categorizing responses more difficult" (p. 451).

A tape recorder was used to minimize data-recording errors. All participants agreed to have their interviews tape-recorded. Sax (1979) refers to Stanley Payne's study on "Interviewer Memory Faults" published in 1949 in the Public Opinion Quarterly, which "compared the number of errors in responses recorded from memory with those that were tape recorded [sic]. Payne reported that the use of tape-recorders "reduced errors of memory by 25 percent" (p. 238). "No attempt should be made to summarize, paraphrase, or correct bad grammar" (Babbie, 1995, p. 266) because "Open-responses are best recorded verbatim" (Fowler, 1988, p. 131).

Tape-recorded interviews were transcribed in their entirety and entered into a word-processing program. Word processing programs are "designed for the production and revision of text and thus useful for taking, transcribing,
writing, or editing field notes, for analysis, and for writing reports" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 529). The word-processing program selected for this research study is Microsoft Word. The operating system is Windows 98.

Kahn and Cannell (1957) further suggested that other potential "sources of errors in any interview [are]: errors in asking questions, errors in probing, errors in motivating, and errors in recording responses" (p. 189). According to Sax (1974), these errors can be categorized as "asking questions that fail to satisfy the purpose of the interview, failure to allow time for the respondent to answer or the anticipation of answers before they are given, failure to obtain trust and confidence in the interviewer, and failure to report or categorize responses properly" (p. 452). Care was taken to minimize these errors.

**Pretest**

McMillan and Schumacher (1997) highly recommends "that researchers conduct a pretest of their questionnaires before using them in studies. Interviews are essentially vocal questionnaires" (pp. 262-263). Fowler (1988) further contends that "Every questionnaire [or instrument] should be pretested, no matter how skilled the researcher" (p. 103). Ten respondents participated in a pretest of the questionnaire for this study. Fowler (1988) holds "the pretest sample should include the range of education and life situations that one would expect to find in the final..."
sample" (p. 104). Each respondent received a summary of the purpose of the study (Appendix I) and the instrument itself because "respondents should have a common understanding of the purpose of the study" (Fowler, 1988, p. 109).

Participants in the pretest were chosen because of the similarity between their educational background, program orientation, and job specifications and those found in the study sample. Pretest participants were asked to identify unclear, confusing, or awkwardly constructed questions. Comments were received from pretest participants. Corrections were recommended, and changes were made. The interviewing instrument was also evaluated and critiqued by three researchers at the Human and Community Sciences Department at the University of Nevada, Reno.

As stated earlier, the purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the governance and administrative strategies used by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership between the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA and the USDA-CSREES. This is highly compatible with the aim of qualitative research which is to "study organizations, groups, and individuals" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 19) and to record "the perception of those being studied...in order to obtain an accurate 'measure' of reality" (Wiersema, 1995, p. 212). More specifically, a phenomenological approach was utilized in the present study in order to capture the "meaning of reality...[which is] in essence, in the 'eyes and minds of the beholders', the way
the individuals being studied perceived their experiences" (Wiersema, 1995, p. 250). Open-ended interviews were the primary source of data collection; however, other sources of data consisting of "records maintained on a routine basis by the organization in which the study is being conducted" (Wiersema, 1995, p. 263), written correspondence, memorandum of understanding, minutes, reports, and the researcher's notes were used for qualitative cross-validation purposes. Fetterman (1989) submitted that "in literate societies, written documents are one of the most valuable and timesaving forms of data collection. I have found past reports, memoranda, and personnel and payroll records invaluable" (p. 69).

**Potential Risks**

One of the risks involved in this study is the researcher's knowledge and professional involvement with the USDA-CSREES, and the resultant potential bias one way or the other. Strauss and Corbin (1990) argued, however, that "this knowledge, even if implicit, is taken into the research situation and helps you to understand events and actions seen and heard, and to do so more quickly that if you did not bring this background into the research" (p.42). Thus this affiliation is seen as more beneficial than detrimental.

In order to decrease risks involved with bias, objectivity of data analysis was maintained by recording the
places, dates and times of interviews. In addition to the
field log, a field journal was kept indicating the
researcher's rationale for decision-making during the
emergence of the data. On a regular basis, the researcher
discussed the data and strategies for analysis with a
disinterested colleague, a process McMillan and Schumacher
(1997) called "peer debriefer [sic]" (p. 409). McMillan and
Schumacher (1997) contended that the process of objectivity
of data analyses used in this study is the most important
strategies for audibility. "Objectivity in qualitative
research refers to the dependability and confirmability
[sic] of the researcher's interactive style, data recording,
data analysis, and interpretation of participant meanings"
(McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 408).

Interviews were be taped-recorded because "tape
recording of the interview is helpful, providing the
respondent is agreeable" (Papillon, 1978, p. 53), and "open-
response answers are best recorded verbatim" (Fowler, 1988,
p. 131). Further, "tapes certainly provide a more accurate
rendition of any interview than any other method" (Yin,
1989, p. 91). Participant's approval to tape-record the
interview was secured prior to initiating the interview.
Triangulation of the data from multiple sources helped
assess the sufficiency of the data through convergence
which improved the validity and credibility of the
information.
Analysis Of The Data

The data collected in this study was organized into clusters. Data was analyzed for the purpose of comparing and contrasting operational strategies between and amongst the partners, establishing relationships or patterns among identified and emerging categories. McMillan and Schumacher (1997) described qualitative analysis as a "systematic process of selecting, categorizing, comparing, synthesizing, and interpreting to provide explanations of a single phenomenon of interest" (p. 502). The process of inductive analysis was utilized for the organization, analysis, contrast, comparison, and interpretation of the data collected in this study. McMillan and Schumacher (1997) identified four cyclical phases to the inductive analysis process. These four phases are:

1) Continuous discovery to identify tentative patterns;
2) Categorizing and ordering of data;
3) Assessing the trustworthiness of the data;
4) Writing synthesis or themes and/or concepts (p. 502).

Analysis began as soon as the first set of data from the interviews was collected. Analysis proceeded as follows: 1) All interview transcripts were read carefully in an effort to acquire an aggregate sense of the data; 2) An organizational system of topics was developed. The initial system was revised and adjusted as new topics or sub-topics emerged and as new categories were discerned; 3) Data was separated into segments or units of similar or equal meaning; 4) The segmentation of data allowed similarities
and distinctions between the categories that emerged. Identification of data chunks or segments, assignment of a topic name, and clustering of each data segment or chunks by topic into identified categories was the technique utilized for comparing and contrasting the data. 5) In the final analysis, other data sources—minutes, grant awards, memos, publications, and reports—were triangulated with the data acquired through interviews. Final presentation of the findings is reported and written in a descriptive-analytical interpretative format.

**Protocol For Analysis**

McMillan and Schumacher (1997) recommended the following methodological approach to organizing data for analysis:

1) Get a sense of the whole: read the first interview or data set carefully and write down ideas about the data as it is read.

2) Generate topics from the data: notice emerging topics as interview transcripts are read and write the name of each topic in the margin of the data set. A topic is a descriptive name for the subject matter of the segment.

3) Compare for duplication of topics: make a list of topics identified and write a provisional meaning or description of each topic. Compare the topics for duplication and overlapping meanings.

4) Try out your provisional classification system: write a code, an abbreviation for the topic, next to the appropriate data segment. Some segments may have several codes.

5) Refine your organizing system: Review your topics to determine if there are other topics not yet identified and if some topics are closer in content.
to or different from others. Group topics as categories with sub-categories (pp. 510-512).

McMillan and Schumacher's (1997) organizational system for data analysis was adopted and followed in this study.

As stated in this chapter, all interviews were tape-recorded. Weitzman and Miles (1995) confirmed that word processors are "basically designed for the production and revision of text and are thus helpful for taking, transcribing, writing up, or editing field notes, for transcribing interviews, for memoing, for preparing files for coding and analysis, and for writing report text" p. 16). Each tape recording was transcribed verbatim utilizing Microsoft Word 8.0 on the Windows 98 operating system. Coding, search and retrieval, data linking, and theory building will be developed using a code-based theory-building software program. Weitzman and Miles (1995) reported that code-based theory-building programs are usually developed by researchers engaged in qualitative studies. These programs "specialize in helping you divide text into segments or chunks, attach codes to the chunks, and find and display all the chunks with a given code (or combination of codes)" (Weitzman and Miles, 1995, p. 17).

Non-commercial, Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching and Theorizing (NUD.IST) software, version 3.0, was selected for this study. Windows 98 is the operating system for NUD.IST. NUD.IST "is a program designed for the storage, coding,
retrieval, and analysis of text. [NUD.IST] is one of the best-thought-out programs around" (Weitzman and Miles, 1995, p. 238).

**Topics, Codes, And Categories**

Interview transcripts were analyzed for information, occurrences, episodes, and ideas relevant to the study. Data segments were developed from the analysis. Data segments were divided into major topics, unique topics, and leftover topics (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997). A descriptive name or topic was assigned to each data segment. A name and a preliminary definition was developed for each topic. Names of topics were written in the margins of each interview transcript.

Similar topics were grouped to form categories; special attention was given to the explicit and implicit meanings in their contents. McMillan and Shumacher (1997) warned that categories "should be internally consistent and distinct from one another" (p. 518). Initially, categories were predetermined by the research questions, the open-ended interview instrument, and categories [ingredients] extracted from the literature. Other categories and sub-categories were adopted and added to the predetermined list of categories as these emerged from subsequent and continuous analysis of the data. Categories were reviewed for their emic and etic topics. Emic topics represented the interviewees' views, and etic topics represented the
concepts and phenomenological meanings to the researcher. McMillan and Schummacher (1997) observed that "qualitative researchers tend to emphasize emic topics and categories in data collection because the goal is usually to represent the situation from the people's perspective" (p. 517).

A preliminary classification system or code was assigned to each topic identified. Coding provided the flexibility needed for the comparison, contrasting, differentiation and combination of the data. Miles and Huberman (1994) defined codes as "tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study" (p. 56). Codes were depicted by letters and represented a specific topic. Each topic identified had its own code; some segments had more than one code because they varied in size (i.e. words, sentences, paragraphs, phrases). NUD.IST software enabled the coding system developed to be used to retrieve and organize segments into categories. The identification of these categories and sub-categories lead to the discovery of patterns. A pattern represented a relationship uncovered among the categories.

Emergence Of Patterns And Data Triangulation

McMillan and Schumacher (1997) identified a "pattern-seeking" process, which allowed for the examination and review of the data in all possible ways. Beliefs, individual situations, collective situations, mental processes,
reasoning and conclusions, and individual and collective actions were analyzed in search of patterns or relationships and to develop an understanding of the complex links between categories. All initial and subsequent memos, field notes, interview notes, comments, and observations were stored in NUD.IST and reviewed thoroughly as part of the pattern-seeking, comparison and contrasting process. Strong consideration were given to the frequency of topics while conducting a thorough search for plausible explications ties and differences among categories.

A thorough evaluation of the data was conducted to evaluate the quality and level of adequacy of the information collected. The evaluation also determined the data's degree of usefulness how central or close the information was to the study being conducted (McMillan and Schumacher, 1995; Miles and Huberman, 1994). The pattern-seeking, comparison and contrasting protocol was established by: 1) Analyzing the identified and established segments or chunks of data; 2) Analyzing each topic or combinations of topics; 3) Allowing categories to emerge; and 4) Allowing the major patterns to emanate. 5) Reviewing emerging patterns against the selected conceptual and theoretical framework; and 6) Triangulation of all data, i.e. cross-checking and comparing all data sources, collection methods, and theoretical frameworks in search of recurring patterns. Identification of the major patterns will direct the findings, reporting, and final organization of this study.
This process of analysis required "moving back and forth among topics, categories, and tentative patterns for confirmation" (Macmillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 518).

**Internal And External Validity**

Internal validity was established by triangulation of data and applying Miles and Huberman's (1994) steps to assessing quality of data. Triangulation provided for the use of "multiple sources and modes of evidence" (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 267). This analytical process included listening to and reviewing all data; verifying the trustworthiness of the data with different sources by utilizing different data collection sources; and by further verifying the findings with either other interviewees or document sources. Miles and Huberman (1994) further identified this process as "connecting a discrete fact with other discrete facts, and then grouping these into lawful, comprehensible, and more abstract patterns" (p. 261).

Miles and Huberman (1994) identified the following steps for assessing the quality, "unpatterns" and explanations of the data. These steps are:

1) Assessing the data through checking for representativeness; checking for researcher effect; and weighting the data, deciding which kinds of data are most trustable [sic].

2) Checking the meaning of outliers; using extreme cases; following up surprises; and looking for negative evidence to test a conclusion about a pattern or 'unpattern' [sic] by saying what it is not like.
3) Making if-then tests; ruling out spurious relations; replicating a finding; checking out rival explanations; and getting feedback from informants to test explanations made about the data (p. 263).

External validity can be established by connecting the conclusions of a study to other studies or cases. As stated previously in Chapter II, a review of the literature did not yield any other studies which assessed the administrative and governance strategies utilized in the formation of public-private partnerships involving higher education and community-based outreach education. Despite the apparent narrow perspective of this study, generalizability can be explored by connecting the findings of this study "to theoretical networks beyond the immediate study" (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 279). For the purpose of this study, external validity was established by connecting the findings of this study to the theoretical framework identified in Chapter II.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify both the effective and ineffective governance and administrative strategies utilized by administrators at the formation of a public-private partnership forged between the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES from 1995 to 1998. Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, Clark County (Las Vegas), Nevada, and Walworth County, Wisconsin were the only three sites selected by the partners for testing the HFA model.
This study is a descriptive, qualitative study.

The study was designed to collect data utilizing open-ended interview questions with administrators who participated in the formation of the partnership. Interviews were taped-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. Researcher's notes, minutes, correspondence, other written agreements, and grant awards were used as additional data sources. Objectivity of data analysis was established by maintain a log, a journal and by the peer debriefing method. Internal validity was established by triangulation of the data collected from interviews to other data sources. External validity was established by connecting the findings of this study to the theoretical frameworks identified in Chapter II of this study.

The methodology, significance of the study, population, statement of the problem, and its limitations were described in this chapter. Subsequent chapters include an analysis of data collected, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

In late 1994 the Kellogg Foundation (Kellogg), Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA), and the United States Department of Agriculture Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service (USDA-CSREES) initiated a partnership. Their goals as partners were to introduce, develop, and ensure sustainability of the Healthy Family America (HFA) program and preserve the established partnership. Through community-based education, the HFA program endeavors to support families, specifically first-time parents, in an effort to prevent child abuse and neglect. The partners selected only three states to test the HFA pilot -- Nevada, Wisconsin and Oklahoma.

The focus of this study was not the design, development, implementation, or evaluation of the HFA program. Rather, the focus was to identify the effective and ineffective governance and administrative strategies utilized by administrators at the formation of the partnership. Institutionalism was the conceptual framework used to analyze the partnership's governance and administrative strategies at its inception through the
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partners historic perspectives, beliefs, shared values, and negotiated rules. Seven variables emerged from this conceptual framework: 1) mission and objectives; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision-making processes; 4) conflict-resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanism and authority; and 7) accountability. Peters (1998) identified these seven variables as necessary ingredients in the formation of public-private partnerships. Through the lens of institutionalism, these seven variables were tested to determine the governance and administrative strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership.

Open-ended interviews with partnership on-site administrators were conducted at the three pilot sites in Las Vegas (Clark County) Nevada, Walworth County, Wisconsin, and Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma. Open-ended interviews were also conducted with other administrators at PCAA in Chicago, Illinois, the Kellogg Foundation in Battle Creek, Michigan and USDA-CREEES in Washington, D.C.

The methodology used in this study was primarily interpretative, utilizing qualitative data obtained from interviews with participants and other document sources. Data collected in this study were organized into categories or clusters with the purpose of comparing, contrasting, establishing relationships, and identify emerging categories. Inductive analysis was used to organize,
analyze, and interpret the data. The methodology for analysis is covered extensively in Chapter III of this study.

The Development Of The Partnership

Prevent Child Abuse America’s Executive Director had come to realize that the organization’s work in the prevention and awareness of child abuse and neglect would never get done “unless we engage...the entire public and all the different kinds of organizations across the country that’s [sic] concerned with children.” More attention was now directed at preventive measures as a way of curtailing child abuse. The PCAA Executive Director noted that the “research was pointing to early intervention with new parents as the place to have the greatest impact in terms of prevention.” Hawaii, for example, had been very successful in using Healthy Start, a program very similar to Healthy Families America. The Executive Director stated that PCAA’s top management felt that HFA, introduced as a national effort, could “ensure that someday all new parents would get the support they need to get off to a good start” through the use of home visitation and other comparable services similar to the Hawaiian program model.

Prevent Child Abuse America launched HFA as a national initiative in 1992 in partnership with Ronald McDonald House Charities. There were a number of states that were
interested in implementing some aspects of the HFA program; nevertheless, by 1993 very few states had moved toward implementation of the program. Rather than starting on a small scale, PCAA sought out a national partner with established community-outreach operations in almost every county in the country. PCAA approached USDA-CSREES, an organization nationally recognized for their community-based educational programming and with access to almost every county in the nation through the Cooperative Extension System. Through its Expanded Food and Nutrition Extension Program (EFNEP) Cooperative Extension was already nationally involved in delivering neonatal nutritional programs in the home to high risk parents. Hence, PCAA's Principal Analyst asserted that "Cooperative Extension has a foundation and a structure and, if you can just move into that house, it's a lot faster than waiting to build a whole new system."

Cooperative Extension and PCAA were not complete strangers. The organizations had collaborated in the past on initiatives and training programs during periods designated as child abuse prevention months and as partners at national conferences dealing with children's issues. When PCAA began its quest for a partner, Cooperative Extension appeared to be the ideal partner. Discussions between PCAA and USDA-CSREES ensued, culminating in the formation of a partnership in search of a funding source. The Kellogg Foundation, amongst other donors, was on the list of the prospective funders for HFA. An individual at the USDA-CSREES enjoyed a
close working relationship with a top Kellogg official. This link proved to be crucial as Kellogg was not interested in funding child-abuse prevention programs at the time. PCAA and USDA-CSREES were able to secure a meeting with Kellogg and presented information on implementing the HFA program through the delivery system established by EFNEP. Kellogg was familiar with EFNEP and Extension’s community-based educational methods. Combining both appeared to be a perfect mechanism for the distribution of both nutritional and neonatal preventive information to first-time parents across the country. Kellogg supported the concept and invited PCAA and USDA-CSREES to submit a written proposal.

The Proposal

The two partners, PCAA and USDA-CSREES, prepared and submitted a joint proposal to Kellogg. The information provided to Kellogg was thoroughly reviewed by the partners prior to submission. The Executive Director for PCAA stated that in their proposal to Kellogg the following had been requested:

1) Eleven pilot sites to introduce and develop HFA through the USDA-Cooperative Extension’s existing home visitation model, to add to and complement the existing infrastructure rather than starting anew.

2) An in-depth outcomes base evaluation [identified by PCAA as a level I evaluation which employs], randomized trials in each of the sites looking over a year or two years time to see what outcomes families were able to demonstrate as a result of the program.

3) A six month planning period to hold extensive
meetings to work out policy and procedures.

4) Funding of $10 million to be awarded to PCAA.

The partners answered the questions raised by Kellogg during the presentation of the proposal.

PCAA and the USDA-CSREES had initially agreed none of the funds were to go to the Extension Service, because, as stated by USDA-CSREES’s National Program Leader “our agency is real keen on is [sic] not complicate [sic] accounting things...I don’t know anything about budgets, didn’t know how to deal with it...And in fact, I arranged it so that the budget stuff went between the NCPCA [PCAA] because I didn’t wanna [sic] put it through our staff here.” Kellogg’s Program Director further asserted:

Extension Service in local communities is connected typically to nonprofit institutions like universities. But at the national level, it’s the federal government, [a] part of the Agriculture Department. It wouldn’t have made sense for the Kellogg Foundation to give a grant to the Agriculture Department.

