A MULTI SECTORAL APPROACH TO IMPLEMENTING STATEWIDE HEALTHY RELATIONSHIPS PROGRAMMING:

Strengths, challenges, and strategies for success from Alaska
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TODAY
• Identify strategies for successful multisectoral collaborations when implementing a program or initiative statewide
• By way of the Alaska Fourth R Evaluation Project

ALASKA FOURTH R EVALUATION PROJECT
• Three year project 2011 – 2014
• Statewide
• Evaluation of 9th grade health curriculum

PARTNERS
• State of Alaska, Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
• Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
• Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
• State of Alaska, Division of Public Health, Section of Women’s Children’s and Family Health
• Strategic Prevention Solutions
• University of Western Ontario

STATEWIDE DATA COLLECTION
WHY COLLABORATE?

• Necessary to leverage funding of statewide program implementation and evaluation
• Enabled more rigorous program evaluation
• Resulted in process that benefitted all partners within their own program priorities and funding structures

WHAT IS A COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP?

• An alliance among people and organizations from multiple sectors, such as schools and businesses, working together to achieve a common purpose.
• Collaborative partnerships take many forms, including that of our Alaskan colleagues, which would be represented as an “alliance among service agencies”

SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS

Several factors determine rate at which a collaborative partnership affects community and system change:

• Clear vision and mission
• Action planning
• Developing and supporting leaders
• Documentation
• Technical assistance
• Resources
• Making outcomes matter

METHODS – How is this collaborative working?

• Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders from each of the organizational partners (n=5)
• Consistent with CBPR principles, used feedback from a consensus-building activity of stakeholders (n=8) at a meeting in April, 2014
• Interview data are being coded and themed by the authors using directed content analysis (Hsieh and Shannon, 2002).
• Today, we are sharing main themes from consensus building activity
CLEAR VISION AND MISSION

Agency missions were different → Yet working on a project that met their agency needs

A good leader holds the shared vision

DEVELOPING & SUPPORTING LEADERS

Challenges
- Shared leadership can take more time to negotiate and build consensus
- Balancing various agendas or priorities
- Lack of clarity with shared leadership
- Takes energy to process
- Role clarity with turnover

Advantages
- Shared leadership between agencies and collaboration for implementation, trainings, etc.
- Shared vision
- Roles and responsibility clarification
- Turnover managed well

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- Built in naturally by structure of the "Evaluation Team"
- Regular team conference calls and action-item notes seen as key to:
  - Keep project on radar
  - Keep partners accountable
  - Keep connected when partners in different places (and travel often)

COORDINATION & COMMUNICATION

Challenges
- Takes time
- Sometimes not sure where things were at
- Location
- Time
- Parental permission

Advantages
- Regular audio scheduled
- Honest communication
- Have systems (implementation committee)
- Shared work and responsibilities – everyone feels a part of
- Efficient
- Leverages resources (e.g., data collection)
- Identified roles/responsibilities through MOUs
- Online tools for distance collaboration

MULTISECTORAL

Challenges
- Limitations on outcomes or focus on areas (including sex)
- State politics
- Differing levels of authority/approval
- Deadlines/timing of funding

Advantages
- Strength for comprehensive policy development beyond project
- Shared load and reach
- Concerted effort and advocacy
- Finding common programmatic goals helps frame the work holistically

NONPROFIT / GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIPS

GET THE JOB DONE

Get it done

Nonprofit

Independent contractor

Government

Agitate
RESOURCES

Challenges
- Travel and data collection
- Evaluation followed second to implementation
- Local staff
- GF implementation
- Political agendas (both federal and state)
- Stipulations attendant to funding receipt
- State fiscal year calendar
- Started piece meal
- Hard to know best efficiency with schools, districts

Advantages
- Shared resources – funding, staffing, expertise
- Federal funding – PREP
- Multi-sectorial non-profit vs state spending restrictions and guidelines
- Political agenda (president and governor) – teen pregnancy prevention (ACA)
- Evaluation – 3 years of funds
- Governor’s initiative

KEY THREAD: RELATIONSHIPS

Social capital builds institutional expectations

Organizational relationships

CONCLUSIONS

- Key factors contribute lack of national success in reaching population health goals
- Alaska provides an example of a multi-sectoral partnership that gives way to shared public and private responsibility for population health improvement
- Relationship, relationship, relationship
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