Background

The Internal Coalition Effectiveness (ICE©) instrument was administered to 38 members and leaders of the CS-CASH Center in August of 2013 to obtain follow-up data on the center’s organizational effectiveness for comparison to baseline data obtained in 2012. The ICE© instrument is part of the Evaluation Core’s overall design (Aim 3) whose purpose is to provide formative data to CS-CASH leaders on how to strengthen various aspects of the coalition toward goal achievement.

The ICE© instrument evaluates the six conceptual levels of coalition effectiveness in two ways: (1) from the perspective of members’ collaborative interactions, and (2) from the perspective of leadership influence.

Members are defined as those who participate in the essential work on a regular or intermittent basis (e.g., community participants, committee/project/team members, advisory/consultant/participating personnel, or other deemed as essential to the work of the project. There were 29 individuals identified as CS-CASH members.

Leaders are essential in facilitating the work to be accomplished. Leaders are defined as those in positions of accountability and include principal and co-investigators; chairs/co-chairs of committees, teams, project, boards; participating agency directors, etc. There were 11 individuals identified as CS-CASH leaders.

Constructs of this valid and reliable instrument include:

1. **Social Vision:** The degree of shared vision and mission that exists.
2. **Practices:** The extent to which skills/practices relative to agricultural health and safety are shared and contribute to sustained collaborative interaction and goal achievement.
3. **Knowledge and Training:** The degree to which knowledge in various aspects of agricultural health and safety are shared and contribute to sustained collaboration and goal achievement.
4. **Relationships:** The quality and quantity of interactions and relations that contribute to and sustain collaboration and goal achievement.
5. **Participation:** The extent of participation among members and leaders to ensure that goals are achieved, as well as the effectiveness of outreach work beyond the internal activities of the grant/project.
6. **Activities:** The degree to which aims/goals/workplan is implemented in its entirety and on a timely basis.

The ICE© instrument consists of 30 items. Survey respondents rate each item according to a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

Baseline Findings

In August 2013, the ICE© instruments were emailed using a link to Survey Monkey with a response of n =16. A reminder email was sent approximately one week later and the response rate was n = 9. Later in September 2013, a second email link to the survey was sent to non-
respondents (n =11) and after the third reminder email link, the response rate was n = 5. The combined total response was N = 32. (n = 10 leaders and n = 22 members).

**Overall Strengths/Opportunities:** Findings were compared to baseline data and showed that scores in each of the categories decreased slightly; however, the Center continues to have strong levels of effectiveness in each of the conceptual constructs of a coalition. In particular, there is a strong sense of shared *Social Vision and Mission* and highly collaborative *Relations* among Center members/leaders that promotes continued productivity and success for the Center.
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Members 2012-2013: A comparison between the two years is depicted in Figure 2. Among members only, ratings in each of the categories also decreased slightly in Year Two, but remain high overall. Members rated Activities lower than other categories indicating that Center members may be less certain about the degree to which aims/goals and the work plan are implemented in its entirety and on a timely basis.
LEADERS 2012-2013: A comparison of leader responses between the two years is depicted in Figure 3. Leaders continue to rate participation at the same high point with relations continuing as the highest construct.

![Figure 3. LEADER Responses  2012-2013](image-url)