The initial proposal from PCAA and the USDA-CSREES was not received favorably by Kellogg. Kellogg’s Program Director reported that PCAA and the USDA-CSREES “were asking for too much money...[but] nobody said that they didn’t like the idea. What they said was that the amount of money was too much.” In order to ascertain whether there was support for the HFA idea, the proposal was circulated within the Kellogg Foundation. Kellogg’s Program Director stated that other members of the Foundation agreed that the HFA proposal was indeed the right idea and explained:
...the problem [child abuse and neglect] was clearly one that we needed to do something about. It’s obviously an important problem. But it was also the right idea because when you try to prevent child abuse, you have to do something before it occurs.

The Program Director further concluded:

Here we have an agency [USDA-CSREES] that has a mechanism for delivering this service. We have another organization [PCAA] that knows what the service is that ought to be delivered and we can just facilitate that process because we have money.

The Kellogg Foundation Appropriation Recommendation (July, 1999) summarized the merits of the proposal from PCAA and the USDA-CSREES:

[The Project will]...help prevent childhood health problems especially child abuse and neglect through support of a model home visitation program, Healthy Families America. Parents face many social and health problems in regards to their children including poor nutrition, low immunization rates, lack of school readiness, and increase rates of child abuse and neglect.

The proposed home visitation program will be similar to the successful Hawaii effort and will build on the existing Cooperative Extension delivery system. In addition, NCPCA [PCAA] will develop a national resource center to provide intensive training and technical assistance to the pilot sites and help guarantee the integrity of the model and quality services.

PCAA and the USDA-CSREES subsequently reduced the number of requested sites from eleven to four and then to three. Kellogg accepted this number, “and maybe after they discover how to do it well in a few states, they can expand it to others”.^ The monetary amount requested was reduced from $10 million to $3,365,000 and finally to the agreed-

---

^Open-ended interview with Kellogg administrator (9-28-99).
upon figure of $2,290,000 over a three-year period: $225,000 was earmarked for technical assistance, $265,000 was earmarked for evaluation, and $1,800,000 was earmarked to fund HFA in the pilot sites. The number of families to be served was 150 families per site, up from the 50 per site originally proposed by PCAA and the USDA-CSREES. Prevent Child Abuse America was charged with assisting "task forces in each pilot state in raising the average cost of $250,000 per year, per site to continue the program" and providing technical assistance. Finally, PCAA's Executive Director observed that "the evaluation was changed from a level I to a level II and was modified so that it is less researched oriented."

The partnership between Kellogg, PCAA, and the USDA-CSREES was established through Kellogg's commitment letter to the Executive Director for the National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse [PCAA] dated September, 1994. A check in the amount of $1,100,000 was enclosed. The partnership agreement in part states:

The project will run from October 1, 1994, through September 30, 1997.

Funds provided by the Foundation will be accounted for separately in the business office of your [PCAA] organization and will be used only for the purposes specified in the aforementioned budget.

---


3A level II evaluation was identified by PCAA's Principal Analyst as a systems evaluation rather than a programmatic research-based evaluation.
Training and assistance will be required for pilot sites and also available to communities and states in which they operate. All training and technical assistance will be coordinated through the center [PCAA].

Through the project, extensive training will be provided to Cooperative Extension paraprofessionals to prepare them to work with high-risk families.

As PCAA's Principal Analyst stated, the foundation was now set to "grow Healthy Families America through the Cooperative Extension system."

Selecting The Pilot Sites

In February 1993, after approaching Kellogg for funding, PCAA began soliciting formal letters of interest from their state chapters by informing them that there might be an opportunity for them to receive funding to do a HFA pilot program in their respective state. PCAA began this process with their local chapters in an attempt to gather preliminary information in anticipation of Kellogg's award of funding. State chapters were specifically asked if they were working with Cooperative Extension in their states. PCAA's Principal Analyst reported that the inquiry process "was very piecemeal, asking them a few questions and then taking several months to kind of get back to them with the next stage". This process was very frustrating to the chapters because they did not know what was going on and

---

'A PCAA state chapter is an organization that seeks to be the leader in child-abuse prevention within its respective state.
since funding had not been awarded, PCAA was unable to provide their chapters with any conclusive information regarding time frames and funding amounts.

PCAA stated that in selecting the pilot sites they were looking for geographic diversity:

"...we did not want three sites in three states that were similar,

...[because] most of our Healthy Families America sites existed within urban areas and had large minority populations,

...we wanted sites that did not have...a lot of activity going on around HFA,

...we also wanted states where our chapters indicated they had a strong relationship with Cooperative Extension.

PCAA had an additional concern:

...not to pick a site where the chapter of the national committee would in any way be perceived as weak or unable to do this. I mean not pick a site where the Extension, state Extension would be the same...it was important to find strength on both sides and extend to the partnership.

After a lengthy review process proposals from Nevada, Wisconsin, and Oklahoma were accepted and declared jointly by PCAA and the USDA-CSREES as the pilot sites for HFA. The final selections were announced six months after Kellogg had granted the funds to 'grow' HFA. Nevada was selected despite the fact that PCAA felt that the state chapter didn’t have a strong relationship with Cooperative Extension. In fact, Cooperative Extension in Nevada had approached PCAA’s state chapter indicating that “there’s this funding opportunity
and we need to be partners to get it and so let's be partners." In Wisconsin, Cooperative Extension enjoyed a very close working relationship with PCAA's local chapter. The state chapter in Oklahoma, according to PCAA, "was in the middle" having done some work with Cooperative Extension. The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership established at the national level was now being extended to the states for the implementation of the HFA program and continuation of the partnership. Table 1 depicts the partnership's organizational concept as described by its initiators.

Table 1

**Partnership Initiator's Organizational Concept**

The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership initiator's organizational concept was focused on the HFA program and reflected inclusiveness of all partners.
The selection and confirmation of the three pilot sites initiated a shift in the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership. At PCAA’s national headquarters the top executives, the initiators of the partnership, moved on to other projects. PCAA’s Executive Director stated that “this is where my involvement was diminished greatly. More and more people became involved. I’d step back.” The implementation of HFA and partnership continuation was passed on to other staff. Table 6 (p. 162) depicts the new organizational concept of the partnership, as described by PCAA’s staff and state chapter administrators, the USDA-CSREES and Cooperative Extension pilot sites administrators.

At the USDA-CSREES, only one of the initiators was left acting as a “liaison...to get things started, and then let them go.” One retired and the other took a position at a land grant university, thus stepping out of the arena at the national level. At the time the USDA-CSREES was experiencing a high turnover of their top level administrators. The USDA-CSREES’s National Program Leader stated that HFA “was seen as a very small project off to the side...and during this whole time...[there were] two, three...it was the fourth changeover in management...it was a constant turnover of people.” Consequently, Extension administrators in each state negotiated directly with PCAA regarding the parameters of Extension’s participation.

---

5Open-ended interview with USDA-SCREES administrator (9-8-99).
Once the funds were awarded Kellogg did not take an active role in the partnership. Kellogg’s Program Director explained its position:

[Kellogg]...provide [sic] funds rather than getting involved in projects. So we really didn't get involved almost at all in the management [of the partnership] because we were very interested in the outcomes...the Foundation really doesn't get into running programs. We just provide resources to people. So we figure that the people who are in the communities know how to do it best. So...we take a very hands-off approach to the administration and running of it.

These circumstances essentially left the administration and governance of the partnership to the assigned staff at PCAA, to the state PCAA chapters, and to the state Cooperative Extension at each of the pilot sites. Did the partnership at the national and state levels develop 1) a mission and objectives?; 2) an organizational structure?; 3) a decision-making process?; 4) a conflict resolution process?; 5) policies and procedures?; 6) a mechanism and authority for expending funds?; and 7) a process for accountability? These were the questions this study asked in order to ascertain the effective and ineffective strategies used by administrators at the inception of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership at the national and state levels.

Nevada’s Partnership

During a meeting at which the University of Nevada, Reno Cooperative Extension (UNR-CE), was making a presentation, a USDA-CSREES representative advised UNR-CE faculty about formation of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES
partnership to introduce the HFA program. The faculty were informed that one of the requirements of the partnership was to work jointly with the state’s PCAA chapter. In Nevada, PCAA’s state chapter was called WE CAN. UNR-CE contacted WE CAN’s Executive Director, who had only been on the job three months. Even though UNR-CE and WE CAN had previously collaborated together on some activities, neither the current Executive Director nor the UNR-CE faculty knew each other. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor explained that WE CAN was not quite sure about the formation of a state partnership and “it wasn’t until I came over to the office, sat down across the table from her and she looked me in the eye...At that point she decided that it was worth pursuing.”

UNR-CE’s Associate Professor reported that WE CAN and UNR-CE submitted a joint proposal to PCAA to implement HFA in the Las Vegas metropolitan area of Clark County, even though “WE CAN...had never been involved in a collaborative grant like this.” Approximately a year and a half after the proposal was submitted, Nevada was approved as a pilot site. WE CAN and UNR-CE officially became state partners. Those portions of the Las Vegas metropolitan area covered by zip codes 89030, 89015 and 89115 were chosen for the delivery of the HFA program. Zip code area 89030 is located in the northern portion of the Las Vegas Valley in North Las Vegas. Zip code area 89015 is located in the eastern portion of the Valley. Zip code area 89115 is located in Henderson within the Las Vegas metropolitan area. UNR’s Associate Professor
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reported that these "three zip code areas were chosen because of its [sic] high concentration of overburdened families, newly transplanted from outside Nevada, with no apparent support systems." At the inception of the partnership, the Las Vegas metropolitan area had experienced a 65% increase in population in the previous years, designating the area as the fastest-growing city in the country.

Prior to the submission of the joint proposal to PCAA, WE CAN, as required by PCAA had gone through a very rigorous and demanding process to establish themselves as the official PCAA state chapter. WE CAN's Assistant Director and Healthy Family Nevada (HFN) Program Manager explained the circumstances:

[Nevada had]...two [PCAA state] chapters, and NCPCA [PCAA] said you could have one. There was a chapter in Northern Nevada in Reno..and then there was a chapter in Southern Nevada, which was WE CAN. [WE CAN] had completed all of the components and jumped through all the hoops that were necessary...[and PCAA] granted the chapter name to [WE CAN].

The newly-established state chapter had much to prove, mainly that PCAA had made the right decision.

**Mission And Objectives**

WE CAN and UNR-CE developed a mission, goals, and objectives for the newly-formed partnership. The mission stated that:

The Healthy Families Nevada Program is to provide education and support to parents of newborns residing
in Las Vegas.®

The partnership administrators also established the program’s goals and objectives:

1) Systematically identify overburdened families in need of support.
2) Enhance family functioning by building trusting relationships, teaching problem solving skills, and improving the family’s support system.
3) Promote positive parent-child interaction.
4) Promote healthy childhood growth and development.^

Organizational Structure

WE CAN and UNR-CE developed a very hierarchical organizational concept. The partnership administrator’s concept was recorded in an organizational chart. Table 2 depicts this arrangement. Portions of the partnership’s structure had been outlined in the joint proposal to PCAA, which stated that “Nevada Cooperative Extension proposes to take the leadership for two program components: home visiting and program evaluation.”® This involved hiring a HFN Project Manager, the home visitation staff, a supervisor, and designing and supervising the program evaluation component. WE CAN assumed responsibility for “the on-going development of the collaborative and statewide institutionalization of Healthy Families Nevada.”®

® Healthy Families Nevada policies and procedures (date was not available).
7 Ibid.
Table 2

WE CAN And UNR-CE Partnership Organizational Structure

- Kellogg
  - Executive Director
  - HFN Program Mgr. & Asst. Dir.
  - Supervisor Assessment Wkr.
  - Assessment Worker

- PCAA
  - HFA
  - Associate Professor
  - HFN Project Mgr. & Area Specialist
  - Supervisor Home Visitors
  - Home Visitors

- USDA-CSREES
  - UNR-CE
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also agreed to hire a Program Manager and staff to perform the initial assessment of families for inclusion in the HFA program. The partnership's administrators agreed that staff would "adhere to the personnel policies and practices of their respective employer organization." Employer was defined as the "organization which hires, houses, supervises and issues the salary of a given HFA project employee." The assignment of roles and division of labor agreed upon by the partnership's administrators, was indeed very unusual as UNR-CE's Associate Professor recounted:

...a lot of NCPCA chapters don't provide direct services[; rather] the NCPCA chapter at the state level often is promoting universal services, promoting those relationships and so forth. And in our state, WE CAN wanted to be a partner in the service provision. And the way that they were a partner was to do the assessment while we were doing the home visiting.

The HFN Program Manager supervised the Assessment Worker Supervisor and was responsible for the HFN newsletter, locating and securing additional funding, building collaborations within the community, working with the collaborators and PCAA. UNR-CE's Associated Professor stated that the HFN Program Manager "at least theoretically,...had responsibility for managing the program pieces...[However,] she was less involved in delivering the program [and] the day-to-day delivery of services." In this role, the HFN Program Manager was accountable to Executive Director at WE

---

10 Same as footnote number 11.
11 Ibid.
CAN and to the Project Manager and Associate Professor at UNR-CE. The HFN Program Manager indicated that "I took my direction from everyone. And you walk a very, very fine line in that role".

The UNR-CE’s Project Manager, was an Area Specialist, a faculty member on the University of Nevada, Reno’s tenure track, and was responsible for the home visitation component of the HFA program. Program delivery and day-to-day services were included in the Project Manager’s duties. The Project Manager was also responsible for other UNR-CE parenting and early childhood programs in addition to meeting all of the requirements of a tenure-track faculty member. The Associate Professor, was assigned the task of developing the HFA curriculum. This individual was also fully involved in all other partnership issues. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor admitted:

...there were a lot of control issues...I think there were some challenges that we had to cope with because of the organization structure and the management of each separate organization and the overlaying of these different roles on individuals.

**Decision-Making Processes**

WE CAN’s HFN Program Manager stated that WE CAN and UNR-CE agreed that “Decisions [sic] will be made by the HFA Core Team utilizing [a] decision-making process.” The HFA Core Team was comprised of WE CAN’s administrative staff and UNR-CE’s HFN program staff. At the inception of the partnership WE CAN and UNR-CE developed a formal protocol
for making decisions which resulted in achieving consensus. UNR-CE's Area Specialist stated that "that was the rule that we followed...we did most things by consensus". This protocol was made into a chart and was distributed to all the partnership administrators. Table 3 depicts this process. Although the administrators faced many challenges, all adhered to the established decision-making process. WE CAN's Program Manager stated:

...we had long meetings. We discussed things at length and much of the time the decision-making worked very well. We actually knew what we were trying to do. You know, we were trying to reach consensus and if we did, that was fine...if we couldn't reach consensus, we could table things. We could search for more information and come back at the next meeting with additional information and see if we could reach consensus at that point in time.

Funding Mechanism And Authority

The UNR-CE's Project Manager reported that "WE CAN started as the fiscal agent and we subcontracted through them", because PCAA gave the funding authority to WE CAN rather than to the partnership. UNR-CE agreed to "subcontract with WE CAN, Inc., which will provide funding as allocated by the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse,"\(^{12}\) even though UNR-CE was incurring the majority of the expenses and thus receiving the bulk of the funding. In a letter dated June 16, 1995, WE CAN's Executive Director informed UNR-CE:

\(^{12}\)Letter to UNR-CE from WE CAN's Executive Director dated 6-16-95.
Table 3

Healthy Families Nevada Protocol for Decision-Making

DECISION

*[HFN Core Team Decides]*

Discussion
(risks/benefits)

Consensus

Yes

No

Table → Vote → 2nd Vote (Those Present/Majority Rule)

Minority Report
(negotiations: 2 volunteers from majority, 2 from minority)

< 70% OF TOTAL GROUP

*All partnership administrators.*

**Fewer partnership administrators.*
As per our proposal of April 30, 1995 WE CAN, Inc. agrees to pay the University of Nevada, Reno $114,401 to participate in the Healthy Families Nevada project. You will collaborate with us to insure program success and primarily focus on home visitation and evaluation in your proposal. The $114,401 will be paid in three installments.

WE CAN was also charged by PCAA with the responsibility for establishing a mechanism for expending the funds. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor attested:

...we quickly discovered that that was very, very hard on them, I had suspected it would be. But WE CAN wanted to be the fiscal agent and I said ‘Are you sure? Because you’ll be dealing with a big university bureaucracy that pays people to be fiscal agents, and...our funding situation can get real complicated.

The Associate Professor speculated as to why WE CAN retained fiscal authority:

WE CAN had to be concerned with the politics of I think...[its own] Board of Directors...I think that part of [the Executive Director’s] concern was getting recognition for having received this large grant. And one way you get recognition is by having this full huge sum of money, which, you know, is a large amount of money promised to us...I think there was sort of a status and a prestige around that that was probably more important for a private nonprofit with an executive director to answer to a board of directors.

UNR-CE’s Associate Professor advised WE CAN that “it would be easier for the University to handle the whole thing and have WE CAN subcontract with us,” but to no avail. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor, however, stated that they were “open to letting them [WE CAN] take on that responsibility” because UNR-CE’s “primary interest was doing a program..reaching families who needed help; with preventing child abuse and neglect;...[and] keeping little children from being injured or from being neglected.”
WE CAN, as a non-profit organization, could expend funds much faster than the UNR-CE. The University would not approve any expenditures until the funding was made available in a designated University account. The partnership administrators established a reimbursement system pursuant to which UNR-CE would first incur an expense and WE CAN would then reimburse UNR-CE once bills for expenses were presented. This mechanism for expending funds was in direct conflict with the fiscal policies of the University, thus hampering UNR-CE’s ability to comply with its designated role in the partnership. Both UNR-CE partnership administrators were taken by surprise and the Area Specialist stated that they “had no idea that the University structure or community-based structure would have caused the problems that it did.”

Nevertheless, the UNR-CE partnership administrators struggled with this reimbursement system for the first year of the partnership. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor conceded that “it became, I think, fairly clear that that was most probably not the best way to handle it. And it would be better to have NCPCA deal with the university system directly.” Eventually PCAA agreed. Even though, PCAA originally wanted WE CAN to be the fiscal officer, WE CAN’s HFN Program Manager indicated that WE CAN also “realized the problem as well. So they [PCAA] decided that they could send WE CAN’s part of the money to WE CAN and the university’s part [to the University], which I think saved WE CAN many
headaches”.

**Policies And Procedures**

Policies and procedures were not formally developed by the partnership’s administrators; rather, each partner followed its own organization’s internal policies and procedures in accomplishing its assigned tasks. On matters relating to the delivery of the HFA program, the partners adhered to the policies and procedures as dictated by the protocol of the HFA program model. UNR-CE internal policies and procedures were much more restrictive and bureaucratic than those of WE CAN which could make split-second decisions by consulting its Board of Directors. UNR-CE had to comply with numerous, complex and rigid employment and fiscal policies and procedures in order to accomplish many of its assignments. WE CAN’s reluctance, during the first year of the partnership, to transfer funding authority to UNR-CE caused delays in the delivery of the HFA program.

**Conflict-Resolution Process**

WE CAN and UNR-CE did not develop a process for resolving conflicts. However, any conflicts could have been brought to and resolved at the partnership’s regularly scheduled meetings. Yet, none of the numerous conflicts between the Project Manager and the HFN Program Manager were ever resolved. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor reported:

There was not a process of addressing some conflict
because I think individuals are not willing to talk about them in a leadership team setting. I believe we had a process in place if the parties who were feeling conflicted wanted the [partnership administrators] to deal with the issues. They could, that could have happened. But the individuals weren’t comfortable with that. So there were some issues that did not come to the table.

Despite the tremendous conflict generated by the personality conflicts between the two Managers none of the other administrators brought these issues to the table for resolution.

On occasions, WE CAN and UNR-CE partnership administrators requested assistance from PCAA’s staff to act as mediators. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor indicated:

[One of the mediators] was a very good listener, understood a lot of the issues, understood home visiting as well, and..did a good job and worked close with the [Project Manager and the HFN Program Manager] as well as with our group in helping to mediate some of those kinds of differences in conflict.

This process appeared to have been working until the HFN Program Manager discovered that one of the mediators was related to the Project Manager. This discovery created an even greater chasm between the HFN Program Manager and the Project Manager. Any trust that existed between the Managers was lost, and the increasing conflicts adversely affected the morale of the program delivery staff.

