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Beyond the theory

• Our purpose today is to introduce you to a working model for building and maintaining collaborative partnerships.

• The model is designed to guide you in implementing a partnership approach to provided effective, locally based services.

• It is designed to make sense of the conceptual and professional complexities which accompany the calls for collaboration.
The Collaboration Rubric®

• The Rubric provides a “roadmap” for groups working together to solve problems affecting their clients. It provides a step-by-step picture of where organisations are up to in building partnerships and it gives clear guidance on what they need to do next.

• The Rubric is founded on sound research. It is a detailed model of how partnerships are built and sustained, moving from simple to more complex forms. The Rubric provides a framework for applying concepts such as ‘relational agency’ and ‘collective impact’ to real world solutions.
What is a Rubric?

Often used to describe a tool that lists criteria for evaluating what counts in a good piece of work (Goodrich, 1996:14)

“The best of our collective and professional judgment at this point in time in our small spot on the planet” (Griffin, 2009:13)

Sometimes referred to as a type of ‘capability maturity tool’ - describe best practice in terms of increasing levels of maturity (Lloyd Walker & Walker, 2011)
The Rubric describes the 18 factors which build effective partnerships - and it does this for each of the 4 different types of collaboration.

In this way agencies can build more complex types of collaboration using the 72 descriptors which make up the roadmap of reform.
The Collaboration Rubric®’s Two Fundamental Insights

Client Need should determine level of Collaboration

- Partnerships must reflect the complexity of clients’ needs: simple forms of collaboration can achieve substantial results for many clients; more complex forms are required for more complex needs.

- The Rubric identifies 4 different types of collaboration to guide agencies in making the right choice for them and their clients.

There are Three “Must Have” Drivers of Collaboration

- The success of any collaboration is sustained by 3 essential drivers – the Authorisation, the Capacity and the Shared Value which underpins the partnership.

- The Rubric identifies 18 factors which build Authorisation, Capacity and Shared Value to create the partnership they need.
Participant Group Activity
Three Questions

1. What practice changed as a result of the collaboration? (FEATURE)

2. What helped make your collaboration succeed? (ENABLER)

3. What stood in the way of it being the best that it could be? (BARRIER)
Four Types of Collaboration

Partnerships with Purpose

Create to accomplish social change

Collaborate to address service gaps

Coordinate to increase service accessibility

Communicate to better understand client issues and build trust

Increasing complexity of client issues

Increasing complexity of partnership
Communicate

To gain a better shared understanding of the issues confronting children, young people and their families and to build trust

- Multiple channels
- Information sharing
- Small scale problem solving
- Share resources
- Train together
- Show hospitality
Coordinate

To increase accessibility - especially for those who find formal services difficult to navigate

- With one or two others
- Streamline intake processes
- Warm referrals
- Assertive outreach (e.g. ‘out-servicing’, joint interventions, co-locating)
Collaborate

To address service gaps and emerging community issues, and provide more responsive ways of working, especially for highly vulnerable client groups

Larger number of players changing system
- Using existing resources or
- Writing joint funding submissions to increase resource base
- Sophisticated intake arrangements to achieve ‘no wrong door’
- Colocation of services
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Create
To build civil society and create new opportunities for social, economic and civil participation

Increased opportunities for participation and reduced reliance on the service system
Diverse mix of partners including
• community organisations
• public institutions,
• business and
• philanthropics
Three “Must Have” Drivers

May do ...(is there an authorising environment?)

Should do ...(is there a shared understanding of its public value?)

Can do ...(is there operational capacity to implement?)
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Three Drivers of Successful Organisational Collaboration

VALUE – SHARED VISION PURPOSE AND OUTCOMES
Partners share goals for their clients, share the planning for how they will achieve these goals and agree how they will measure their success.

CAPABILITY – THE CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT
Partners need to be willing and able to develop shared ways of working.

A STRONG AUTHORISING ENVIRONMENT
Partnerships need to be endorsed by funding agencies, policy makers, and influential stakeholders as well as being led and supported within the organisations.

