# **Self-evaluation Tool for Action in Partnership**

#### A summary of

Bilodeau, A., Galarneau, M., Fournier, M., Potvin, L., Sénécal, G., & Bernier, J. (2017). Self-Evaluation Tool for Action in Partnership. Toronto, ON, Canada: Health Nexus. https://en.healthnexus.ca/sites/en.healthnexus.ca/files/resources/selfevaluationtool.pdf Bilodeau A, Galarneau M, Fournier M, Potvin L, Sénécal G, Bernier J. L'Outil diagnostique de l'action en partenariat. Montréal, QC, Canada : Chaire Approches communautaires et inégalités de santé (CACIS), 2008, revu en 2014. http://chairecacis.org/fichiers/bilodeau\_et\_al.\_2008\_2014\_outil\_diagnostique\_action\_en\_partenariat\_0.pdf

## How to cite this NCCMT summary:

National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools (2018). *Self-evaluation Tool for Action in Partnership*. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University. (Updated 28 June, 2018) Retrieved from <u>http://www.nccmt.ca/resources/search/316</u>.

## Categories:

Tool, Communication, Consensus building, Partnership development and maintenance, Partnership evaluation Tool



National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools Centre de collaboration nationale des méthodes et outils

Date updated: June 28, 2018

## **Relevance For Public Health**

Public health professionals collaborate with others and participate in partnerships throughout their careers. This tool allows members of partnerships to evaluate themselves and learn about the requirements for effective partnership work.

This tool is an English translation/adaptation of the *Outil diagnostique de l'action en partenariat*, created in French, in Québec, in 2008. It is now available in both official languages and can facilitate bilingual evaluation within or across partnerships.

## Description

This tool provides members of a partnership with the opportunity to express perceptions and opinions on their partnership experiences. The tool's 18 items are related to the following six requirements for effective partnership work:

- 1. the range of perspectives relevant to the issue
- 2. early stakeholder involvement in strategic decisions
- 3. engagement of stakeholders in negotiating and influencing decisions
- 4. commitment of strategic and pivotal stakeholders to the project
- 5. partnership arrangements that favour equalization of power among the stakeholders
- 6. partnership arrangements that help build collective action

## **Implementing the Tool**

## Who is Involved?

This tool was designed to be used by members of a partnership who have decided to participate in self-evaluation.

## Steps for Using Tool

There are three options for using this tool:

- 1. The members conduct a group discussion and complete the 18 items of the tool together to come up with a collective evaluation.
- 2. Each member of the partnership answers the tool individually, and then discusses their responses as a group to come up with a collective evaluation.
- 3. Each member of the partnership answers the tool individually; members compile all the responses and then discuss the results together.

Particular attention may be paid to items for which results are less favourable.

These summaries are written by the <u>NCCMT</u> to condense and to provide an overview of the resources listed in the <u>Registry of Methods and Tools</u> and to give suggestions for their use in a public health context. For more information on individual methods and tools included in the review, please consult the authors/developers of the original resources.

For each item, respondents have to choose one of three options representing varying degrees of achievement of the item (strong, moderate, weak) in their partnership. Once the members have completed the 18 items of the tool, A, B and C responses can be compiled for each of the 18 items, for items related to each of the six requirements, or for all 18 items together.

Three types of partnership evaluation may be produced depending on how the tool is applied: a) a one-time evaluation, b) a longitudinal evaluation, or c) a summary portrait across multiple partnerships.

For this tool to work properly, the partnership should be: 1) more than a place for information-sharing and networking; 2) the venue for collaborative work on a specific project with resources.

**Evaluation and Measurement Characteristics** 

## Evaluation



Has been evaluated.

The validity of the original French tool has been evaluated. It has been found to be sensitive to variations in judgement, to allow good convergence among respondents within the same partnership and to distinguish partnerships with better and worse results on one or another of the requirements. A rigorous procedure of translation and adaptation – which combined expert committee formulation from two parallel translations and a pretest with target users- ensures equivalence of the English version with the original French tool.

## Validity



Validity properties meet accepted standards.

Construct validity and ecological validity were verified. The tool's validity is supported by the soundness of its theoretical model that is based on a series of case studies using the sociology of Actor-Network Theory, and numerous literature reviews of the functioning of partnerships.

## Reliability

Reliability not tested

## Methodological Rating

Not applicable

# **Tool Development**

# **Developers**

Angèle Bilodeau, Louise Potvin, Marilène Galarneau, Gilles Sénécal, Michel Fournier, and Jocelyne Bernier, Chaire de recherche du Canada Approches communautaires et inégalités de santé, Université de Montréal

## Method of Development

The tool is based on a theoretical model built from case studies that identified conditions associated with quality of partnerships. The authors used these findings to create a series of statements (items). The tool was pretested using the cognitive interviewing method. Its construct validity was tested with satisfactory results.

## Release Date

2017

**Contact Person** 

These summaries are written by the <u>NCCMT</u> to condense and to provide an overview of the resources listed in the <u>Registry of Methods and Tools</u> and to give suggestions for their use in a public health context. For more information on individual methods and tools included in the review, please consult the authors/developers of the original resources.

Title of Primary Resource	Self-Evaluation Tool for Action in Partnership
File Attachment	None
Web-link	https://en.healthnexus.ca/sites/en.healthnexus.ca/files/resources/selfevaluationtool.pdf
Reference	Bilodeau, A., Galarneau, M., Fournier, M., Potvin, L., Sénécal, G., & Bernier, J. (2017). Self-Evaluation Tool for Action in Partnership. Toronto, ON, Canada: Health Nexus. <u>https://en.healthnexus.ca/sites/en.healthnexus.ca/files/resources/selfevaluationtool.pdf</u> Bilodeau A, Galarneau M, Fournier M, Potvin L, Sénécal G, Bernier J. L' <i>Outil diagnostique de l'action en partenariat</i> . Montréal, QC, Canada : Chaire Approches communautaires et inégalités de santé (CACIS), 2008, revu en 2014. <u>http://chairecacis.org/fichiers/bilodeau_et_al.2008_2014_outil_diagnostique_action_en_partenariat_0.pdf</u>
Type of Material	Online resource
Format	On-line Access
Cost to Access	None.
Language	English, French
Conditions for Use	None

Title of Supplementary Resource	Diagnostic Tool for Action in Partnerships: Foundation, development and validation
File Attachment	None
Web-link	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21913588
Reference	Bilodeau, A., Galarneau, M., Fournier, M., & Potvin, L. (2011). L'Outil diagnostique de l'action en partenariat : Fondements, élaboration et validation [Diagnostic Tool for Action in Partnerships: Foundation, development and validation]. <i>Canadian Journal of</i> <i>Public Health</i> , 102(4):298-302.
Type of Material	Journal Article
Format	Periodical
Cost to Access	None.
Language	French
Conditions for Use	None

These summaries are written by the <u>NCCMT</u> to condense and to provide an overview of the resources listed in the <u>Registry of Methods and Tools</u> and to give suggestions for their use in a public health context. For more information on individual methods and tools included in the review, please consult the authors/developers of the original resources.