**Accountability**

Programmatic accountability was established by the partners through the quarterly reports submitted to PCAA. A process holding each partner accountable for the
functioning, administration, and governance of the partnership was not developed. WE CAN and UNR-CE deferred to the programmatic accountability of HFA as a way to report the partnership’s functioning, growth, and development. Some of the struggles herein described were mentioned in the reports presented to PCAA. Nevertheless, the main focus of the reports was, the progress or lack thereof of the HFA program.

Impact

The formal and informal governance and administrative systems created by the partners appeared to have impacted the delivery of the program. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor stated that “With [sic] our particular partnership, with assessments being done by one agency and home visitation being done by another agency, with the kinds of fiscal restrictions” that plagued the partnership, UNR-CE had to remain flexible. WE CAN’s HFN Program Manager, on the other hand, stated that “the staff that was working with families did their job in spite of everything. They were seeing the families.” While families were eventually seen, WE CAN’s initial reluctance to share fiscal authority with UNR-CE delayed the delivery of services for several months. Both UNR-CE and WE CAN agreed that the entire program delivery staff was frustrated by the unresolved disputes at the administrative level that prevented them from performing their jobs.
WE CAN admitted that the administrative and governance conflicts also had an effect on the partnership administrators and on the functioning of the partnership itself. UNR-CE's Project Manager concluded that because the two organizations had not really thought through the structure of a program that involved intensive home visitation, program delivery was hampered. The greatest impact was on the staff directly involved with the families. From the beginning the staff was fragmented. The Assessment Worker and the Assessment Worker Supervisor were assigned to WE CAN, the Home Visitors and the Home Visitor Supervisor were assigned to UNR-CE. WE CAN and UNR-CE program delivery staff became trapped between the conflicting managers and seemingly polarized by the conflicts that existed.

Obstructions To The Partnership

Early on both WE CAN and UNR-CE uncovered significant challenges that interfered with the governance and administration of the partnership. Neither organization was familiar with the other on its method of operation. UNR-CE's Associate Professor referring to proposals she had submitted in the past, observed:

We had outlined what we were going to do in the proposal and then we had been awarded the funds based on the merit of this proposal. And once the funds were awarded, the expectation was that we were going to take that money and we were going to do what we said in the proposal that we would do with it. And there was an accountability built in, both fiscal and programmatic, in most grants [proposals]. In this particular grant we soon discovered that NCPCA [PCAA] planned to be much
more involved in the actual carrying out of the work than any of us had ever been used to before...that was a real shift...I, for example, knew very little about NCPCA initially; how it was set up and how it worked and so forth.

This initial lack of knowledge appears to have given rise to some of the challenges experienced by the partnership’s administrators throughout the life of the partnership.

The separation of key positions created communications problems and delays in the delivery of the HFA program. WE CAN hired the assessment worker and UNR-CE hired the home visitors. The HFA model requires that these positions work very closely together. The duties of the assessment worker were to secure referrals from area hospitals and other organizations, conduct the initial assessment of parents to ensure compliance with HFA guidelines, and prepare assessment reports. These reports were then reviewed by the assessment worker supervisor, a person also housed at and employed by WE CAN. The assessment reports were then sent to the family support worker supervisor who was housed at and employed by UNR-CE and had the responsibility of assigning the home visits.

Initially, this process caused significant delays in the delivery of services to families and created severe morale problems amongst the staff. WE CAN reported that its staff felt excluded from UNR-CE and saw themselves as outsiders. UNR-CE reported that its staff was impatient with the process and dissatisfied with the delays. The staff was not being all housed under the same roof and the on-going
control issues between the HFN Program Manager and the Project Manager caused conflicts that plagued the partnership until its third year of existence.

The evaluation component of the program posed another difficulty for the partnership. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor reported that the partnership’s proposal to PCAA required an “evaluation plan and in fact evaluation was really emphasized in terms of importance.” Even though Kellogg had not funded the program evaluation component, PCAA made it a requirement for the pilot states “with no funding to support it”. Since UNR-CE assumed responsibility for the evaluation component, it was left looking around for other funding sources in order to comply with this requirement.

In an effort to foster clearer lines of communication and understanding between PCAA and the Cooperative Extension pilot states, PCAA hired UNR-CE’s Project Manager as a PCAA trainer. This individual had previously established a relationship with PCAA through its Infant Mortality Reduction Initiative and was a Kellogg Fellow who had completed a three-year leadership program with the Foundation. The Project Manager continued to perform her work in that capacity and also began:

...work[ing] with the three states...so that we could begin to look at what was the role of the state chapter; what was the role of Cooperative Extension; how could...that come together in response to Kellogg’s needs and desire to see how we could make such a partnership work.

PCAA’s hiring of the Project Manager as a trainer was both
productive and destructive. UNR-CE’s Project Manager stated:

[My appointment]...helped them [PCAA] see some of the problems, the challenges they were facing in the way they were trying to relate to these three states, and got them to hire an additional person who really increased communication and cohesion.

The person hired, however, was the Project Manager’s sister. Their familial relationship remained concealed from WE CAN and UNR-CE for a little over a year. The Nevada Project Manager explained:

...[PCAA] hired [my sister]...based on her credentials...and qualifications, based on her ability to do a good job, her background in working with intensive home visiting. And we wanted to ensure that people valued what she came with and then later...we didn’t have any problems with telling them later. We were also afraid that it could backfire. But we didn’t know if [the partnership administrators] would have felt like, you know, ‘You all purposely deceived us. You didn’t give us this information. You didn’t tell us these things’. But Kellogg knew who that person was. NCPCA, you know, knew how we were related. And [UNR-CE] knew...how we were related.

This lack of disclosure intensified the air of distrust in the partnership.

Communications problems were detrimental to the operation of the partnership. PCAA’s Principal Analyst stated that WE CAN’s Executive Director “was...kind of working directly with NCPCA [PCAA] at times”, thus excluding the UNR-CE’s partnership administrators from the lines of communication. This exclusion created further distrust amongst the partnership administrators. WE CAN and UNR-CE agreed that poor communications and the lack thereof, between the administrators, was a very challenging detractor from their intended purpose. UNR-CE’s Project Manager
reported that "there were control issues...there were [sic] some communication going on that wasn’t always shared between the partners at the local level".

Accessibility to program recipients' personal information was identified as a challenge to the partnership. UNR-CE's Associate Professor pointed out that the University's Human Subjects Protocol approved the evaluation component of the program and "we were under an additional obligation not to reveal the identity of our families [as] confidentiality was a major concern for this kind of program". Further, the Agreement for Screening between local hospitals and the partnership stressed confidentiality and provided:

[HFN agrees to] Treat [sic] as confidential, any and all information obtained from clients, and to restrict access to such information to such persons directly connected with the administration or enforcement of the program.\(^{13}\)

UNR-CE's maintaining the degree of confidentiality required by the University's policy created controversy. UNR-CE's Associate Professor reported that weekly meetings were held with the home visitation staff to allow for the exchange of information and as a forum:

...where they really were able to talk about their families and get ideas from the rest of the group about how to handle crises or issues that were occurring with their families. Well, there were difficulties in the partners about who should be allowed to attend those meetings.

\(^{13}\)Taken from Healthy Families Nevada Meeting Agenda dated 8-29-1995.
And [the Project Manager] decided that only the home visitors and the supervisor should be there. [The HFN Program Manager] wanted to be involved in those meetings and felt that if she didn’t understand some of these issues that it was difficult for her to be the program manager. And there were [sic] some, I suppose, disagreement about [the Program Manager’s] role and some concerns about who would know very intimate details about the families we were working with.

As a result of the Project Manager’s decision the HFN Program Manager reported feeling excluded, not trusted by the UNR-CE partnership administrators, and that her exclusion from the meetings hindered her ability to perform her duties. The HFN Program Manager further reported:

Any program that we’re [WE CAN] involved in, we need to be thoroughly involved in. That doesn’t mean that we’re micro managing the program. I’m not into that. What it means is, I’m informed. When someone tells me I can’t attend a meeting because of confidentiality, excuse me, you know.

Nevertheless, UNR-CE’s Associate Professor contended that maintaining a strict line of confidentiality “was probably a good decision.” The ensuing conflict between the Project Manager and HFN Program Manager over attendance at home visitor meetings continued for over two years and, according to the HFN Program Manager “it wasn’t resolved until the [Project Manager] left the partnership.”

Wisconsin’s Partnership

Prevent Child Abuse Wisconsin (PCAWI) and the University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension (UW-CE) had previously collaborated on many projects. UW-CE Program
Specialist reported:

...that entity is just 10 blocks from our office here and over the last 10 to 15 years, Family Living programs and Cooperative Extension and that agency had done some other things together. We knew each other. We had shared materials, had worked on some other projects, so we had a working relationship and a friendship.

PCAWI's Executive Director confirmed that their organization and UW-CE "did a five-year project with 13 of the northern Wisconsin counties...We maximized our strengths. We worked together."

The Executive Director for PCAWI received word from PCAA that proposals would be accepted to pilot test the HFA Program and decided to submit a proposal. PCAWI's Executive Director reported:

I'm already poised because I have my relationship in place. We already know how to work together. We kind of understand each other's system or lack of systems...they [UW-CE] weren't coming in with a lot of baggage, and scars, you know, bloody clothes from previous turf wars.

Given this, forming a partnership with UW-CE appeared to be a natural progression. Thus PCAWI and UW-CE joined forces and agreed to submit a joint proposal. The UW-CE Program Specialists remembered:

...the original proposal process, what came from, umm, the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse [PCAA] was really just a handful of questions. It wasn't a very formal proposal. In fact..I helped put some information into that and I thought at the time, this is just a sort of an information-gathering thing. It wasn’t as detailed as the proposals often are..We sent it in and didn’t hear anything and didn’t hear anything..Then at a later date, we received notice.
-- you are one of the sites.

Prior to submitting the proposal to PCAA, UW-CE had received requests for home visitation programs from some county Extension offices. UW-CE was looking for funding to institute these programs. HFA appeared to be the perfect response because, as the Program Specialist recalled, "we had several counties that were interested,...we worked with them to sort out who might be the best candidate...Walworth County was the one who turned our proposal in. It was accepted; that's where we did [HFA]."

Walworth County (County) is a rural community located in southeastern Wisconsin on the Illinois border. The County has approximately 75,000 inhabitants (according to the most recent census data), including a fairly large migrant population primarily from Mexico. The migrant workers come to the County in the summers and work on the farms and in the large canning companies. Over the years many of the workers have settled in the County. Extension's Family Living Educator (County Educator) reported that the reason the growing Latino population was chosen as the recipients of HFA:

...for many years our county board and other organizations and agencies didn't acknowledge that we had a growing number of Spanish-speaking people. We just kind of ignored it...we couldn't do that any longer this is Walworth County...we are responsible for our families and taking care of our communities. Healthy Families was the first program in Walworth County that acknowledged that we have a growing
audience and we’re I think the first agency in our county to hire bilingual staff.

At the time, UW-CE was working with the Walworth County Resources Coalition. The County Educator discussed the origins of the coalition:

..the project,..idea took place years before the actual Kellogg project got started...back in 1989, I believe..I was talking with some colleagues in other Departments at Walworth County, and talked about the idea of working better together to provide programs and services for families. And out of these initial discussions grew the need to see if we could establish a county wide effort that would bring together people who also shared the common interest of working together, collaborating..understanding that if we work together we could accomplish more. And out of those initial discussions..grew what we have formed, a family resource coalition for Walworth County. And [the coalition] was organized..I believe in 1990. And it is still in existence and is non a nonprofit organization..I served as the first chairperson and president of the program. And it is a countywide organization that looks at providing support, education, and information to parents...one of the goals of the coalition was to take a look at developing a home visitor program for our families. And we thought that this would be a very attainable project as we have just one hospital...and the core of our county services are located right here in [the town of] Elkorn [at the same address]. So we’re moving forward with this effort securing funding and moving forward with hiring a coordinator when this opportunity with the Kellogg Foundation happened.

A staff member from PCAWI had served as a consultant to the coalition and helped the group in numerous ways, including speaking at local informational programs. Thus, the infrastructure for HFA was already in place, and only one thing was missing, funding. The stage was set for the formation of a partnership involving PCAWI, UW-CE, supported by their collaborators the Walworth County Family Resources Coalition.
Mission And Objectives

PCAWI and the UW-CE partnership administrators did not develop a mission and objectives for the partnership at its inception. When asked if the partnership had developed a mission at its inception the response from UW-CE’s Project Director was “I don’t know that we ever used that word...I’m thinking of times where I’ve been with [others] and they said ‘We need to work on our mission statement.’ We didn’t do that”. However, the partnership administrators reported that there was already agreement as to the direction they were taking. Partnership administrators adopted the HFA mission which was described in the report entitled Healthy Families Walworth County: A Summary of the First Two Years (February, 1997): “The mission of HFA is to provide support and education to all families of newborns, encouraging communities to provide universal services for all new parents.”

PCAWI and UW-CE’s objective, also articulated in the 1997 report, was to offer “either prenatally or at the birth of a child...on a voluntary basis, long term, intensive parent education and support to overburdened parents through the use of the home visitation service delivery model.” The County Educator indicated that the partnership administrators’ goal was to “replicate that model [HFA] within that county...And then...adjust the model within the context of the families we want to serve.” The partnership administrators’ agreed that everyone moving in the same
direction from the start helped in the governance and administration of the partnership and in making HFA work.

Organizational Structure

Organizational structure was another element that the partnership administrators did not formally address. PCAWI's Executive Director reported that "our partnership developed quite informally and grew as it went". Instead of depicting its structure in an organizational chart, they chose to develop a 'flow chart'. The flow chart depicted the Walworth County's HFA program (identified as the Healthy Families Walworth County Project) in the center. All other partnership administrators and collaborators were placed around the center indicating the relationships with arrows. Table 4 is a schematic representation of the Wisconsin pilot site organizational structure.

PCAWI's Executive Director admitted that "no one ever understood our flow chart. And the more we tried to explain it to the National Committee--they never, they never understood it." PCAWI's Executive Director explained:

...we may have not had real formal organizational charts and things like that because there wasn't ever something where we were trying to sort of catch each other...I think that we were less formal about a lot of this because things were going well.

...you don't have to make a big mystery out of the whole structure and how to make things work. That really the bottom line is relationships. And hierarchy is not everything...mission is as important as outcome, and to be clear on mission. Lots of problems will solve themselves when you focus on mission. Because if you're focused on what your intent is and that is to..help
Table 4

PCAWI And UW-CE Partnership Organizational Structure
those families either at the very beginning, and that the needs of the families are what drives everything. Or that the purpose is to put in place a statewide system for home visiting, for that reason then, other little things like who’s on top, who’s on the bottom, who’s big, and who’s little, and.. the turf war is just...it’s unimportant.

Despite the apparent lack of structure, each of the partnership administrators’ had roles and developed job descriptions. The County Educator’s role, in addition to supervising the EFNEP program in the Walworth County UW Extension office, served as the president of the Family Resource Coalition and stated that “as such [I] was responsible for the community development and team relationships.” Even though the HFA and home visiting staff were housed in the County’s UW-CE office, the County Educator was not responsible for their supervision. Rather, the partnership hired a Project Coordinator to oversee the day-to-day mechanics of the HFA program in addition to supervising the home visiting staff.

PCAWI and UW-CE considered the time that would be devoted to HFA by two of the administrators in the partnership. Fifty percent of the UW-CE Project Director’s salary and fifty percent of the PCAWI’s Assistant Executive Director were paid by funding received from PCAA. PCAA did not support this arrangement initially. UW-CE’s Program Specialist stated:

...I remember at the beginning the National Committee

---

14Job descriptions were not available at the time of this study.
[PCAA] thinking that...they were really, very negative about us keeping money at the state level for [one of the partnership administrators] and I [sic]. I think they were suspicious of that, umm really, really felt that it was hurting the program at the local level. We stuck to our guns on that because it just looked like there was gonna be so much of this that [PCAWI's Executive Director] and I didn’t see how we could do this unless we actually bought out some of our time and put it towards that [HFA].

While the County Educator dealt with the Family Resource Coalition, UW-CE’s Program Specialist indicated that PCAWI and UW-CE’s partnership administrators located in Madison dealt with “the budget, and the training, and the [HFA] model, and getting the stuff for the local chapter”. UW-CE retained the research evaluation component.

PCAWI’s partnership administrators were the advocacy voice for HFA at the Wisconsin legislature. PCAWI’s Executive Director stated the reason the agency assumed this role:

...they [UW-CE] can’t always be advocating because legislators think these are just bureaucratic fat cats and they just want more and more and more and more. Whereas...we could have people advocate...We’re just a voice for saying here, this is something that holds some promise, the Healthy Families a voice of the problems...So we could be a more pure advocacy voice,...and we could do a little troubleshooting and... try to be supportive so that Extension would be able to do this [HFA] without...all these other people [interfering and] would stay off their backs.

PCAWI’s Executive Director reported that partnership administrators also “spent a lot of time trying to find new funding sources...and eventually we were able to get legislators’ interest and support so they’ll carry the
ball.” However, it was the County Educator who secured the funding from Walworth County for the continuity of the HFA program in the County. UW-CE’s Program Specialist stated that “that was her [County Educator] thing and she did a beautiful job of it”. PCAWI’s Executive Director asserted that “when you look at the grand scheme of division of labor, it sorted itself out very nicely.”

The partnership administrators allowed each other to function within their assigned roles. The administrators’ approach was to allow each partnership administrator to perform its assigned functions and to do what each did best. Assistance was provided when a partnership administrator requested it, but within limits. PCAWI’s Executive Director concluded:

...we did not try to take..away anything from her [the County Educator’s] authority so to speak for those local partners. She was the lead person on that...the division of labor also meant that, you know, who’s really in charge of which part and we didn’t try to..get in the way.

**Decision-Making Process**

PCAWI and UW-CE did not develop a formal decision-making process. Rather, the partnership administrators, as recounted by PCAWI’s Executive Director, would “just talk to each other and say, ‘What’s going..[on]?’ I mean it was, it was just not real formal..[and we had]..constant conversations...we had very open communication.” The County Educator indicated that the UW-CE and PCAWI partnership administrators located in Madison made most of the
decisions, but "anything that would affect us here locally [in Walworth County] I was brought into that." The partnership administrators contended that their approach to understanding, respecting, and supporting each other's role created an ease for making decisions, and that a formal process was not required. The partnership administrators concluded that preplanning was the key to developing the governance and administrative functions of the partnership, and they were determined to make the partnership work.

**Funding Mechanism And Authority**

At the onset of the partnership PCAWI's Executive Director surmised:

...if this [HFA] is gonna grow big, we needed...an administrative infrastructure. And that was not gonna be us, because we like to be a small shop, we like to be catalytic...So I wanted..them [UW-CE] to be fiscal agent, not to mention that they have a whole office or the next guy who does all that stuff and runs some numbers. Whereas I would have had to hire somebody to do that.

...at first we thought...that the money would just be forward [sic] to us and that we could, that [PCAWI] could even have handled it if...she could have had the money and spent it down. In fact she was interested in doing that, but as we started to see that we had to bill for expenses...and when we looked at who wants to bear the burden of hiring people, providing benefits, all that, [PCAWI] doesn't have a bookkeeper. She doesn't have a secretary. It just didn't seem like something that they could easily manage.

Partnership administrators, from their perspective, made the key decision that UW-CE would have authority over the funds and would develop and manage a mechanism for expending such funds. PCAWI indicated that they just wanted
a "small cut" for their expenses.

UW-CE dealt directly with PCAA in terms of billing and reimbursement of expenses. The UW-CE Project Director reported:

...we took the responsibility of hiring employees and then we had the responsibility of billing and..getting them [PCAA] to reimburse us for the grant...And in the end that really was a good way to go because we had difficulty in getting the national committee to reimburse us. At times we’re floating them...At one point they were six months behind in reimbursing us. And the University system kind of absorbed that. So looking at who can best handle these things...the University, I think, is much better equipped to handle big dollars where’s [sic] [PCAWI] wasn’t.