These 3 drivers are described by 18 key factors in the Collaboration Rubric.
The Rubric Matrix - 18 Enabling Factors which build the 4 Types of Collaboration

The Rubric describes the 18 factors which build effective partnerships - and it does this for each of the 4 different types of collaboration.

In this way agencies can build more complex types of collaboration using the 72 descriptors which make up the roadmap of reform.
Participant Group Activity
Using the Rubric

- The Rubric can be used strategically by leaders to plan a partnership approach to delivering services.

- It can also be used analytically to give a detailed picture of the strengths and weaknesses of existing partnerships and to identify the next steps in reform.

- Used repeatedly over time it gives a clear picture of the progress of reform.
Using the Rubric

- Used in its survey form the Rubric data can be presented graphically to assist leaders in communicating with their staff to plan future reforms. The charts provide:
  - Detailed pictures of the current status of each of the 3 enabling areas
  - Comparisons with previous years achievements (when the Rubric is used repeatedly)
  - Comparisons with similar organisations
  - Priorities for future action

- The Rubric also provides rich qualitative information to create partnerships which are truly owned by the participants
The Rubric in Action

- In 2013 leaders of four CYFSP Networks commenced a partnership building process using the Rubric to analyse the status of their partnerships and identify ways to improve these over time. The project continued into 2014.

- The profile (approximately 140 participants, every program represented, equal senior and front line staff).
The Action Learning Cycle

ASK
Using the survey to gather information on the partnership

ANALYSE
Identifying the strengths and challenges of the partnership

BUILD
Acting on specific recommendations from the Rubric

REFLECT
Identifying the ways in which change can happen

THE RUBRIC MATRIX
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Outputs from the Rubric

4 types of data as part of the cycle of analysis, planning and implementation which underpins the change process.

1. Overall view of the current status of the partnership
2. Item by item analysis of the drivers of partnerships
3. Priorities for immediate action
4. Qualitative information on the content and direction of the change process in a structured set of categories.
The Results
Results

• In all cases the partnerships have improved their operations and the process has been welcomed by the agencies.

• Agencies report the use of the Rubric has had a significant impact on the status of their partnerships and has enabled them to improve the way they work together.

• Detailed reports on their partnership and follow up planning workshops have given them the opportunity to implement changes.

• Agencies have a clear picture of key issues including governance, leadership, staff engagement and best practice partnership techniques to build their capacity to achieve outcomes for clients.
Partnerships with Purpose

Create to accomplish social change

Collaborate to address service gaps

Coordinate to increase service accessibility

Communicate to better understand client issues and build trust

Increasing complexity of client issues

Increasing complexity of partnership

2014 ACT is here

2013 ACT was here
Outcomes of the Survey

ACT - wide

Overall substantial increase in the perceived levels of collaboration in the CYFSP Networks in the 3 areas of Capacity, Authority and Shared Value.

The greatest increases were in the “shared value” (governance) domain.
ACT Overall 2013

- Authority: 65%
- Shared Value: 40%
- Capacity: 64%
ACT Overall Change 2013-2014

75% Authority

55% Shared Value

73% Capacity
ACT Overall Change 2013-2014

- 75% Authority
- 55% Shared Value
- 73% Capacity
Information sharing practices - 2nd measure (C6)
Span of partnerships 2nd measure (C13)
Staff Development (C7)
Improving service accessibility (C8)
Key program connections (C9)
Span of partnerships
Information Practices (C12)
Budget management (C15)
Network Co-ordination (C5)
Summary
Middle Managers role (A3)
Staff commitment (A6)
Informal staff networks (A7)
Senior Executives leadership 3rd measure (A4)
Policy support (A1)
Senior executive leadership 2nd measure (A2)
Client views (A13)
Focused professional development (A12)
Collaboration History (A8)
Funders support (A14)
Conflicts resolution (A9)
Senior leadership (A5)
Agencies independence (A11)
Boards support (A10)

ACT Total of All Networks 2014 Authority to Partner
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Summary: Average across available items

Right partners (SV8)

Governance group (SV7)

Documented governance arrangements (SV6)

Share data (SV5)

Measuring outcomes (SV4)

Planning (SV3)

Related strategies (SV2)

Purpose statements (SV1)

ACT Total of All Networks 2014 Shared Value
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Priorities for Action

• In addition to providing an overview of the current status of the partnership the Rubric invites participants to identify priorities for action.

