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Background

**We know**

Community coalitions **help**

- Accelerate progress toward community-level policy & systems changes
- Reduce health disparities

**We don’t know**

Specifically **why** community coalitions have these effects, especially those with SNAP-Ed involvement

- Is it a function of day-to-day coalition processes, characteristics or structures?

SNAP-Ed: Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program–Education, a federal program to support healthy eating and physical activity in lower-resourced populations
Study Objectives

- Measure coalition characteristics for coalitions in Arizona that included a SNAP-Ed staff member
- Identify strengths and areas for improvement within each coalition
Study Design: The Tool

Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory

Questionnaire administered to coalition members

Includes 40 items about coalition processes, characteristics & structures, scored from strongly disagree (1.0) to strongly agree (5.0)
Study Design: The Tool

Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory

40 items → 20 coalition factors → 6 domains

- Communication
- Environment
- Membership Characteristics
- Process & Structure
- Purpose
- Resources
Study Design: Setting & Participants

Pre-Post Assessment
In 2016 (pre) and 2018 (post), trained SNAP-Ed staff administered the Wilder with community coalition partners.

Coalition Inclusion Criteria
✓ Established for at least 6 months
✓ Work in Food Systems (FS) or Active Living (AL) SNAP-Ed focus areas
✓ Include at least 5 organizations, and a SNAP-Ed representative

Participants: 7 coalitions (3 FS, 36 members; 4 AL, 37 members)
Outcome and Analysis

**Outcome.** Within-group change in Wilder factors over time

**Primary Analysis.** Wilcoxon signed-rank tests to compare scores for the 20 factors. Descriptive statistics also used for the % of respondents whose scores for individual factors decreased.

**Secondary Analyses.**
1) Analyzed by focus area (FS and AL)
2) Explored urban vs. rural coalition differences
Results Across Two Years

Scores related to coalition purpose, environment, and resources increased.
Results Across Two Years

Scores related to coalition membership characteristics and coalition processes decreased.
Results by Domain & Coalition Type

**Process & Structure**
- Flexibility
  - Development of Clear Roles & Policies
  - Multiple Layers of Participation
  - Pace of Development

**Resources**
- Skilled Leadership
- Sufficient Resources

**Membership Characteristics**
- Participation Is in Self-Interest
- Appropriate Cross Section of Members

**Purpose**
- Unique Purpose

**Communications**
- Open & Frequent Communication

**Environment**
- High Scoring Factors

**Low Scoring Factors**
- Food Systems
- Active Living
- Both Coalition Types
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## Results for Food Systems Coalitions

### Strongest Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Responses improved</th>
<th>% Responses stayed the same</th>
<th>% Responses worsened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique Purpose</td>
<td>*p&lt;.05</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strongest Decline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Responses improved</th>
<th>% Responses stayed the same</th>
<th>% Responses worsened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pace of Development</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake in the Process/Outcome</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration in Self Interest</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results for Active Living Coalitions

### Strongest Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>% Responses improved</th>
<th>% Responses stayed the same</th>
<th>% Responses worsened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of Collaboration</td>
<td>p&lt;.05 57</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake in the Process/Outcome</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Purpose</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient Resources</td>
<td>p&lt;.05 51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strongest Decline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>% Responses improved</th>
<th>% Responses stayed the same</th>
<th>% Responses worsened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Layers of Participation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Section of Members</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition Seen as Legitimate Leader</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable Political/Social Climate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results for **Urban vs. Rural Coalitions**

(Scores range from 1.00 to 5.00)
CONCLUSIONS

Short term changes in coalition outcomes are measurable

Coalitions may increase collaboration, purpose & resource security over time

Attention to short term outcomes may help longer term goal achievement

There may be FS/AL differences, or rural/urban differences in coalition characteristics

More attention may be needed to internal processes and membership diversity

IMPLICATIONS
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QUESTIONS?

Email me: kmcelvee@email.arizona.edu

Find me on Twitter: @SNAP_Ed_Eval