A six-month reimbursement delay would have been catastrophic for PCAWI which operated on a very limited budget. PCAWI and UW-CE partnership administrators agreed that making the "key decision" to transfer management and authority of the funds to UW-CE helped in the administration and governance of the partnership.

**Policies And Procedures**

Policies and procedures were developed for the delivery of HFA. PCAWI’s Executive Director reported that "we talked about what needed to be done and how we were gonna do it". However, none were developed for the functioning of the partnership. PCAWI and UW-CE partnership administrators followed and adhered to the internal policies within their own institutions. PCAWI’s Executive Director pointed out that "keep in mind though that these people [HFA program delivery staff] were all University employees, there’s a
whole framework of policy...the framework of policies and procedures really are [sic] Extension's policies and procedures." PCAWI partnership administrators agreed to the partnership's use of UW-CE's internal policies and procedures because the University had responsibility for the budget as well as hiring the personnel for HFA. PCAWI and UW-CE partnership administrators preferred to use policies and procedures already in existence, "rather than starting from scratch."

Conflict-Resolution Process

PCAWI and UW-CE partnership administrators contended that a formal process for conflict resolution was not needed. UW-CE Project Director recalled:

We spent so much time together and talked so much that I think at times we just dealt with each thing as it came up.

The County Educator stated:

...people were informed all along the way and had the opportunity to give input, so that probably was the way we did it [resolve conflicts] and because of that [open communication] we really didn't have conflicts to deal with.

PCAWI's Executive Director reported:

And we didn't really have serious, serious conflicts...if people had concerns...we had some ways of addressing them soon enough that it didn't break up the partnership in any way.

Therefore, a rather ad hoc, informal system was utilized.
Accountability

PCAWI and UW-CE partnership administrators chose to become accountable to each other and to the HFA collaborators in the County by revisiting their goals and would remind each other of the partnership’s intended purpose. Partnership administrators were accountable to PCAA through quarterly reports. UW-CE’s Project Director confirmed that she “took the lead in doing the budget report every quarter...And everybody [else] had a different thing that they were responsible for.” The written reports were also forwarded to the partnership’s HFA collaborators in the County. The County Educator stated that the reports were a way of “creating opportunities to share...the progress, as well as to get input into what we want to do directly. And making sure that we were meeting the goals of the program and meeting the needs of our families.”

Impact

PCAWI and UW-CE partnership administrators pointed out that their formal and informal administrative and governance approach in managing the business of the partnership had a “huge impact” on the delivery of the HFA program. The County Educator stated:

...by having all that [governance and administration]...figured out and dealt with and organized, it allowed us to really focus on what it is that we needed to do to support families...having [PCAWI and UW-CE] take care of all those other things that needed to happen, tremendous amount of time and energy went into that, that I could really focus on what I know best...I think
it allowed me the freedom and flexibility to focus on Walworth County. And if I had to worry about the budget or worry about doing the reports, oh, I don't know if I could have done it. I could really focus on my area of expertise and that worked out really well.

PCAWI's Executive Director further attested:

I think when you, if you look at sort of...the final outcome, did we engage families, and did we retain families, and the did we see a difference in what [happened] in the family, we did...[and we also] have [sic] openness and flexibility.

PCAWI and UW-CE partnership administrators agreed that all the planning, the communication efforts, the distribution of responsibility, and the comfortable working relationship from the onset of the partnership were crucial and had a positive, long-term effect on the delivery of the program.

**Obstructions To The Partnership**

UW-CE Project Director reported that "there certainly were conflicts with the National Committee [PCAA], and there were personality problems on their staff" putting PCAWI in the position to mediate between UW-CE and PCAA. PCAWI's partnership administrators agreed with the Project Director's assertion. According to PCAWI most of the conflicts arose from PCAA's lack of knowledge of UW-CE's system. PCAWI's Executive Director indicated that "it would make [the University partners] pretty anxious when people were rude to her [UW-CE Project Director] or when she thought they were, it was just some young kid out of school who is trying to tell her how to run the program." PCAA's lack of understanding of the University system gave rise to
and perpetuated a conflicting relationship with UW-CE partnership administrators throughout the life of the partnership.

Oklahoma’s Partnership

Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension (OSU-CE) had two established home visitation programs in the community: the Community Nutrition Education Program and the Home Visitation Parent Education Program. These programs were a blend of two nutrition educational programs—EFNEP and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program. The first program was run by the State Specialist in the area of nutrition education, and the second program was run by the State Specialist in the area of parenting and child development. Both State Specialists were seeking ways to expand the Home Visitation Parent Education Program to all the counties in the state.

At the same time, Prevent Child Abuse Oklahoma (PCAOK) was submitting a response to a request for proposal from the Oklahoma Family Preservation and Support Initiative for the development of a plan utilizing home visitation for at-risk families. PCAOK had already established a collaborative group known as the Healthy Families Oklahoma Initiative. This collaborative group was interested in establishing home visitation programs throughout the state. PCAOK was awarded the grant from the Family Preservation and Support Initiative and with their collaborators from the Healthy
Families Oklahoma initiative developed a state-wide home visitation plan. This plan was called the Healthy Families Oklahoma Home Visiting for At-Risk Families Plan.

PCAOK and OSU-CE received individual notices from their respective national partners about the HFA initiative. They also received information on the request for proposals. PCAOK's Executive Director stated that she had a working relationship with OSU-CE's State Specialist in parenting and child development and that they decided to submit a joint proposal for the HFA project. Before the proposal was submitted to PCAA, the OSU-CE State Specialist in parenting and child development approached the State Specialist in nutrition education about the proposal. The Specialists discussed the possibility of developing a combined program that would teach parenting skills and nutrition education to low-income families.

The Executive Director for PCAOK and the two State Specialists subsequently submitted a written proposal for the HFA project. The rationale given was:

Both organizations [PCAOK and OSU-CE] have worked collaboratively to bring [the] best practices in parenting education and child abuse prevention to Oklahoma's citizens. Both organizations have strong support and commitment from their respective administrators and Board of Directors for this project. This represents a significant public/private partnership to prevent child abuse in Oklahoma.15

---

15Taken from Healthy Families Oklahoma Pilot Site Proposal, Capability Summary, November, 1994.
After a very long period of waiting, PCAOK and OSU-CE received notice that Oklahoma had been selected as one of the pilot sites, and their partnership was formed.

In their proposal to PCAA, PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators identified Shawnee in Pottawatomie County as the state’s pilot because, as they both stated, Shawnee has the state’s largest Native American population. “The tribes that will be served include the Citizen’s Band Potawatomi[^16] [Nation]; [the] Kickapoo [Tribe of Oklahoma]; [the] Absentee Shawnee [Nation]; [the] Iowa [Nation]; and the Sac and Fox [Nation].”[^17] Three of these tribes are headquartered in Pottawatomie County.

About the time PCAA advised PCAOK and OSU-CE that Oklahoma would be a pilot state, OSU-CE’s State Specialist in parenting and child development, one of the initiators of the partnership, moved out of state. The OSU-CE Specialist in nutrition education who “thought I was only signing up to be a support person” became the Healthy Families Project Director for OSU-CE (OSU-CE Project Director). The OSU-CE Project Director indicated that she was assigned this position “by default...[and]..became as closely involved as I

[^16]: The tribe spells its name different from the County.

[^17]: Taken from a letter from PCAOK and OSU-CE to PCAA dated September 11, 1995.
was... [because] my supervisor... asked me to go ahead and take over the management of that [project] until we got a person to fill that position that we had open."

The partners' initial enthusiasm and their vision for expanding HFA to all Oklahoma families were tempered at the very inception of the partnership by PCAA. PCAA scheduled an introductory site visit with the partnership administrators. OSU-CE's Project Director observed:

..we had a site visit from a couple of people from the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse [PCAA]. And that was the, I think absolutely the most horrible day in Extension because, again, you know, it wasn’t, there was no pretense of it being a partnership from their viewpoint. They were there to explain the method that the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse [used]... and it was like they were reading to us from their bible and we were supposed to be following along and doing everything just the way they wanted it. And there was no pretense of sitting back and asking Extension, you know, ‘What is your experience? How do you deal with advisory committees? How do you work at recruiting families?’ You know, it was just like, we know absolutely nothing about how to develop a community-based home visitation program and they were there to set us straight on how it needed to be done... and I really took offense to that.

PCAOK's Executive Director expressed that PCAA'S top-down approach was detrimental to the partnership, particularly because the partnership administrators from OSU-CE "had never worked with the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse [PCAA] before so they [OSU-CE] were completely new to me." Nevertheless, PCAOK and OSU-CE moved forward, but not without some initial uncertainty.

OSU-CE was represented in the partnership by the
Project Director, operating out of Stillwater, the Southern District Program Coordinator, and the Extension Educator in Family and Consumer Science (County Educator) operating in Pottawatomie, Shawnee County. PCAOK was represented by the Executive Director and the Healthy Families Oklahoma Coordinator. During one of the partnership's initial meetings OSU-CE questioned PCAOK's place at the table. PCAOK's Executive Director attributed OSU-CE query to a lack of understanding of "who we were, what our role was. We were kind of a little small potato folks. I mean our chapter wasn't very big or didn't have a very big budget or anything." Additionally, PCAOK did not have a working relationship with the OSU-CE Project Director. Rather, PCAOK's working relationship with OSU-CE had been established with the State Specialist that had left the University. Consequently, noted PCAOK's Executive Director, "our organizations and particularly the 'big' organization at the University and the higher-ups...really didn't know us from Adam."

PCAOK's Executive Director reported that even though PCAOK and OSU-CE "had a few bumps along the way" they formed a working team.

PCAOK's Executive Director stated:

...although we didn't have all the details worked out,

The Coordinator position was vacated after 13 months.
that we had at least a good vision for where we wanted to go. We know [sic] what our strengths were. We spent hours and hours together...working out details and felt like we were [making] a good decision.

OSU-CE’s Project Director agreed that the partnership administrators were ready to move forward:

There was a strong coalition there [in Pottawatomie County]..other social service agencies that our Extension people know and we just felt really good about moving forward with implementing a home visitation program to improve parenting skills..and didn’t really see any problems with that...[Rather,] I think that within that year, year and a half..I felt that we really did develop a strong partnership.

PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators appeared determined to achieve their initial visions for a home visitation program through the HFA initiative.

Mission And Objectives

PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators principally adopted the HFA program mission established by PCAA, but also wove in their own vision. PCAOK’s Executive Director indicated that their vision was that “every new parent in the state would have access to [a] family support program..particularly [through] home visitation for new parents.” Indeed, this vision became the partnership’s main goal and objective because HFA, recalled PCAOK’s Executive Director, was seen as a “broader initiative rather than just a program.” PCAOK’s Executive Director reported:

[The goals]...really weren’t put in writing in any way, which again I think [is] a weakness that probably
should have been done...because like so often happens with these kind of things you get the money you’re told you’re getting, you’ve got to start immediately, and you just have to know, go right straight forward and hit the ground running. And sometimes it doesn’t allow very much for the planning piece.

PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators agreed that their priority was getting the Pattowatomie site fully operational while, at the same time keeping some of their focus on statewide expansion.

Organizational Structure

An organizational structure was not developed at the inception of the partnership. Rather, OSU-CE’s Project Director reported that “we kind of developed our own working relationship and figuring [sic] out how to best plug in with each other.” Subsequent to the introduction of HFA in Pottawatomie County, the partnership administrators developed a hierarchical style organizational chart depicting the administrators and other contributors to the HFA initiative. They used arrows in an attempt to establish a connection between contributors and partnership administrators. Nevertheless, the chart fails to provide a clear understanding of the relationships between the partners and other contributors. Table 5 is a schematic representation view of the organizational structure as described by the partnership administrators.
Table 5

PCAOK And OSU-CE Partnership Organizational Structure
Though the organization chart may have lacked clarity, the partnership administrators were able to present a clear picture of the assignment of duties to PCAA:

OSU Cooperative Extension (CE) will be the fiscal agent for handling of funds, be an equal partner in program planning and development, will employ all local program (direct service) staff, and provide technical assistance regarding program implementation.

The Oklahoma Chapter (OCPCA) will be an equal partner in program planning and development, have particular responsibility for statewide expansion of Healthy Families America, and provide technical assistance regarding program implementation.

OCPCA will continue facilitation of the Healthy Families Oklahoma Advisory Council as a statewide coalition for the initiative. The OSU CES County site will further develop an existing community coalition as an advisory group.19

PCAOK’s Executive Director explained that she understood her role to be “part convener, getting the folks around the table[;]..liaison with [the] national office..[and] conveyor of information and being the point person for that. And also educator, [advocate], conveying [to the legislature] what Healthy Families was all about..”

OSU-CE’s Project Director described her role:

PI [Principal Investigator]..to ensure that we got the program started, the people hired, that the money was there, that we got the paperwork done so people could be paid. [Also] to make sure that we were meeting the requirements of the grant and serving more in a managerial role. [I] Had [sic] actually nothing to do

19 The Oklahoma Kellogg Project, Responses to Training and Technical Assistance Questions Report (April 17, 1995).
with the subject matter.
The OSU-CE County Educator’s role was ensuring adherence to the HFA model in the delivery of program through training and supervising the home visitation staff. She stated that “I saw my job as in the trenches”. The County Educator was supervised by Oklahoma Cooperative Extension’s District Director and Southern District Program Specialist. According to the County Educator, both District Directors were part of Oklahoma Cooperative Extension’s internal structure that was responsible for ensuring that the HFA initiative was a “win-win situation for the district.”

Decision-Making Process

Decisions were made in a rather informal manner that resulted in verbal agreements. The partnership administrators held meetings, discussed issues, and continued the discussions until achieving consensus, which, meant that the majority agreed. The Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service/Oklahoma Committee to Prevent Child Abuse Report (September 11, 1995) stated that “Decisions [sic] regarding the overall management of the project would not be made unilaterally by an individual or single agency but would be processed as a team to achieve consensus.”

Decision making was more structured when PCAOK and OSU-CE’s internal processes were involved. PCAOK and OSU-CE opted to follow the established policies and procedures of their own organizations. At OSU-CE, programmatic decisions
or actions were addressed by the Project Director, while administrative issues were routed to the District Administrators. OSU-CE’s internal decision-making process worked most of the time, but the process at times hindered the delivery of the program. The County Educator reported that “sometimes I would get bogged down with the administrative end while they checked all the policy books...a lot of times it really slowed some things down for us.”

Funding Mechanism And Authority

Initially, PCAA awarded all funds to PCAOK and PCAOK would then reimburse OSU-CE for incurred expenses. PCAOK’s Executive Director pointed out that “the State Committee [PCAOK] did not really have the infrastructure...to manage the project.” Consequently PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators agreed to share the fiscal authority. The Oklahoma Kellogg Project, Responses to Training and Technical Assistance Questions Report (April 17, 1995) established:

Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) and the Oklahoma Committee to Prevent Child Abuse (OCPCA) are co-fiscal agents. Originally, OCES was identified [by PCAA] as the fiscal agent. However, after the first check was issued to OCPCA, we became co-fiscal agents to facilitate the transfer of money from OCPCA to OCES. Currently, OCPCA receives the check [from PCAA]; subtracts OCPCA’s share of the money; and sends a check for the remainder to OCES. Each party keeps an account of the money disbursed by their agency. These two accounts are merged for the quarterly report sent to NCPCA. Therefore, [PCAOK’s Executive Director and OSU-CE’s Project Director] represent the fiscal management
component for the [partnership].
OSU-CE’s Project Director confirmed that the most challenging part of the agreement was “accepting another agency’s culture within Extension and being, [sic] and not able to mold it to some degree to fit our Extension system.”

While the fiscal agreement between the OSU-CE’s Project Director and PCAOK’s Executive Director worked, the County Educator felt excluded, pointing out that as “the HF Program Manager I had a right to know the total amount of what we were spending...It was very frustrating for me whenever I was stonewalled.” The County Educator was, however, provided access to the maintenance operation budget. Once the Project Director became aware of the County Educator’s concerns, any fiscal information requested was provided. Access to additional fiscal information enabled the County Educator to better manage the HFA program and to plan for and control non-recurring or unforseen expenses.

**Policies And Procedures**

As stated earlier in this chapter, PCAOK and OSU-CE each opted to follow its own institution’s internal policies and procedures. The partnership did not develop additional policies and procedures for the administration of the partnership. According to the County Educator “the policy was that any item or issue that came up that was a bit different than just the day-to-day functioning of the program and working with families and parents...was discussed
in..meetings." OSU-CE’s Project Director felt that working with PCAOK "was no different than working with one of my peer specialists right down the hallway on a project...I guess I never felt the need to have a real formal understanding about how we were going to do this."

Conflict-Resolution Process

Since PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators made decisions by consensus and were in constant communication with each other, they did not develop a formal conflict-resolution process. Rather, as problems arise, open discussions ensued in an effort to arrive at resolutions. PCAOK’s Executive Director, however, did express the need to remain in the role of mediator between PCAA and the partnership:

...there was quite the sense of coming in and talking down approach...I was embarrassed about that and I felt like it was my role and responsibility to try to make that work more smoothly so it would not jeopardize our relationship.

PCAA’s top-down approach exerted considerable pressure on the partnership administrators at the inception of the partnership and throughout the life of the program. PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators contended that the need for mediation remained until the program’s conclusion.

Accountability

Accountability for the HFA Program and to each other was provided, in part, in the reports submitted to PCAA. The
reporting system was designed to allow for input from all partnership administrators. PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators reported on the challenges, triumphs, and future expectations of the partnership and the program. Overall, PCAOK and OSU-CE held each other accountable for fulfilling their designated roles by bringing issues to the partnership for resolution, and maintaining a steady pace toward the fulfillment of the partnership's vision.

Impact

The rather informal governance and administrative systems established by the partnership administrators at the inception of the partnership, appeared to have had a negative impact on the program and the administrators themselves. OSU-CE's Project Director observed:

...the amount of time and emotional energy that [the County Educator] had to expend in dealing with the organizational side of this project had to take away some from the amount of time and emotional energy she could spend in helping her staff learn and do what they needed to be about.

PCAOK's Executive Director reported that "a lot of that [conflicts with PCAA] directly impacted the program...[The conflicts with PCAA] took a lot of our energy and time and attention away from the focus...[and] delayed our efforts [to deliver the program]."

PCAOK and OSU-CE agreed that despite the difficulties with PCAA, their partnership was a good one. OSU-CE's
Project Director explained:

One of the things that I think was really helpful to us here in Oklahoma [State University] was because Extension is located in Stillwater, which is 60 miles away from the State Capitol [Oklahoma City], and most of the staff in the various state social service agencies receive their degrees from OU [University of Oklahoma], which has a degree in social services. They have a real strong working relationship together and they all know who each other is and it’s a real tight group. Well, here is Cooperative Extension sitting outside of that [network].

The OSU-CE Project Director did not suggest that its exclusion from ‘the network’ was intentional. Rather, the University of Oklahoma was ‘the network’s’ alma mater and its graduates in the social services field had established very close ties and connections with social services agencies. When working on projects, those graduates preferred to partner with known organizations rather than developing new relationships. PCAOK’s Executive Director helped OSU-CE partnership administrators connect with the social services network in Oklahoma City.

Obstructions To The Partnership

“The grant from hell”, as it was called by one of the OSU-CE administrators, had a very rocky beginning. PCAOK and OSU-CE engaged in this partnership endeavor with the understanding that a partnership was being forged. Nevertheless, from the County Educators’s perspective “the Healthy Families [PCAA] people were...you know, it was obvious that they were in charge.” This ‘in-charge’ attitude was carried over during PCAA first site visit to the state.
The County Educator reported that OSU-CE had not aggressively retained the families participating in its intensive home visitation program because it believed that PCAA wanted new families on the Kellogg money. The County Educator concluded:

So basically when we began the Kellogg, we had no families in our program is what happened. And whenever...they had their initial site visit with us...they were really upset when they found out we had no families in our program. Because according to what they said, according to the plan was...to build on existing programming. And since our existing program had gone away, I mean it was just gone away. It wasn’t like it had been months between...And they were really upset by that...which upset all of us that they were upset. And they let us know it upset them...that meeting had a verbal [tone]. And so it turned out to be just not a real positive meeting.