• This provides the network staff and leaders key information about the success of existing strategies and directions for the future.
Priorities for Action
Anonymous Network
2014/13
Shared Value

- Related strategies: 43% (2014), 35% (2013)
- Planning: 55% (2014), 64% (2013)
- Measuring success: 45% (2014), 32% (2013)
- Shared data: 35% (2014), 29% (2013)
- Agreed purpose statements: 35% (2014), 39% (2013)
- Right partners: 15% (2014), 29% (2013)
- Documented agreements: 15% (2014), 18% (2013)
Item by Item Comparisons

- The Rubric also offered the Networks an item by item comparison between their own performance and that of similar Networks or of the ACT overall.

- This approach provided Networks with the opportunity to reflect on their own priorities and on what was possible to achieve in their area.
Example Item by Item Comparison

Joint Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network 2014</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT 2014</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network 2013</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT 2013</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies to improve partnerships

• The open ended questions (the comments) seek to answer the question:

_What strategies do managers and staff think could improve the way partnerships are going in the Networks?_

• Open-ended questions allow participants to answer on their own terms, and are useful for exploring new areas. In this case these answers were helpful for the 2014 planning process.

• In all, 705 comments were received across the four Networks. A number of high-level categories have been developed to assist in the analysis, and identify the practice implications of survey responses.
Strategies to improve partnerships

For example the ACT project identified:

- *Develop shared practice knowledge* – common set of guiding principles, language, practice models, tools, case reviews, shared professional development

- *Continue to build relationships* – staff at all levels meet, exchange information, build trust

- *Improve accessibility of services* and address service gaps through more sophisticated forms of collaboration
Strategies to improve partnerships

For example the ACT project identified -

- **Strengthen key roles** - Network Coordinators / team and other operational leaders

- **Strengthen role of governance group** at the local level – shared statement of purpose, shared goals, extend local partnerships beyond program focus

- **Increase accountability** for participation in governance meetings
In Conclusion – our reflections

Good process underpins a success change to a genuinely collaborative model

- Importance of a structured process that allows for honest reflection on “how we are going” (partners become disenchanted if they cannot see this)

- Network ownership of the process is critical
Gaining the Authority to Collaborate

• Collaboration must be endorsed by leaders at all levels
• Yet big policy frameworks are often not joined up (child protection, housing, disability, education, early childhood, mental health & D& A). So local networks have difficulty attracting these key members to the table
• New types of leaders who understand collaborative governance – focus on relationship building (active listening and communication aimed at establishing shared meanings, determined problem solving and conflict resolution.
• Greater client focus to drive collaboration - involving clients in service design and evaluation etc
Building the Capacity to Collaborate

• Start with shared training to increase “relational agency” – (understanding and respecting each other’s knowledge and skills)

• Develop a shared practice framework

• Develop ways of sharing information about common clients with their permission.

• Develop ways of sharing of resources (including staff)
Creating the Shared Value of the Collaboration

• Lack of clear purpose – networks do not identify the problems that their collaboration seeks to address – absence of shared data
• Collaborative approaches rarely embedded in performance frameworks
• Getting the right partners - greater role at the table for universal services/ “first to know” and other government services such as education and health/ Centrelink
• Better identification of client issues through outcomes data (for example: re-substantiation rates, immunisation rates, literacy rates)
Conclusion

• Building collaboration at the local level – it is easy to publicly espouse but privately discount this overused term

• Devil of collaboration is in the detail

• A place for evidence informed action research tools to increase individual and collective accountability and to inspire creative partnerships
Low Cost Model of Implementation

The Rubric is customised to the needs of each partnership, therefore costs vary, but overall costs are low since it is designed to be owned and implemented by the partnership itself.

*Two models are available* –

**Consultancy** where the training, implementation, analysis, reporting and planning is led or directly managed by the consultants *(Recommended in the initial stages)*

**Certification and licensing** where the agency staff are trained and licensed to use the Rubric *(Recommended for later use)*
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