PCAA was relying on PCAOK and OSU-CE’s representation that the HFA model would be built on an existing OSU-CE home visitation program in Pottawatomie. Information regarding the drop in that program’s participants, however, did not reach the PCAA trainers.

This initial misunderstanding and PCAA staff’s reaction made PCAOK and OSU-CE question their involvement in the HFA program. OSU-CE Project Director expressed that PCAOK and OSU-CE partnership administrators felt that “Maybe [sic] we don’t even need to have this. Maybe we should just say no to this grant.” The County Educator contended that the initial conflict may have been avoided if the site visit could have been rescheduled:

...first of all it was the day after the Oklahoma state [sic] [City] bombing. So none of us wanted to be at work anyway. Especially here in Shawnee because of the
proximity to Oklahoma City..most people [work in and] commute [to Oklahoma City and were] affected [by the bombing]...the whole state was upset by this..I'd say a 30-mile radius was traumatized. And..in fact, I think we even tried to cancel the meeting with [PCAA], and of course they couldn't because their travel arrangements had been made and everything. It was just, it would have been too much of a hassle to change everything. And so we went on with the meeting.

OSU-CE's Project Director reported that future confrontations were avoided "by having everything written down; it was very clear what the expectations were. [That way] there was nothing implied or misunderstanding [sic], which I think is what had been the problem."

Lack of space to house newly hired HFA staff was another obstacle the partnership had to confront. OSU-CE hired three full-time family support workers and a family assessment worker. The County Educator recalled:

"...we had nowhere to put these full-time people...the big challenge with that was that we were told, somewhere along the line..there would be rent money available in this grant. And then we were told there wasn't rent money available in this grant."

In a six-month period, not only did the entire HFA staff move into new offices, the entire Pottowatommie Extension County office moved as well.

From its inception the partnership experienced high turnover in personnel. OSU-CE lost one of its initial partnership administrators, the State Specialist in parenting and child development, prior to Oklahoma being awarded pilot-state status. While that vacancy was filled the replacement stayed only for a very short period of time and resigned. The resulting vacancy was eventually filled
approximately a year and half later at which time the Project Director relinquished her role in the partnership to the new administrator. PCAOK hired a Healthy Families Coordinator at the inception of the partnership, but she stayed only a little over a year. Changes in staff created a large gap in the continuity and flow of the program and the operation of the partnership. PCAOK’s Executive Director contended:

...we did not have the same vision. Partly just because these were a different mix of people...with some of those folks not having that history and being involved with all the many hours of discussion...that again [created] some challenge.

Kellogg, PCAA And CSREES

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Kellogg did not participate in the governance and administration of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership. Kellogg’s Program Director asserted:

...we encourage partnerships. So they [PCAA and USDA-CSREES] came to us with a partnership that made sense to us. We’re interested in partnerships. They came to us and said, ‘We know something about how to prevent child abuse. These folks have got a delivery mechanism that exists in every state in this country. Every county, you know, every state in this country.’ So my notion was, ‘Yes! If we can take your [PCAA’s] knowledge, hook it up to that [Cooperative Extension’s] distribution system, we have great potential for expanding this to every state in the nation.’ Kids are abused in every state in the nation. So they [PCAA and USDA-CSREES] formed a partnership, came to me, and then I [Kellogg] became a partner with the partnership that exists [PCAA-USDA-CSREES].

Kellogg awarded the funds for the purpose proposed by
PCAA and USDA-CSREES—testing of the HFA program through Cooperative Extension’s delivery method. Kellogg technically became part of the partnership. Its internal policy was to step back once funds were awarded and allow the other partners to fulfill the partnership’s intended purpose. From Kellogg’s perspective, it was entirely up to PCAA and the USDA-CSREES to come to an understanding and agreement on the governance and administrative strategies that would enable them to accomplish their mission and goals. Kellogg’s role in the partnership was not to run or assist in the running of the program. Rather, Kellogg described its role as providing the funds.

Kellogg was aware of the difficulties pilot sites were experiencing with PCAA and chose not to get involved. Kellogg’s Program Director explained:

...I thought that the organizations just needed to struggle and work it out...we think the local issues need to be handled by local people. And we don’t try to use our club or our resources to resolve that [governance and administrative challenges or conflicts].

Kellogg referred pilot states to PCAA and the USDA-CSREES because they had the responsibility for managing the HFA program and resolving any concerns, challenges, or conflicts that developed. Kellogg fully expected the conflicts to be worked out. The Program Director noted:

There had been a power play and NCPCA [PCAA] try [sic] to be tough with the Department of Agriculture..Cooperative Extension..My notion is that you can’t lose the partnership. I’m [Kellogg] not going to finance if [sic] you don’t have [the] partnership...they [PCAA] couldn’t decide that, ‘If we
don't like this land-grant college, we'll go find us another college.' That wasn't part of the deal. They [sic] [PCAA and the pilot sites] had to make it work...that meant they [PCAA] had to stay at the table with Cooperative Extension places...I would not interfere with local arrangements. I think the local folk can figure that out for themselves.

The PCAA USDA-CSREES joint proposal to Kellogg requested additional funding and time for planning before initiating the project. Kellogg denied their request, awarded the funds, and identified the start date of the project. PCAA rushed to meet their obligations without any preplanning. The resulting consequences and impact on the project and the partnership and its administrators have been described in this chapter. Kellogg did not see the need for preplanning. PCAA had a good program and a wealth of experience with child abuse and neglect. The USDA-CSREES, through its land-grant universities, was the leader in community-based education. Kellogg also surmised that since PCAA and USDA-CSREES had been involved in partnerships and collaborative agreements they were familiar with each other and could move quickly on the project.

While PCAA had a good program in HFA and its mission and goals were altruistic, it did not have the necessary governance and administrative experience going into this partnership. Preplanning could have provided PCAA and the pilot sites the opportunity to work out some mutually agreeable governance and administrative arrangements before beginning the project. Kellogg's Program Director summarized his experience:
...we learned that you have to work on a coalition like this [PCAA and USDA-CSREES], you have to negotiate with the university versus other people from outside who want to do things...you can't force a shotgun marriage. So we learned something about those kinds of negotiations, how tough they can be, how they work better in some places than others. The idea [HFA and the PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership] seemed right. And I still think the idea is right. What makes ideas work seems to be the ability of the people to form relationships that are mutually beneficial. So I can design the best program I want to and I can put some people in there who don't have the ability to form [collaborations] to do the give and take that needs to occur. And a design won't help. The design can help keep people at the table, but the people at the table...have to be people who can make things go together [in a cooperative] atmosphere. Despite the challenges] I did see [that] the mutuality [between PCAA and Cooperative Extension] was the well-being of kids.

Kellogg's perspective was that there were multiple ways of achieving the same objectives. Kellogg's Program Director pointed out that "I would have continued to give them [PCAA and USDA-CSREES] the same flexibility that I gave them to change things." The Program Director further added that "Things didn't go the way they should have gone...I still think [HFA program and the PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership] was [sic] worth the money that we invested in it."

Prevent Child Abuse America

Mission and objectives

Prevent Child Abuse America's vision was that every state in the country welcome and fund the Healthy Families America Program. Its goal was to test the program in three pilots sites through Cooperative Extension local networks. PCAA's Principal Analyst indicated that if these pilot sites...
proved successful, "we would then have moved on to expanding within Cooperative Extension nationally, and that obviously didn’t happen...It hasn’t necessarily grown the way we thought it might." It appears as though the three Cooperative Extension pilot states, did share PCAA’s vision to introduce the Healthy Family program in their states. However, PCAA’s Principal Analyst contended that the vision of the three pilot states was limited:

[Their vision was] not to see if they should adopt our home visitation model universally in every county in the United States. Their interest in doing was...well, I think it’s primarily to increase their involvement in the, the early childhood kind of effort.

This apparent gap in vision was not discovered at the inception of the partnership, but much later in the project. The project proceeded with the selection of pilot sites in Nevada, Wisconsin and Oklahoma. Nevada was selected even though, according to PCAA’s Director of Training and Technical Assistance (Director of Training), PCAA’s state chapter in Nevada “didn’t have a strong relationship with Cooperative Extension.” Wisconsin was selected because, as the Director of Training recalled “Cooperative Extension and...[PCAA’S state] chapter were already working so close.” The Director of Training stated that Oklahoma was also selected despite PCAA’s knowledge that its state chapter and Cooperative Extension had done “a little bit of previous stuff together, [but] not much.”

PCAA’s Director of Training initially did not support Oklahoma’s selection as a pilot state. The Director of
Training made a recommendation to PCAA's Executive Director to delay awarding Oklahoma pilot-state status. The Director of Training felt that OSU-CE had not accepted PCAOK as an equal partner. Rather, OSU-CE wanted to be the lead partner and that was not the way things were supposed to be. The Director of Training requested training for OSU-CE and PCAOK to develop a better understanding of how PCAA expected HFA to work. The Director of Training's request was denied, and Oklahoma was granted pilot-state status at the same time as Nevada and Wisconsin. Though disappointed with PCAA's decision the Director of Training was nevertheless committed to the success of HFA in all three pilot states.

PCAA's mission and vision were similar. Its goals and objectives were to meet Kellogg's demands. These goals were established in PCAA-USDA-CSREES's joint proposal. Its principal goal was to replicate HFA within every Cooperative Extension system in the country.

Organizational structure

PCAA had to develop an internal structure to support the HFA initiative. A research component, a training component, and a program development and technical assistance component were needed. Approximately nine months after receiving Kellogg's monetary award, PCAA filled the position to supervise the research component. This position was later made into a Principal Analyst position that continued to oversee the research component. PCAA also added
the Director of Training and Technical Assistance that was responsible for program development and technical assistance. This position supervised the Project Director position who was responsible for the training component. The Project Director position was filled approximately three months after the Director of Training and Technical Assistance was hired. PCAA's staff who had initiated the partnership with the USDA-CSREES as well as conceptualizing and drafting the joint proposal to Kellogg, handed over the reins of the HFA program to the Director of Training and Technical Assistance. While the initiating administrators were still available on a as-needed basis, they moved on to other assignments.

PCAA did not develop a structure that included its pilot site partners. Rather, PCAA’s state chapters and Cooperative Extension partners felt that PCAA had a very top-down inflexible style and that it had made very little effort to recognize their expertise and experience. Table 6 depicts PCAA partnership’s organizational concept. The Director of Training responded that the critical elements of the HFA program were creating the state partners’ perceptions of a top-down style. However, this response appeared to be inconsistent with the explanation of PCAA’s role in the project:

...this was a project of the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse...who was expected to take the
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leadership role in this whole project...it was to be the chapters’ responsibility to do that, they were the leaders, they were the state leaders as it related to this project...[the] NCPCA [PCAA] organization should have come in and should have really worked and said, to the chapter, 'This is what has got to happen. This is what you need to do. Let me provide you with some direction, and do that.' And I'm not sure that that ever really happened.

This approach may have created the initial and on-going controversy between PCAA and PCAOK and OSU-CE in Oklahoma and the conflicts between WE CAN and UNR-CE in Nevada. Nevertheless, the state PCAA chapters and local Cooperative Extension in pilot sites, despite their initial struggles with PCAA and with each other, made every attempt to function as partners.

**Decision-making process**

PCAA developed an internal process for making decisions. However, a process including the pilot-site states was non-existent. PCAA’s Principal Analyst reported:

> In terms of the partnership between the national Prevent Child Abuse America and the local sites, I would have to say that we were the decision making body. But to a larger extent we tried to get information from the sites to inform those decisions, the communication facilitated our decision making process.

PCAA did not deem it necessary to include its pilot site partners in the decision-making process. PCAA Principal Analyst informed:

> We were the grant-making agency for the sites, they’re responsible to us to do what we’re telling them to do.
in order to collect this money. And early on there was a strong feeling among some at the national office, that...sites to some extent were not doing what we wanted them to do. That [the pilot sites] were taking, you know, using the money to do what they wanted to do and not implementing this special model that we call Healthy Families America...and that was largely the source of the conflict.

Funding mechanism and authority

A challenge at the inception of the partnership was the allocation of funds. PCAA and the USDA-CSREES agreed that funding should be awarded to PCAA because the USDA-CSREES was federally funded. The USDA-CSREES’s National Program Leader indicated that CSREES did not want to be the fiscal agent at the national level. PCAA Principal Analyst concluded:

...once I knew more about how their system is set up in terms of funding, it wouldn’t have made sense for the [chapters] to be a fiscal agent for the grant. They were..fine at the national level for us to be a fiscal agent. But when it came to doling out money to the pilot sites, we wanted to have our chapters be the fiscal agent for the grant and then they would pay Cooperative Extension agencies for their services..the flow of cash in this project was probably the most controversial part..[due largely to the fact that] Cooperative Extension is university based. So universities have very intricate, complex, and..slow accounting systems. Our chapters, and for that matter, the national organization being smaller than a university,..we have more flexibility. So we could jump into whatever funding changes, budgetary changes, whatever needed to happen, it didn’t take..any time for us to do that. With the university system you can’t just hire someone until you’ve got money in the bank in that grant account. Just that factor alone, you know, was a huge mess, because we wanted to give the cash on a reimbursement basis.

PCAA did not disclose to the pilot site partners the
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full amount of funds awarded by Kellogg. This omission created challenges for pilot site partners. UNR-CE’s Associate Professor expressed:

The amount of money that we were going to get in this grant shifted over the period of the grant. As I mentioned earlier, we at first thought we were going to have funds to do the evaluation and we didn’t have funds to do the evaluation. And then as time went along...it was a little bit different at certain points to know how much money we were going to get. That was challenging because we had established goals and then we didn’t know, we were then thrust into being not sure how much we were gonna get.

The same sentiment was echoed by Oklahoma who, at the request for proposal stage, received a fax from PCAA inquiring as to their funding needs and:

When we were notified that we would be part of this, they never clarified that [the] amount would be different than what we had submitted or what our final budget would be nor asked us to put together a final budget early on...So we had a lot of conflict and there early on about what money are we talking about and all of that. And it turned out to be less [money] than any of us thought.

Policies and procedures

Partnership policies and procedures, non-existent at the inception of the partnership, were eventually developed and instituted in the third year of the project. Like the pilot sites, PCAA utilized its internal organizational policies and procedures to attend to its administrative needs. The lack of operational policies and procedures when dealing with the pilot sites created confusion, mistrust, and polarization and created the impression that PCAA was not inclusive. Pilot site partners reported that PCAA
considered its policies and procedures as the only valid ones and that everyone else had to learn its system. PCAA made no initial attempt to understand pilot site partners' internal systems or needs or jointly develop policies and procedures. Rather, PCAA policies and procedures ruled until more that two years into the project.

Conflict-resolution process

PCAA did not develop a process for conflict-resolution. PCAA’s Principal Analyst stated:

...we [PCAA and the pilot sites] didn’t have a formal structure...and because we didn’t have a formal structure, I think that made the administration of the project more difficult. Because every conflict...was like going through all the steps, all over again. What do we do? How do we get the information to resolve this? And who gets to make the decision and what are, you know, everything was a brand new, every conflict was dealt with as a new entity.

Despite the serious conflicts between PCAA and the pilot sites and amongst some of the partnership administrators in pilot sites, PCAA did not enlist the services of a professionally trained mediator. Mediation attempts were made by PCAA’s Principal Analyst and the Project Coordinator. Their attempts, while well-intentioned and undertaken in good faith, did not diminish the rising level of conflict.

Accountability

Accountability was achieved through quarterly reports submitted by the pilot sites to PCAA. PCAA maintained their
accountability with Kellogg and USDA-CSREES by way of reports. The reports contained programmatic information and described challenges faced by the partnership. Written reports appeared to be the means used by some partners at the state and national level to report on their administrative and governance challenges.

Impact

PCAA believed that its administrative and governance approach with the pilot sites had minimal impact on the delivery of HFA. While PCAA did not discuss the issues created by its approach as insignificant, the Principal Analyst maintained:

[The issues]...affected [the paraprofessional staff] in that they were aware at some level of the conflicts. And that made their life [sic] more difficult because...they couldn’t get as much support from their programs as they might have wanted...but for the most part I think, in terms of their relationships with families, it impacted very little.

PCAA still considers USDA-CSREES and the states as partners. It is not an active partnership, but nevertheless, the Principal Analyst stated “we’re still partners on paper. We always make sure that they’re listed whenever we list our partners on a national level.”

Obstructions to the partnership

PCAA stated that one of its biggest challenges at the inception of the partnership was defining its relationship with the pilot sites. From PCAA’s perspective, it was the
national partner and the fiscal agent for the Kellogg
proposal. However, PCAA’s Principal Analyst recalled that
the pilot sites were under a different impression:

[That they had]...received a grant from Kellogg to do a
model, a pilot Healthy Families America program. And in
fact their money came from us...We were responsible to
Kellogg as the funder to report on all activities...But
to the sites...they still perceived themselves as having
received a Kellogg grant. So that’s how most of them
talked about it...They didn’t report directly to
Kellogg...Kellogg didn’t want reports from three
different pilot sites. They wanted a report on the
project as a whole.

Neither the state Cooperative Extension pilot sites nor
PCAA’s state chapters referred to their partnership as a
PCAA project. Instead they referred to the partnerships
as either the Kellogg Project or the Healthy Family America
Project.

PCAA was a relatively simple and unsophisticated
operation and was not prepared to deal with the flood of
administrative and governance issues created by this
partnership. PCAA’s Principal Analyst admitted:

It was the first time that...Prevent Child Abuse America
had received a grant and then given grants to pilot
programs...we had no system in place where we could
have sites report on their accounting to us. We had to
develop a whole accounting system for each site that
was specific to fit with their accounting needs, which
meant the chapter and the university. So instead of
three pilot sites, now you’ve got six accounting
systems just to integrate back at our national office,
which had limited accounting resources ourselves [sic].
We had a part-time person doing our accounting work for
us at the national level, who did not have a CPA and
had never been in a role of being a grant,
grantor...we’d never done anything like that before, so
that was [a] true test.
PCAA's Executive Director offered her explanation for its lack of preparedness:

...the award was for less than we had asked for, and the award excluded a six-month planning period, which we had specifically asked for funds for. So rather than having the luxury of six months of a...I can't remember what it was to be, but there was $50,000 for six months to do planning when we would have sat down and have [sic] extensive meetings. We only worked out in advance a lot of the things that one might have wanted to think about in terms of policy and procedure. Instead, the foundation told us they didn't feel that was necessary. They awarded us the money; we were supposed to start on day one.

From Kellogg's perspective, both the USDA-CREES and PCAA were very good at what they did. PCAA had a very good initiative, the HFA program. The USDA-CREES had over one hundred years of experience in community-based education and at least twenty in home visitation infrastructure. Kellogg believed that since the USDA-CSREES and PCAA both enjoyed a wealth of experience participating in partnership arrangements, there was no need for pre-planning. Kellogg instead, in its award letter to PCAA, announced that the HFA project would "run from October 1, 1994, through September 30, 1997."

There were also organizational and cultural differences between PCAA's operations and that of its Cooperative Extension partners at the pilot sites. PCAA's Principal Analyst recognized that "our organizational culture is just...much more flexible...so it was really, learning about each other [that] took a great deal of time and was a huge
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issue." The Principal Analyst described the state Cooperative Extension's attempts to educate her:

PCAA described the attempts as "repeatedly trying to get it through my head that Cooperative Extension doesn't work that way. That the national level was not really comparable in terms of their control and relationship to the state project, the state systems. So really what we needed to do was have the national Prevent Child Abuse America office relating to the state leaders in each of our three pilot states...and I finally understood where she was coming from...so figuring out the levels within the systems was pretty difficult...as well. That took a long time for me to get that figured out.

PCAA's lack of knowledge about its partners' organizational culture was compounded by the differences in organizational languages. PCAA's Project Coordinator recalled that Cooperative Extension's organizational dialect was very new to PCAA. In Nevada and Oklahoma, this dialect was also new to PCAA's state chapters.

All partnership administrators at the state pilot sites had varying degrees of difficulties working with and relating to PCAA. Oklahoma reported the greatest discord. OSU-CE Project Director asserted that "the main..burden in implementing the project was really the National Committee [PCAA]." Most Cooperative Extension state pilot site administrators contended that PCAA neither created nor provided an opportunity for working together as partners.

Rather, OSU-CE Project Director commented:

And everything had to be done to fit into their system. It didn't matter whether it fit into the Extension system. The reporting that had to be done was something...
that they had already developed. Extension didn't sit down and was able to think about, 'Okay, how do we want to get, what information do we want to gather from each side and what would be useful?' You know, there was none of that that went on. It was just...you know, this is the way it's gonna be. And I, I guess that...you know, when it really filled [sic] it in my mind, at that point in time it was not a partnership, it was subcontract.

OSU-CE's Project Director pointed out that "I don't want to paint NC, the National Committee [PCAA] as the total bad guy because we, in Extension didn't have our strong partner [USDA-CSREES] at the table at the national level representing us either."

PCAA's Director of Training expressed concern about its relationship with the pilot sites. She observed:

There wasn't a real clear expectation of what the sites could receive, could expect from NCPCA, other than training and technical assistance. I felt that NCPCA, as the recipient of the money, should have been in charge of the project...Not in telling people what to do but by being there as an obvious, umm, a source of guidance, of technical assistance, of support to the project.

PCAA's Executive Director felt that the PCAA's role was to support its state chapters and that each chapter needed to figure out how to function administratively with its Cooperative Extension state partner. The Director of Training, while recognizing the pilot sites needed some autonomy could not adopt the Executive Director's hands-off approach:

...if this was going to work, if each of those three initiatives had to be able to work it out for themselves, they had to be able to create a program
that was specific and unique to the needs of the families that they were serving. And each one of them was serving different populations. They, in fact, were the experts. NCPCA was not the expert...But NCPCA needed to be able to provide them with very clearly defined parameters within which they could work. And I didn’t feel that was there.

The Director of Training and the HFN Project Manager (PCAA’s trainer from Nevada) scheduled site visits to Oklahoma on April 23 and 24, 1995 to Nevada on April 25 and 26, 1995, and to Wisconsin from May 1 and 2, 199520. While the Nevada and Wisconsin site visits appeared to be have been relatively inconsequential, the visit to Oklahoma was an apparent disaster. PCAA’s Director of Training recalled:

[Oklahoma]... was supposed to have ..an existing program, and it wasn’t there. And the heavy handedness was it had to be there because that was an expectation of the grant. In Nevada a lot of resistance actually came from the chapter side...[It had] some real issues of control...the chapter was really trying to, once more, assert their [sic] leadership within the community. The Cooperative Extension appeared very willing to work. Wisconsin was interesting...whether they had big problems or not, they worked it out themselves. It was very clear what they wanted, that they felt that this project was good and they were gonna take care of family business within the family. They didn’t fight out in the open like we saw some of the other sites do.

The Director of Training was unwilling to aid Oklahoma in establishing HFA through the existing home visitation infrastructure. PCAOK and OSU-CE’s experience with home visitation programs was not in question. Rather, the

---

Director of Training related that “it wasn’t what we were supposed to do. I’m not sure if I would necessarily say [our meeting] was heated. But it was..we were very clear and it was direct.”

Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service

The USDA-CREES voluntarily relinquished to PCAA the authority to receive all funds from the Kellogg Foundation for the HFA project. Kellogg and the USDA-CREES contended that funding was awarded to PCAA mainly because the USDA-CREES was a federally funded agency, already the recipient of millions of dollars in federal appropriations. Therefore, it made sense to grant full funding authority to PCAA. This decision, however, plagued the partnership throughout the entirety of the project. As a result the state Cooperative Extension partnership administrators at the pilot sites felt like “contractees” of PCAA rather than partners with an equal standing as was their initial understanding from the USDA-CSREES.

PCAA exacerbated the situation by not disclosing to the pilot sites the full dollar amount of the award received from Kellogg. WE CAN’s HFN Program Manager recalled that the lack of disclosure created the perception that “NCPCA [PCAA] was keeping too much of the money and not giving the programs enough.” This same perception was echoed by all other pilot site partners. Even PCAA state chapters at the
pilot sites became distrustful of PCAA. State Cooperative Extension partners became disillusioned with PCAA's unwillingness to share funding information and with the USDA-CSREES' lack of involvement.

Once funding was awarded to PCAA the USDA-CSREES became almost a silent partner. Two of the three administrators who were, initiators of the partnership accepted positions at land-grant universities and moved from the national headquarters. In addition the remaining administrator was left in the middle of a chaotic organizational restructuring phase involving the USDA Cooperative Extension and Research systems. The restructuring created high turnover and redistribution of duties, assignments, and projects.

The National Program Leader (Program Leader) at the USDA-CSREES stated that HFA was "seen as a very small project off to the side" and did not enjoy the full support of top-ranking officials at the USDA-CSREES. The Program Leader noted that the USDA-CSREES assumed no responsibility for the accountability for the project. Consequently, as the Program Leader reported Cooperative Extension state partners were left with minimal and weak support from the national level:

...not being on equal footing, [state Cooperative Extensions] sort of felt that they had to...do the best they could to make the...way they managed their individual programs fit with this rather rigid structure [imposed by PCAA]. So it was left to them to...have to try to make it work...so there was no strong voice up at the national level..

Near the end of the project's first year, the Program Leader
took a professional development leave, rendering the already minimal support from the USDA-CSREES even further.

The USDA-CSREES observed the development of a cohesive relationship between PCAA and Kellogg after the funds were awarded to PCAA. The USDA-CSREES’s Program Leader recalled:

I noticed that Kellogg and...the Child Abuse Prevention people became the dominant management features in it [the partnership], which I think was a real problem because...our system [Cooperative Extension] is much more flexible...and I am not a dictating, delegating [person] anyway. [Nevertheless] we were considered partners of the...Child Abuse prevention group who is the parent of [the] Healthy Families America [program]. So we were considered a partner...[however] they had very rigid...standards and rules and the way the [administration of the] program was conducted was [inflexible].

Indeed when the Program Leader participated in the first training meeting attended by all partnership administrators she felt like “I was more of a figurehead than an involved partner.” The Program Leader contended that the USDA-CSREES was a weak link in the partnership rather than a full partner, despite the fact that “Cooperative Extension was a partner that was very much needed for the delivery of the program.”

According to the USDA-CREES Program Leader the absence of an inclusive partnership structure involving the pilot sites was not the only problem:

...personality issues [with PCAA]...were problematic...kind of autocratic personalities being the ones that would march in and tell people what to do that causes as much problem as the lack of structure did.

The Program Leader had the distinct impression that PCAA understood that they needed to be inclusive and flexible in
collaborating with the pilot sites. The Program Leader stated that “NCPCA [PCAA staff] understand [sic] the issues at Extension. I think there was some feeling [amongst PCAA’s staff] that they would just go ahead and do it [what they wanted] the way they were going to anyway.”

Inflexibility, delegation of rules, and a top-down decision-making approach contributed to the conflicts between the pilot sites and PCAA. The USDA-CSREES Program Leader added:

NCPCA [PCAA] at the [National level] made most of the decisions...we would talk and try to negotiate and see how things would [get] work [sic] out. But they [PCAA] mostly made the decisions. [Its] rules pretty much dictated things...I think it’s a natural problem when something [a structure] so rigid is imposed on a community development [organization] where [the structure]...needs to be flexible.

The Program Leader believed that the Cooperative Extension state partners were surprised by PCAA’s attitude and impositions indicating that “I don’t think the states entered into [the partnership] assuming that it was gonna [sic] be, you know, a round peg poking your square hole.” Cooperative Extension pilot sites did appeal to the USDA-CSREES for assistance in dealing with PCAA. However, the USDA-CSREES’s attempts at intervention were unsuccessful.

Cooperative Extension state partners complained that the USDA-CSREES’s silent-partner role left their interests unprotected. They described feeling abandoned by the USDA-CSREES and at the mercy of an inflexible, top-down, autocratic PCAA that did not consider any of their needs or
collaborating with the pilot sites. The Program Leader stated that "NCPCA [PCAA staff] understand [sic] the issues at Extension. I think there was some feeling [amongst PCAA’s staff] that they would just go ahead and do it [what they wanted] the way they were going to anyway."

Inflexibility, delegation of rules, and a top-down decision-making approach contributed to the conflicts between the pilot sites and PCAA. The USDA-CSREES Program Leader added:

NCPCA [PCAA] at the [National level] made most of the decisions...we would talk and try to negotiate and see how things would [get] work [sic] out. But they [PCAA] mostly made the decisions. [Its] rules pretty much dictated things...I think it’s a natural problem when something [a structure] so rigid is imposed on a community development [organization] where [the structure]...needs to be flexible.

The Program Leader believed that the Cooperative Extension state partners were surprised by PCAA’s attitude and impositions indicating that "I don’t think the states entered into [the partnership] assuming that it was gonna [sic] be, you know, a round peg poking your square hole."

Cooperative Extension pilot sites did appeal to the USDA-CSREES for assistance in dealing with PCAA. However, the USDA-CSREES’s attempts at intervention were unsuccessful.

Cooperative Extension state partners complained that the USDA-CSREES’s silent-partner role left their interests unprotected. They described feeling abandoned by the USDA-CSREES and at the mercy of an inflexible, top-down,
autocratic PCAA that did not consider any of their needs or requests. PCAA's demeanor did not meet the partnership expectations of Cooperative Extension state partnership administrators who had previously worked in partnership arrangements. Rather, Extension pilot site administrators were very vocal in expressing their frustrations and feelings of being trapped.

Cooperative Extension partnership administrators' disappointment with USDA-CSREES was magnified when their attempts to reason with PCAA failed. PCAA was inflexible with Cooperative Extension on matters regarding its internal policies and procedures and program delivery methods. Cooperative Extension partnership administrators complained that the USDA-CSREES handed them a contract subjugating their expertise, experience and grass-root approach to community-based education to PCAA. USDA-CSREES agreed that they were an absent partner. Their absence from the partnership was attributed to high staff turnover, dramatic changes in their administrative structure, and increased workload.

Cooperative Extension partnership administrators indicated that the end of the HFA project brought out mixed feelings and emotions. All were pleased with the HFA initiative and its helping children and supporting families. Most were relieved at not having to deal any longer with PCAA's organizational approach. Most Extension site administrators were disappointed that the USDA-CSREES had
not retained some funding authority and had become a silent partner in this partnership. USDA-CSREES could have delegated its funding authority to Cooperative Extension at the pilot sites where it belonged, specifically since the partnership's expectation was for Cooperative Extension to deliver the HFA program through its delivery system.

Administrator's Strategies

The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership experienced severe challenges at its inception that continued throughout the life of the project. These challenges are discussed in depth in this chapter. How did the partnership administrators deal with these challenges? Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 summarized the strategies utilized by administrators in this partnership. The tables are organized around the seven elements identified by Peters' (1998) as necessary for the formation of public-private partnerships. Peters' (1998) seven elements became the variables analyzed in this study through the lens of institutionalism which provided insight into the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership's beliefs, shared values and negotiated rules. These tables provide an emerging framework of the interactive nature of public-private partnerships.
Table 7

Summary Of Strategies Used By Nevada Pilot-Site Administrators From WE CAN\textsuperscript{21} And UNR-CE\textsuperscript{22}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effective strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission and objectives</td>
<td>Established jointly.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Jointly designed. Written role descriptions.</td>
<td>Organizational structure not followed. Overlapping roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making process</td>
<td>Formal and inclusive. Sought consensus. Copy given to all.</td>
<td>Process tended to be cumbersome, time consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict-resolution process</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Lacked any process. Conflicts not addressed. PCAA mediator relative of UNR-CE administrator, relationship not disclosed to UNR-CE and WE CAN. Disclosure exacerbates the distrust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{21}PCAA's state chapter.

\textsuperscript{22}University of Nevada, Reno, Cooperative Extension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effective strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies and</td>
<td>Followed each organization’s internal policies and procedures.</td>
<td>UNR-CE administrators not familiar with internal complex bureaucratic fiscal and personnel policies and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding mechanism</td>
<td>Developed budget.</td>
<td>PCAA’s reimbursement mechanism inconsistent with UNR-CE policy. Fiscal authority not shared. Controlling approach by WE CAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Written reports to PCAA and collaborators. Programmatic in nature.</td>
<td>None to each other, only to PCAA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Summary Of Strategies Used By Wisconsin Pilot-Site Administrators From PCAWI\textsuperscript{23} And UW-CE\textsuperscript{24}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effective strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission and objectives</td>
<td>Established jointly</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Developed jointly</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles clearly defined and respected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making process</td>
<td>Very informal.</td>
<td>Few written records of reasons for decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relied on open, on-going communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict-resolution process</td>
<td>Very informal.</td>
<td>No formal process. No mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant and open communications between administrators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{23}Prevent Child Abuse Wisconsin, PCAA's state chapter.

\textsuperscript{24}University of Wisconsin, Cooperative Extension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effective strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
<td>Followed each organization’s internal policies and procedures.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding mechanism and authority</td>
<td>Shared fiscal authority. Developed budget.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Very informally to each other. Joint written reports to PCAA and collaborators. Programmatic in nature.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Summary Of Strategies Used By Oklahoma Pilot-Site Administrators From PCAOK\textsuperscript{25} And OSU-CE\textsuperscript{26}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effective strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission and objectives</td>
<td>Established jointly.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Developed jointly. Roles clearly defined and respected.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making process</td>
<td>Very informal. Relied on open, on-going communication.</td>
<td>Few written records of reasons for decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict-resolution process</td>
<td>Very informal. Constant and open communications between administrators.</td>
<td>No formal process. No mediator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{25}Prevent Child Abuse Oklahoma, PCAA's state chapter.

\textsuperscript{26}Oklahoma State University, Cooperative Extension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effective strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
<td>Followed each organization's internal policies and procedures.</td>
<td>OSU-CE travel policy and chain of command obstructive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding mechanism and authority</td>
<td>Shared fiscal authority. Developed budget.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Very informally to each other. Joint written reports to PCAA and collaborators.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmatic in nature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Summary of Strategies Used by Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effective strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission and objectives</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Did not include pilot sites in the development process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Developed internally.</td>
<td>Excluded pilot sites in the development process. Hierarchical structure imposed on pilot sites. PCAA roles not fully disclosed to pilot sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making process</td>
<td>Developed internally.</td>
<td>Pilot sites excluded from development process. Decisions made without input from pilot sites. Decisions dictated to sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict-resolution process</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Lack of any process. Attempted ad hoc mediation unsuccessfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
<td>Developed internally.</td>
<td>None developed jointly with pilot sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Effective strategies</th>
<th>Ineffective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding mechanism</td>
<td>Developed reimbursement</td>
<td>Delegated fiscal authority only to state chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Written reports to Kellogg.</td>
<td>None to pilot sites. Pilot sites to PCAA only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required quarterly reports from pilot sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This chapter focused on the governance and administrative strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership. The partnership’s intended purpose was testing the Healthy Family America (HFA) program model through Cooperative Extension’s community-based delivery system. HFA is a community-based educational program directed at first-time parents. HFA’s programmatic aim is the reduction of child abuse and neglect through educational prevention methods. Only three pilot sites were selected to test the HFA model. These three pilot sites were Las Vegas (Clark County) Nevada, Walworth County, Wisconsin, and Pattowatomie County, Oklahoma.

Peters’ (1998) necessary elements for the formation of public-private partnerships became the variables tested in this study. The following seven variables were analyzed: 1) mission and objectives; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision-making processes; 4) conflict-resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanism and authority; and 7) accountability. The effective and ineffective strategies used by administrators at the formation of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership were identified through open-ended interviews with administrators and other data sources.

Governance factors such as mission, goals, and objectives instituted were found to be somewhat useful.
Organizational structures, while helpful to a certain extent, seemed in general to have hampered the development of the partnership. The decision-making process developed, while useful, generated abundant confusion and conflict. Designations of funding authority were found to be obstructive and mechanisms for expending funds cumbersome.

Administrative factors such as policies and procedures and a process for conflict-resolution were nonexistent. Mediation was needed, yet a process was not initiated. Accountability for achieving programmatic outcomes was established. Nevertheless, accountability of the partners to the partnership was not established.

Other organizational factors such as a lack of planning hindered the formation of the partnership. In addition, the mutual lack of knowledge of each partner’s organizational style, culture and language proved disastrous. Distrust, inflexibility and control issues resulted in further conflict. The high turnover of partnership administrators inevitably created confusion. Sparse and inadequate records of meetings, actions taken, and decisions made impeded the transfer of information to new partnership administrators.
In 1994 the W. K. Kellogg Foundation (Kellogg), Prevent Child Abuse America (PCAA), and the United States Department of Agriculture Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service (USDA-CSREES) entered into a partnership to test the Healthy Family America (HFA) program. The partnership’s mission was to provide support to families, specifically first-time parents, through the HFA program in an effort to curtail child abuse and neglect. Its goal was to test the HFA model for replicability throughout the country. Cooperative Extension’s community-based outreach mechanism was identified by the partners as the delivery system for testing the HFA model. The partners selected only three pilot sites to test HFA. These pilot sites were established in Las Vegas (Clark County), Nevada, Walworth County, Wisconsin, and Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, from 1995 to 1998.

The focus of this study was the effective and ineffective governance and administrative strategies
utilized by administrators at the inception of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership. HFA program design, development, implementation, and evaluation were not the subjects of this study. Peters' (1998) seven necessary elements for the formation of public-private partnerships constituted the seven variables analyzed in this study. These seven variables tested the effective and ineffective strategies utilized by administrators at the inception of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership and are thoroughly discussed in Chapter IV of this study. The effective and ineffective strategies utilized by administrators, lessons learned, and recommendations for the formation of future partnerships are set forth in this chapter. It addresses the following research questions: 1) What strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be effective? 2) What strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be ineffective? 3) What new strategies would administrators in the formation of this public-private partnership utilize in the formation of another partnership? 4) What effective strategies or procedures will be indicated and recommended for use in the formation of future public-private partnerships?

Effective Strategies

*What strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be*
effective?  Without any guidelines to rely upon, administrators in the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership were able to develop some effective governance and administrative strategies. Some of these strategies were developed very informally, while others were formal. The formal and informal effective strategies provided administrators with some guidance in the overall operation of the partnership.

Mission and Objectives

At the inception of the partnership, one of the initiators' strategies was to develop a joint vision and mission and goal. The vision was to reduce child abuse and neglect through HFA's preventive mechanisms. The mission was two-fold: 1) Expose new parents to the educational components of the HFA; and 2) Deliver the HFA program through Cooperative Extension's home visitation infrastructure in every county in the country. The partnership initiators' goal was to select pilot sites to test HFA's replicability to meet their mission.

Nevada, Wisconsin, and Oklahoma adopted the partnership initiators' vision, part one of their mission and the testing portion of their goal. The partnership's mission, vision, goals and objectives were programmatic in nature. They were not developed in response to or for purposes of addressing governance and administrative factors of the partnership's operation, but only to test and deliver the HFA program.
model.

Organizational Structure

Administrators at PCAA developed a HFA project organizational structure for use internally by PCAA staff. Nevada's organizational structure was hierarchical in nature. Oklahoma developed a semi-hierarchical structure. Wisconsin developed an informal structure. Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 in Chapter IV depict these organizational concepts. Each organizational structure and chart was developed independently by the administrators at the respective pilot site. All administrators at each pilot site participated fully in the development of the partnership's organizational structure.

PCAA developed job descriptions for its HFA project staff. Wisconsin and Oklahoma administrators developed broad guidelines of each partner's role in the respective partnership. Nevada developed formal written role descriptions for each administrator. Wisconsin and Oklahoma reported that their structure and role descriptions facilitated communication amongst administrators. Nevada, Wisconsin, and Oklahoma provided copies of their administrators' role descriptions to PCAA.²⁷

In Oklahoma, some OSU-CE administrators initially

²⁷Role descriptions were not available at the time of this study.
questioned the inclusion of PCAOK's administrator in the partnership. PCAOK and OSU-CE had to be partners in order for Oklahoma to be a pilot site, and the OSU-CE administrators accepted the joint requirement of the partnership. All Oklahoma administrators respected each other's roles and contributions to the partnership. OSU-CE, unlike Cooperative Extension in Wisconsin and Nevada, had an internal structure that included additional administrative layers in its chain of command.

Wisconsin administrators agreed on their roles prior to submitting their joint proposal to PCAA. PCAWI and UW-CE administrators had already developed a strong working relationship. These administrators recognized and respected each other's ability, expertise, and experience and endeavored to support each other in the partnership.

Decision-Making Process

Wisconsin's and Oklahoma's partnership administrators developed rather informal and lax decision-making processes. Their goal was to achieve consensus. Administrators in these pilot sites made all partnership decisions and resolved any potential conflicts by maintaining constant and open communications with each other. Wisconsin and Oklahoma administrators found that their informal process facilitated and expedited the operation of their partnerships. Nevada administrators developed a very formal decision-making process, also with the goal of achieving consensus. Nevada's
process facilitated the operations of the partnership. PCAA developed an internal organizational process for making decisions regarding the partnership.

Conflict-Resolution Processes

Some partnership administrators resolved conflicts by maintaining open communication with each other. In Oklahoma, the PCAOK Executive Director took on the role of mediator to resolve disputes between PCAA and other partnership administrators. In Nevada, UNR-CE’s Associate Professor in Nevada gravitated towards this role in an attempt to resolve dispute among partnership administrators. PCAWI’s Executive Director in Wisconsin, like PCAOK’s, assumed the role of mediator in order to resolve conflicts between UW-CE and PCAA. These administrators gravitated towards this role because of their candid, temperate, and easy-going personalities.

Policies And Procedures

The administrators at each pilot site chose to follow their own organizations’ internal policies and procedures in fulfilling their assignments. The partnering organizations had the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs of the partnership. UNR-CE, UW-CE, and OSU-CE had formal internal organizational policies and procedures available to administrators. WE CAN’s internal policies and procedures were somewhat informal. PCAWI’s and PCAOK’s internal
policies and procedures were simple. Most administrators' internal policies and procedures served the partnership well.

**Funding Mechanism And Authority**

PCAA and the administrators at each pilot site developed budgets individually for the partnership. All pilot sites identified and assigned budget preparation responsibilities to a partnership administrator. PCAA assigned this responsibility to a staff member. Administrators in Nevada jointly made decisions on the partnership's budget. In Wisconsin UW-CE, administrators managed the partnership's budget. Wisconsin administrators awarded the largest portion of the funds to UW-CE. PCAWI requested and received its portion of the funds from UW-CE. All administrators participated in the partnership’s funding decisions.

In Oklahoma, PCAOK initially received the entirety of the partnership’s funds. PCAOK administrators deducted PCAOK’s agreed upon share of the funds and transferred the balance to OSU-CE. OSU-CE administrators were the recipients of the largest portion of the funds. PCAOK and OSU-CE administrators developed individual operational budgets. Most administrators participated in the partnership’s fiscal decisions.
Accountability

Partnership accountability was achieved by way of written reports. The reports focused on programmatic outcomes. All partnership administrators participated in the preparation of the reports. Partnership administrators commented that the reporting process was cumbersome and involved. However cumbersome, these reports provided administrators with a means for measuring the partnership’s progress towards its programmatic goals. Administrators utilized information from these reports to keep their collaborators and stakeholders informed of HFA program developments.

Organizational Culture Strategy

Administrators at PCAWI and UW-CE in Wisconsin enjoyed a strong working relationship prior to becoming a pilot site. "Buddy" was the word used to describe the administrators’ relationship. Wisconsin partnership administrators were familiar with each other’s organizational culture and operation. PCAWI’s Executive Director stated that "the years we had at developing relationships really proved to be important in order to pull something like this off at the time". The established relationships and prior knowledge of each other’s organizational culture made PCAWI and UW-CE a formidable team in meeting the demands of the partnership’s intended purpose.
Ineffective Strategies

What strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership were found to be ineffective? Some of the strategies developed by the partnership's administrators proved ineffective. These strategies created many challenges and conflicts. The challenges and conflicts created by ineffective strategies are fully described in Chapter IV of this study.

Mission And Objectives

The initiators of the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership did not include pilot-site administrators in the development of the partnership's vision, mission, goals and objectives. PCAA was the designated administrator of the HFA program. PCAA handed down to the pilot sites the mission and objectives developed by the partnership's initiators. Administrators in each of the pilot sites developed a "local" interpretation of the partnership's mission and objectives. This local interpretation differed from that of the partnership's initiators and created conflict between PCAA and the pilot sites. The partnership initiators' vision, mission, goals, and objectives were described earlier in this chapter.

Administrators at PCAA interpreted replicability of the HFA model as replicating the model's critical elements without omissions, changes, or alterations. Initially, pilot site administrators understood "testing of the HFA model" as
testing the critical elements of the model for the purpose of adopting those elements that met their community needs and either replacing or changing those that did not. Pilot site administrators complained that PCAA rigidly instituted the HFA model's critical elements without regard to each of the pilot sites' particular needs. Nevada's UNR-CE Associate Professor reported that "there certainly were problems in relation to the HFA model and how we could make that work in our organization when we were in conflict. That was hard". Pilot-site administrators contended that they were not allowed the flexibility to meet the needs of their local communities.

Organizational Structure

PCAA, as administrator of the HFA project involving the three pilot sites, did not develop an overall organizational structure. Rather, PCAA required that each of the pilot sites develop organizational charts depicting the relationships between the partnership's administrators. PCAA did develop its own internal organizational structure, but did not share its chart with pilot site administrators. PCAA developed job descriptions for their HFA project staff, but again did not provide them to pilot-site administrators. were not afforded copies of these job descriptions.

Some of Nevada's pilot-site administrators did not adhere to the partnership's organizational structure, even though all administrators participated in its design. All
administrators participated in the development of each other’s role descriptions. Nevertheless, implementation proved problematic because some administrators did not adhere to their roles and serious control issues surfaced. A hidden lack of trust between three partnership’s administrators and their unwillingness to appreciate and respect each other’s experience and abilities appeared to have precipitated these problems. Some administrators believed that all partnership administrators needed to be involved in every aspect of the delivery of the program. This belief, combined with a thin veneer of civility resulted in on-going morale problems for the HFN program delivery staff. Distrust, issues of control, and bifurcation in the roles of Nevada’s partnership administrators caused fragmentation of the HFA program and delays in the delivery of services to the intended population.

Oklahoma’s partnership organizational structure differed from that of Nevada and Wisconsin because of a distinctive feature of the OSU-CE internal organizational structure. OSU-CE’s internal chain of command called for the involvement of two of its district directors. While the district directors’ participation was not problematic for the partnership as a whole, it was at times problematic for the administrator from the County Educator. The OSU-CE internal structure required the County Educator to navigate through additional layers of bureaucracy in order to meet partnership and HFA program assignments. Wisconsin’s pilot-
site administrators, on the other hand, did not report any obstructions to the development of their partnership that were related to its organizational structure.

**Decision-Making Process**

PCAA did not develop either a formal or informal decision-making process that involved the pilot-site administrators. Rather, as the grantees and HFA program administrator, PCAA made all decisions and informed the pilot sites accordingly. At times, PCAA requested information from the pilot sites prior to making decisions. However, such occasions were the exception to the rule. Pilot-site administrators were angered and annoyed with PCAA's top down decision-making policy. Despite those administrators' complaints and discontent with its decision-making policies, PCAA did not change its process until the end of the project's second year. The delay in changing the process caused morale problems and disruptions between pilot-site administrators and PCAA.

Administrators in Wisconsin's and Oklahoma's partnerships reported that their decision-making process did not cause any significant disruptions to either their partnerships' operations or delivery of the HFA program. In Nevada, even though consensus was often achieved, at times some administrators were disingenuous in their votes, silently disagreeing with the outcome. While supporting decisions in a public forum, some administrators worked
diligently behind the scenes to undermine the intended effect of the decision. This mode of operation exacerbated the on-going conflict between some of the partnership's administrators.

**Conflict-Resolution Process**

None of the pilot sites developed a formal process for resolving conflicts. Neither did PCAA. Partnership pilot sites' administrators did not identify the informal process as a process for resolving conflicts, but as a method of communication with each other. A very informal and rudimentary form of mediation was attempted in resolving conflicts. The end result was that conflicts were neither curtailed nor eliminated.

Some of the administrators in Nevada's partnership were in constant conflict. The partnership did not openly address the conflicts between these administrators, even though the conflicts were apparent to all administrators as well as the program delivery staff. During regularly scheduled meetings some of the administrators inferred that conflicts could be discussed at the meetings, but no such discussions took place. Instead, the administrators in the conflict chose to resolve the conflicts on their own. Some contacted PCAA directly; others sought support for their points of view from other partnership administrators. PCAA's attempt at resolution was to assign one of its staff members to Nevada. The PCAA staff member was related to one of the
administrators in conflict. PCAA did not disclose this information to Nevada partnership administrators. Distrust and more conflict ensued and effectively killed any chance of resolution. The conflicts between administrators in Nevada were never fully addressed nor resolved.

In Oklahoma, partnership administrators and PCAA staff got off to a very rocky start. Conflicts between partnership administrators and PCAA staff continued throughout the life of the partnership. Administrators described some of PCAA’s staff as inflexible, demeaning, argumentative, and uncooperative. Administrators identified some of PCAA’s staff’s overall management style as top-down and autocratic. Administrators in Nevada and Wisconsin also discussed these PCAA’s staff members’ management style in the same terms.

Policies And Procedures

None of the administrators in the partnership developed policies and procedures at the inception of the partnership. All administrators followed their individual organizations’ internal policies and procedures in meeting HFA needs. This approach worked very well in Wisconsin and internally for PCAA. This approach proved problematic for Nevada and Oklahoma.

In Nevada, UNR-CE did not have a flexible system for reimbursement of funds. Its existing personnel system was very complex and bureaucratic and delayed the hiring of the program delivery staff. UNR-CE partnership administrators
were not entirely familiar with their institution’s internal fiscal and personnel policies and procedures. In Oklahoma, OSU-CE’s personnel system was similar to and as problematic as UNR-CE’s. OSU-CE had a policy that prevented paraprofessional staff from traveling outside of the state. This policy proved very damaging in that staff were not able to attend training conferences required by PCAA because they were conducted outside of Oklahoma. Like their Nevada counterparts, OSU-CE partnership administrators were not entirely familiar with their institution’s internal policies and procedures.

**Funding Mechanism And Authority**

PCAA did not disclose to the pilot sites the amount of funds awarded by Kellogg. Every year pilot sites were unclear about the amount of the funds they would receive. The amounts from PCAA changed every year. Lack of disclosure of information regarding funding created a cloud of distrust between pilot site partners and PCAA. The distrust remained throughout the life of the project.

At the inception of the partnership, PCAA did not assign funding authority to the pilot site partnerships. Rather, PCAA assigned funding authority to its state chapters. Prior to this action, PCAA did not ascertain whether each of its state chapters had the necessary infrastructure to administer the partnership’s funds at the respective pilot site. PCAA also did not inquire about the...
internal accounting systems of any of its pilot-site partners in each of the land-grant universities. PCAA never considered granting funding authority to the Cooperative Extension pilot-site partners, even though delivery of the HFA program was assigned to Cooperative Extension. Cooperative Extension hired the program delivery staff and incurred most of the expenses related to the delivery of services. PCAA accepted the consequences of its choice two years after the formation of the partnership. PCAA's Principal Analyst admitted that "the organizational cultures were so different and the cash flow really was the first controversy that pointed [at] that, that highlighted the difference in organizational culture."

PCAA developed a reimbursement system for its state chapters to dispense funds to the Cooperative Extension partners. This method did not appear to be problematic for Wisconsin and Oklahoma. In those states the partnership administrators shared the partnership's fiscal authority. PCAA reimbursement system had a catastrophic effect on Nevada's partnership. UNR-CE's internal fiscal policies did not allow a reimbursement system of accounting. Despite this clear hindrance to program delivery, WE CAN initially was unwilling to share funding authority with UNR-CE. Rather, WE CAN retained fiscal authority for the first year of the partnership and transferred funds to UNR-CE in small amounts. WE CAN's administrator's initial control of the funds caused delays in the implementation of the HFA
Accountability

The partnership did not consider accountability between and amongst partnership administrators. Rather, accountability was programmatic in nature. That is, the partnership administrators' focus was on the outcome of the HFA program implementation development and evaluation. PCAA's staff deemed pilot sites accountable to PCAA. As a result pilot-site administrators did not operate in cooperation with PCAA, but were instead answerable to it. All pilot-site administrators were fully committed to the HFA program and the families it served. In a subtle way, their commitment also created accountability amongst pilot-site administrators as each had to contribute to the creation of the progress reports sent to PCAA.

Planning

The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership did not allow any time for the planning. PCAA and USDA-CSREES partnership administrators requested time and funds for program and partnership preplanning. Neither was granted by Kellogg. Kellogg's partnership administrator concluded that PCAA's and the USDA-CSREES's expertise and previous experience in partnership arrangements, obviated the need for additional planning time. Kellogg awarded the funds to PCAA with a start and end date for the project. PCAA and the pilot sites
were required to respond quickly without the benefit of pre-
planning.

Lack of initial planning rendered PCAA partnership
administrators and staff poorly equipped to deal with the
partnership's operations. PCAA staff were unable to handle
and manage the ensuing flood of governance and
administrative matters generated by this partnership. Lack
of initial planning created a ripe environment for the
proliferation of misunderstanding, distrust, turf battles
and, other conflicts between and amongst partnership
administrators.

Organizational Culture

Some partnership administrators were not familiar with
their counterpart's organizational culture. PCAA was
unfamiliar with the relationship between the USDA-CSREES and
Cooperative Extension in the pilot states. PCAA either did
not understand or had no knowledge of the Cooperative
Extension organizational culture and structure at the
respective pilot sites. Neither Oklahoma's nor Nevada's
partnership administrators had a clear understanding of each
other's culture. This lack of knowledge about each other's
organizational culture was at the root of many of the
challenges faced by those partnership administrators.
Wisconsin partnership administrators had a prior working
relationship. Each was familiar with the other's
organizational culture. Partnership administrators in
Wisconsin commented that this knowledge reduced the partnership's governance and administrative challenges.

Organizational Language

Partnership administrators did not speak the same organizational or cultural language. Without planning time, this discovery was not made until conflicts began to surface. PCAA discovered at the end of the project that its vision and goals differed from that of the pilot sites. PCAA's vision and objective were not realized, as explained in this chapter. The divergence was attributed to differences in interpretation, understanding, and meaning of each other's organizational language.

Request For Proposal

PCAA's request for proposal was informal, lengthy, and confusing. Pilot sites complained that PCAA sent out only a short questionnaire. The questionnaire elicited minimal information. PCAA agreed that its request for proposal was not a well thought out process.

Turnover

The Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership was plagued with turnover. Oklahoma was the most affected by high turnover, while Wisconsin and Nevada appeared to have been spared. Complicating matters, Oklahoma did not maintain adequate written records of the partnership's operation.
Most of the partnership's institutional memory left with the administrators who resigned during the course of the project. New partnership administrators filtered information through their own frames of reference and drew their own conclusions. Consequently, each new partner developed and implemented a different understanding and interpretation of the partnership's intended purpose. The absence of partnership historical documents proved counterproductive to the operation of the Oklahoma partnership. PCAOK's partnership administrator stated that it appeared as "though we were starting anew every single time."

**Strategies Recommended**

**By Administrators**

*What new strategies would administrators in the formation of this public-private partnership utilize in the formation of another partnership?* Partnership administrators regarded their involvement in the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership as a learning experience. Administrators were eager to share their experiences. Partnership administrators agreed that the new strategies emerging from this experience will aid in future partnership ventures.

Partnership administrators made the following recommendations for the formation of another public-private partnership: 1) Allow time for planning; 2) Recognize each other's value and draw on each other's expertise; 3) Involve
all partnership administrators in the business of the partnership; 4) At the partnership’s inception bring together all parties involved in the partnership; 5) Remain open, inclusive, and flexible in a spirit of cooperation; 6) Learn about each other’s organizational culture and language; 7) Plan and work together in a spirit of cooperation and respect; 8) Fully disclose budget and fiscal information to all partners; and 9) Have a process or means to resolve conflicts. Deal with conflicts as they arise. Do not let them fester.

Recommendations For Future Partnerships

What effective strategies or procedures will be indicated and recommended for use in the formation of future public-private partnerships? Seventeen major findings in this study are recommended as effective strategies for the formation of new public-private partnerships. These major findings may also be applied to partnerships already in existence. This study confirms the significance of the elements that were the result of Peter’s (1998) earlier findings and that were the variables in this study: 1) development of a mission and goals; 2) development of an organizational structure; 3) development of a decision-making process; 4) development of a process for conflict-resolution; 5) development of policies and procedures; 6) development of a funding mechanism; and 7) development of
a process for project accountability. Reference to Peters' (1998) findings are in Chapter II of this study. All other recommendations resulted from findings generated directly from this study. Table 11 describes these findings. The recommendations are based on three broad categories indicated by the majority of the participants in this study: 1) very highly recommended factors were identified as the most conflicting in the partnership; 2) highly recommended factors were identified as essential to the partnership; and 3) recommended factors were identified as desirable but not essential.
Table 11

Emerging Conceptual Framework For The Formation Of Public-Private Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental elements</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Very highly recommended. Provides guidance, cohesive focus, and direction. Should be developed jointly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and objectives</td>
<td>Very highly recommended. Creates standard for measuring partnership’s progress towards its mission. Provide guidance, focus and direction. Should be developed jointly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Very highly recommended. Should emerge from open discussions with other partnership administrators and not imposed upon the partnership by a few. Design should be based on needs of partnership and not on individual members. Important that the partnership's structure is easy to follow, flexible, adaptable to partnership needs, and compatible with individual partner’s organizational structure. All partners should participate in the design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role descriptions</td>
<td>Highly recommended. All partners should participate in establishing the role descriptions of each partner. Process should focus on maximizing each partner’s skills, experience, and expertise. Should be followed and be flexible enough to allow for changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental elements</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be written and distributed to all partners. Respect for contributions of others is imperative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making process</strong></td>
<td>Very highly recommended whether process is formal or informal. Decisions should be made jointly and in good faith. Process should allow open discussions and dialogue and should include an appeal process. Adherence to process and to final decisions is imperative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding authority</strong></td>
<td>It is very highly recommended that funding authority be shared. All fiscal decisions should be made jointly. Full disclosure of fiscal information should be made to all partners. Partnership should develop a mechanism for expending that fulfills its fiscal needs and is compatible with fiscal policies of each partner's organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget preparation</strong></td>
<td>Highly recommended that the budget be prepared jointly. Ensure full disclosure of all monies received and expended. All partners should receive a copy of the budget. Decisions on budget transactions should be discussed openly. Modifications and revisions to the budget should require joint approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental elements</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget administrator</td>
<td>Recommended. Partners should jointly assign one partner to act as budget administrator. A partner with experience and expertise in fiscal matters is highly desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
<td>Recommended. Partnership may develop or each partner may follow its own institution's. Partners must ensure these institutional internal systems will not impede the partnership’s intended purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict-resolution process</td>
<td>Very highly recommended that process is established. Partners should jointly decide on the process. Process should be in writing and Distributed to all partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Very highly recommended that third-party mediation be used if the conflict-resolution process does not work. Partners should jointly agree in advance on mediators to be used. Professional training and experience is highly recommended. Mediators must be unbiased and have no relationship with any party in the partnership that would create a conflict of interest. Process should provide that decisions are binding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic accountability</td>
<td>Highly recommended that process be determined jointly by all partners, be in writing and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental elements</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distributed to all partners. Frequency and nature of accountability should fit the needs of the partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability to partners</td>
<td>Highly recommended that a formal or informal process be developed jointly by all partners. Process should ensure partners are accountable for fulfilling the mission, goals, and objectives of the partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Very highly recommended that planning take place prior to the formation of the partnership. All partners must be included in the planning process. Planning will provide an opportunity to develop the governance and administrative approaches needed for the operation of the partnership. Planning affords the partners the time and environment to meet, to learn about each other's organization, and to begin the building of relationships between individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture and language</td>
<td>Highly recommended that each partner acquires a working knowledge of each other's organizational culture and language. Some prior knowledge is very desirable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental elements</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership institutional memory</td>
<td>Highly recommended that the partnership have a process to document significant decisions and their consequences as well as other actions, events, and matters that significantly impact its operation. Records should be readily accessible to new partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management style</td>
<td>Highly recommended that style not be controlling, but flexible, inclusive, adaptable, and fostering an environment that encourages cooperation and collaboration built on mutual respect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Implications

Given the proliferation of public-private partnerships discussed in Chapters I and II and the scarcity of studies related to the administrative and governance factors affecting partnerships, their formation, and subsequent operation, additional research is needed. Future studies could expand on each of the variables explored in this study and may also uncover other factors or variables needed for partnerships to fulfill their intended purpose. For example, should one of the minimum qualifications for partnership formation be some form of previous experience in partnership endeavors? Should those involved in the conceptualization and initiation of a partnership maintain their involvement, be it formal or informal, throughout the life of the partnership?

Should each partner’s participation be clearly defined at the inception of the partnership? At the formation of the PCAA-KELLOGG-USDA-CSREES partnership, USDA-CREES withdrew, though unofficially, and Kellogg became a silent partner. Could some of the initial difficulties experienced by partnerships be resolved by having all organizational partners understand each partners’ degree of involvement and commitment? Would initially awarding funds to all partners curtail turf battles and other control issues? Or, would it generate new problems and conflicts? The findings in this study and further research into the above questions may encourage additional public-private partnership formations
and may assist existing partnerships with the complexities involved in quasi-organizational structures.

Walworth County, Wisconsin, has continued the effort initiated by PCAA, the Kellogg Foundation, and the USDA-CSREES to deliver the HFA program. The administrators in a new Walworth County partnership are the collaborators in the original partnership. Walworth County's new partners are in the process of developing their partnership's governance and administrative factors. They are modeling most of their governance and administrative factors after those employed by the PCAWI-UW-CE state partnership. Future studies of partnerships should include the Walworth County partnership, testing for the similarities and differences between the factors used by the state level partnership and those used by a partnership in a county environment.

Partnership’s Outcome

In Nevada, the partnership was dissolved at the end of the project. UNR-CE assumed management of the HFA program. The program was continued with UNR-CE and Clark County funds. UNR-CE continued HFA with some variations to the program's critical elements in order to meet community needs. WE CAN became involved in the Family to Family program funded and supported by the State of Nevada. WE CAN and UNR-CE continued collaborative efforts on a very limited basis.

In Wisconsin, PCAWI and UW-CE dissolved the partnership
at the end of the project. However, Walworth County, UW-CE in Walworth County, and the Walworth County Resources Coalition and other former HFA collaborators established a new partnership to deliver the HFA program. Walworth County was the sole source of funding for the HFA program. UW-CE in Walworth County assumed management of the program. Walworth County Extension made changes to HFA's critical elements in order to meet community needs. Former PCAWI and UW-CE partnership administrators continue to maintain a strong working relationship.

PCAOK and OSU-CE administrators dissolved their partnership at the end of the project. Partnership administrators interact on projects from time-to-time. The HFA program in Oklahoma subsequently received funding from the Office of Child Abuse Prevention and the USDA Oklahoma Nutrition Education project. Oklahoma's legislature chose not to participate in the funding of HFA. OSU-CE assumed management of the program and made changes to HFA's critical elements in order to meet community needs.

Most participants in this study agreed that their experiences with the HFA project were enriching both personally and professionally. Most also agreed that the administrative and governance aspects of the partnership were stressful, disappointing, confusing, time-consuming and strenuous. Some partnership administrators stated that they would not engage in another partnership endeavor similar to the Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES partnership. All participants
in this study confirmed that the HFA model was a good program. Most partnership administrators stated that the HFA program evaluation method was excellent. All participants reported that the services provided to children and their families through the HFA model was the most rewarding part of the project.

Summary
The focus of this chapter was the effective and ineffective strategies used by administrators in this partnership, lessons learned, and their recommendations for future partnerships. Analysis on the effective and ineffective strategies used by Kellogg-PCAA-USDA-CSREES administrators at the national and state levels were thoroughly discussed in Chapter IV of this study. The major findings in this study are described in Table 11. Most administrators reported that this partnership venture was very rewarding because they helped children and families. Most administrators expressed frustration in working with PCAA. Future studies are needed to test the theoretical framework proposed in this study for the administration of public-private partnerships.
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APPENDIX I

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION OF INTERVIEW</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE'S TITLE</th>
<th>INTERVIEW DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA'S PARTNERSHIP (WE CAN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>9-3-99</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR-CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>9-14-99</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR-CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>9-28-99</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN'S PARTNERSHIP (UW-CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>9-15-99</td>
<td>9:99 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkorn, WI</td>
<td>County Educator</td>
<td>9-15-99</td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>INTERVIEWEE'S TITLE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkorn, WI</td>
<td>Collaborator Family Resources Coalition</td>
<td>9-15-99</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>9-16-99</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma's Partnership</td>
<td>Video Conference Former Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, KY</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>9-20-99</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>9-23-99</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Springs, MD</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>9-8-99</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Principal Analyst</td>
<td>9-13-99</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION OF INTERVIEW</td>
<td>INTERVIEWEES</td>
<td>INTERVIEW DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winetka, IL</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>9-29-99</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Former)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>Dir. Training and</td>
<td>10-2-99</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Asst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USDA-CSREES**

Washington, DC.    Nat. Program Leader 9-8-99 9:00 AM

**W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION**

Battle Creek, MI    Program Director 9-29-99 10:00 AM

The following partnership administrators declined interviews: WE CAN’s former Executive Director, UNR-CE Area Extension Specialist; HFA PCAA Trainer.
APPENDIX II

LETTER TO INTERVIEWEES

Date:

Name
Street address
City, state, zip code

Dear:

Thank you so much for agreeing to participate in the data collection process of my dissertation. I am happy to confirm our meeting in (city and state) on (data and time). This study is about the administrative and governance strategies utilized by participants at the inception of the public-private partnership forged between the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse, and the USDA Cooperative Extension System. This partnership introduced the Healthy Family America community-based educational model for first-time parents in overburdened families in Oklahoma, Nevada, and Wisconsin, from 1994 to 1997.

This study will assess effective and ineffective
strategies used by administrators and faculty in the development and implementation of the partnership's:
1) mission and objectives; 2) organizational structure;
3) decision making processes; 4) conflict resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanisms and authority; and 7) accountability.

Enclosed please find the interviewing instrument I will be utilizing for our interview. Please complete questions 1 through 10. I will collect this portion of the instrument when we meet. Questions 11 through 73 will be asked during the interview. Even though this interviewing questionnaire may appear to be lengthy some of the questions may not apply to your specific situation. For your information, I have also enclosed a brief synopsis on public-private partnerships.

Once again, thank you. Participation in this study will contribute to the theoretical literature on public-private partnerships, specifically in relation to their administration and governance. The results of this study could establish administration and governance guidelines for existing partnerships and for the formation of future partnerships. The results of this study may be applicable and transferable to the formation of other types of public-private partnership arrangements. Please don't hesitate to contact me at (702) 251-7531 or send me an e-mail at lewinc@agt1.ag.unr.edu should you have any questions.

Best regards,
APPENDIX III

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

My name is Celia Feres-Lewin. I am currently a graduate student in the department of Educational Leadership, College of Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I am in the process of writing my dissertation. As discussed during our recent telephone conversation, I would like to extend an invitation for you to participate in the study of A Public-private Partnership Approach to Community-Based Education. Your initial involvement in this study will involve participation in a one-on-one interview approximately 4 hours in duration. Subsequent contacts will require significantly shorter periods of time and may entail clarification, verification or confirmation of information collected. Complete anonymity will not be possible, as interviews involve one person talking with another. Nevertheless, confidentiality, when requested as to specific quotes, will be honored. There is no momentary compensation for your participation in this study. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntarily and you may withdraw at any time.

The purpose of this study is to examine the administrative and governance strategies utilized by

This study will assess effective and ineffective strategies used by administrators at the inception of the public-private partnership to address the partnership's: 1) mission and objectives; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision-making processes; 4) conflict-resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanism and authority; and 7) accountability. Data will be collected by way of open-ended interviews. Interviews will be tape-recorded in order to maintain the reliability of your responses. All tape-recorded interviews will be transcribed. A copy of the transcripts will be mailed to you and you will have an opportunity to make corrections to the transcripts prior to their use in the analysis.

Your participation in this study will contribute to the theoretical literature on public-private partnerships, specifically in relation to their administration and governance. The results of this study could provide the basis for system and policy changes to future and existing partnerships involving the Kellogg Foundation, PCAA and the
USDA-CSREES in their implementation of programs for children and families. Results of this study may provide guidelines for the formation of future or existing partnerships and may be applicable and transferable to the formation of other types of public-private partnership arrangements.

In the event that you have any questions or are in need of verification of this research project, you may contact Dr. Teresa S. Jordan, Executive Committee Chair and Associate Dean of the College of Education, at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, located at 4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89154; telephone 702-895-3011. For questions about the rights of research subject, you may contact the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Office of Sponsored Programs at 702-895-1357.

By signing below you hereby give consent for your voluntary participation in this study, to be interviewed by the researcher named in paragraph one, and to have your interview tape-recorded. You also acknowledge that there will be no momentary compensation for your participation in this study, and that you are aware that you may withdraw from participation in this study at any time.

_________________________  _______________________
Participant's name          Participant's signature
Date____________________
APPENDIX IV

SYNOPSIS ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

The literature on public-private partnerships reveals that in recent years the availability of federal and state funding for community-based education and services has diminished. "No single sector -government, business, nonprofit, or citizen/volunteer- can resolve [community-based educational] issues alone" (Boyle & Mulcahy, 1996, p. 3). This diminishing access to and availability of federal and state dollars has given rise to a proliferation of public-private partnership arrangements. There is a need for new links and coalitions that represent a broad range of interest groups and organizations that have transcended traditional supporters.

Jezierski (1990, p. 217) defined public-private partnerships as a consortium providing flexible, voluntary, cooperative decision-making structures "linking the complementary strengths of each organization" (Harding, 1996, p. i). Partnerships appear to be the ideal arrangement for the delivery of quality, cost-effective, and much-needed public and educational services. Public-private partnership arrangements are becoming the ideal organizational form for
meeting head-on communities' increasing demands for social and educational services.
APPENDIX V

INTERVIEWING INSTRUMENT

Contact type: ____________________________ Site: ____________________________
Visit: __ Contact date: ____________________________
Phone: __ Today's date: ____________________________
E-mail: __ Written by: ____________________________

Demographics: Male __ Female __

1) Respondent's name: _________________________________

2) Name of respondent's agency/organization/institution:

3) Respondent's job title: _________________________________

4) What is the highest educational degree you have completed?

5) How long have you been working with this agency/organization/institution?

6) Please describe what you do at (name of agency/organization/institution). Please use additional paper if needed.

7) How many years of experience do you have working in this field?

8) How did you become involved in the public-private-partnership of NCPCA, CES and the Kellogg Foundation?

--------------------
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9) What is this partnership called at your agency/organization/institution? ________________

10) Were you with this agency/organization/institution at the inception of the partnership? ______ If yes, what role do you play in this partnership? ________________

If no, when did you join the partnership and what was your role? ________________

11) Did you experience any challenges at the inception of the partnership? If yes, please tell me what were these challenges?

12) Did the partners establish a partnership mission and goals? If yes, what process was utilized to arrive at and decide upon a mission and goals?

13) Where the mission and goals established at the inception of the partnership? If no, when were they established?

14) What was the mission?; What were the goals?

15) Did the partnership establish an organizational structure at its inception? (If necessary, define what is meant by organizational structure).

16) If yes to number 15 what process was utilized to determine and arrive at the structure? Was this organizational structure established at the inception of the partnership?

17) If yes to number 15, what was the structure?

18) If no to number 15, when was the organizational structure established? Why was the structure not established at the inception of the partnership?

19) Did the organizational structure pose administrative and governance challenges to the operation of the partnership? (Define administration and governance if necessary). If yes, what were those challenges? How were they dealt with?

20) Did the partnership's organizational structure conflict with your own organization/institution/agency organizational structure? If yes, what were the conflicts? How were these conflicts resolved?
21) Did the organizational structure facilitate the administration and governance of the partnership? If yes, what were the contributions? If no, what were the impediments to facilitation? How did you deal with the impediments?

22) Did the partnership establish a process for decision-making? (If necessary, define what is meant by decision-making process).

23) Was this process for decision-making established at the inception of the partnership?

24) If yes to number 23 above, What process was utilized to determine and arrive at the decision-making process? What was the decision-making process?

25) If no to number 23, when was the decision-making process developed? Why was this process not developed at the inception of the partnership?

26) Did the decision-making process pose administrative and governance challenges to the operation and function of the partnership? (If necessary define administration and governance of necessary). If yes, what were they?

27) Did the partnership's decision-making process conflict with your own organization/institution/agency decision-making process? If yes, what were the conflicts? How were these conflicts resolved?

28) Did the partnership decision-making process facilitate communication? If yes, how? If no, why not?

29) Did the partnership decision-making process facilitate the administration and governance of the partnership? If yes, how? If no, why not? How did you deal with the impediments?

30) Did the partnership establish a process for conflict resolution? (If necessary, define what is meant by conflict resolution).

31) Was this process for conflict resolution established at the inception of the partnership?

32) If yes to number 31, what process was utilized to determine and arrive at the conflict resolution process? What was the conflict resolution?
33) If no to number 31, when was the conflict resolution process developed? Why was this process not developed at the inception of the partnership?

34) Did the conflict resolution process pose administrative and governance challenges to the operation and function of the partnership? If yes, what were they?

35) Does your organization/institution/agency have a conflict resolution process? If yes, what is this process? If no, what process is used for resolving conflicts, disagreements, and disputes?

36) Did the partnership's conflict resolution process conflict with your own organization/institution/agency process for resolving disputes, disagreements, and conflicts?

37) If yes, what were the conflicts? How were these conflicts resolved?

38) Did the partnership's conflict resolution process facilitate communication? If yes, how? If no, why not?

39) Did the partnership's conflict resolution process facilitate in the administration and governance of the partnership? If yes, how? If no, why not? How did you deal with the impediments?

40) Did the partnership establish policies and procedures? (If necessary, define what is meant by policies and procedures).

41) If yes to number 40, what process was utilized to determine and arrive at the policies and procedures? What were the partnership's policies and procedures?

42) Were these policies and procedures established at the inception of the partnership?

43) If no to number 40, when and where policies and procedures developed? Why were policies and procedures not developed at the inception of the partnership?

44) Did the policies and procedures pose administrative and governance challenges to the operation and function of the partnership? If yes, what were they?

45) Did the partnership's policies and procedures conflict with your own organization/institution/agency policies and procedures? If yes, go to question number 46; if no, go to question number 47.
46) If yes, what were the conflicts? How were these conflicts resolved?

47) Did the partnership policies and procedures facilitate communication? If yes, how? If no, why not?

48) Did the partnership's policies and procedures facilitate the administration and governance of the partnership?
   If yes, how? If no, why not? How did you deal with the impediments?

49) Did the partnership establish a mechanism for expending funds? If yes, What was the mechanism? If no, why not?

50) Was this mechanism established at the inception of the partnership? If yes, go to question number 51. If no, why not? When was a mechanism established?

51) How was the authority to expend funds established?

52) Did the mechanism for expending funds pose administrative and governance challenges to the operation and functioning of the partnership? If yes, what were they?

53) Did the partnership's mechanism for expending funds conflict with your own organization/institution/agency mechanism for expending funds? If yes, go to question number 54; if no, go to question number 55.

54) If yes, what were the conflicts? How were these conflicts resolved?

55) Did the partnership's mechanism to expend funds facilitate communication? If yes, how? If no, why not?

56) Did the partnership's mechanism to expend funds facilitate the administration and governance of the partnership? If yes, how? If no, why not? How did you deal with the impediments?

57) Did the partnership determine and identify partner accountability? (Define partner accountability if necessary)

58) If yes to number 57, how was accountability determined?

59) If no to number 57, how were partners made accountable?

60) Was accountability established at the inception of the partnership? If yes, go to question number 61. If no, why not? When was accountability established?
61) Did the partners develop a process for establishing accountability? If yes, what was it? If no, how was accountability determined or established?

62) Did accountability pose administrative and governance challenges to the operation and functioning of the partnership?

63) Does your organization/institution/agency have a process or mechanism for accountability? If yes, what is it? If no, go to question number 66.

64) Did partner accountability conflict with your own organization/institution/agency mechanism for accountability?

65) If yes, what were the conflicts? How were these conflicts resolved?

66) Did the partners accountability facilitate communication? If yes, how? If no, why not?

67) Did partner accountability facilitate the administration and governance of the partnership? If yes, how? If no, why not? How did you deal with the impediments?

68) Can you please tell me in your own words if the mission and goals, organization structure, decision-making process, conflict resolution process, policies and procedures, funding mechanism, and accountability had an impact on the deliverance of the Healthy Family America program?

69) If yes, what were the impacts?

70) Do you perceive these impacts as aiding in the deliverance of the program? If yes, how? If no, why not?

71) If you were starting a new public-private-partnership, what things would you do different at the national level?

At the local level? Within your agency/organization/institution?

What things would you repeat at the national level?

At the local level? Within your agency/organization/institution?

What things worked at the national level?
At the local level? Within your agency/organization/institution?

What things didn't work at the national level? At the local level? Within your agency/organization/institution?

72) Do you feel you were enriched by your experience with the partnership? If yes, please describe how. If not, please describe why not.

73) Do you have any comments you would like to add?
APPENDIX VI

LETTER TO INTERVIEWEES
IN FIELD TEST

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the field test of this interviewing instrument. It is important that you comment on the instrument's clarity or lack thereof and whether questions were awkwardly constructed. All comments are welcome.

This study is being conducted because the literature on public-private partnerships reveals that in recent years the availability of federal and state funding for community-based education and services has diminished; and, coupled with a growing federal deficit, "public-private partnerships have become an increasingly popular vehicle for both limiting federal expenditures and leveraging federal funds" (Riggin, Grasso, & Westcott, 1992, p. 40). Jezierski (1990, p. 217) defined public-private partnerships as a consortium providing flexible, voluntary, cooperative decision-making structures "linking the complementary strengths of each organization" (Harding, 1996, p. i).

Further, educational policy issues and community services are in need of new links and coalitions that represent a broad range of interest groups and organizations.
that have transcended traditional supporters (Boyle & Mulcahy, 1996, p. 3). "No single sector -government, business, nonprofit, or citizen/volunteer- can resolve [community-based educational] issues alone" (Boyle & Mulcahy, 1996, p. 3). Bringing together the "expertise available to respond to learning needs, problems or issues identified by such external constituencies as local communities, citizens groups, state, national or other public [or private] sector organizations" is community-based education in its purest sense (The University of Nevada, Reno, Cooperative Extension, 1997, p. 1).

The purpose of this study is to examine the administrative and governance strategies utilized by administrators in the formation of the public-private partnership forged between the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Prevent Child Abuse America, and the United States Department of Agriculture Cooperative States Research Education and Extension Service in the introduction of the Healthy Family America community-based education model for first-time parents in overburdened families in Oklahoma, Nevada, and Wisconsin, from 1994 to 1997.

This study will assess effective and ineffective strategies used by administrators in the public-private partnership to address the partnership's: 1) mission and objectives; 2) organizational structure; 3) decision making processes; 4) conflict resolution processes; 5) policies and procedures; 6) funding mechanisms and authority; and
7) accountability.

Your participation in this study will contribute to the theoretical literature on public-private partnerships, specifically in relation to their administration and governance. The results of this study could establish administration and governance guidelines for existing partnerships and for the formation of future partnerships. The results of this study may be applicable and transferable to the formation of other types of public-private partnership arrangements.
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