

Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory

As discussed in *Strengthening Formal Systems through Collaboration* (Module 5)

The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory (Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001) is an assessment tool that helps provide an idea of how well interagency collaboration is doing in areas important to success. It captures a current snapshot of how the collaboration is functioning overall by assessing twenty factors that are grouped into the six categories of Environment, Member Characteristics, Process and Structure, Communication, Purpose, and Resources. The inventory can be used to help identify the possible strengths and weaknesses of individual factors in an organization's collaboration, or can be used to provide an overall score of collaborative success. This instrument is designed to be a concise and simple diagnostic tool that can assess groups' collaboration throughout the lifespan of a project.

Instructions

The inventory is made available to the public free of cost via their website, where it can be taken online or printed for distribution to others (<http://www.wilder.org/Wilder-Research/Research-Services/Pages/Wilder-Collaboration-Factors-Inventory.aspx>). Leaders can create a group that has a unique web link for faculty, staff, and collaborative partners to access the survey. This unique link ensures responses from collaboration members are kept together. Another option is to distribute the survey in an email or printed version for individuals to complete (*See The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory below*).

As individuals from the collaboration take the inventory, they rank the level in which they agree or disagree about each of the statements. If using the website, an average score for each of the 20 factors of a successful collaboration is calculated, based on the group's responses. Responses are also compiled in a final summary report of results (as shown in snapshot of website below). For the printed version, the average for each section is calculated. Typically, scores that are 4.0 or higher reflect strengths within the collaboration, 3.0 to 3.9 could be either strengths or weaknesses, depending on the context, and 2.9 or lower reflect a point of growth within the collaboration. These scores are a starting point to discuss the relationships between partners.

When reviewing the results, consider the following:

- What areas does the collaboration excel in?
- What areas need improvement?
- What can be done to improve the collaboration?
- For items that are low, are any particularly problematic?
- Overall, how strong are the scores?

This tool provides an opportunity to have discussions and get insights from team members on ways to improve the collaboration. It also helps get everyone on the same page. However, the responses are only beneficial if they are used to create solutions and improvements for the collaboration.

Snapshot of Website Inventory Results

Collaboration Factors Inventory

Thank you for completing the Inventory!

The figures below show your average score on each of 20 factors. Averages can range from 1 to 5. To better interpret your scores, refer to [Collaboration: What Makes It Work, Second Edition](#). If you do not own this publication, you may purchase it online by clicking on the link.
Bookmark this page to return to these scores later (please note that old scores may occasionally be cleared from this database). You may also print these summary scores or [your individual item responses](#) if you prefer.

Factor	Factor Average
History of collaboration or cooperation in the community	3.0
Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community	3.0
Favorable political and social climate	3.0
Mutual respect, understanding, and trust	3.0
Appropriate cross section of members	3.0
Members see collaboration as in their self-interest	3.0
Ability to compromise	3.0
Members share a stake in both process and outcome	3.0
Multiple layers of decision-making	3.0
Flexibility	3.0
Development of clear roles and policy guidelines	3.0
Adaptability	3.0
Appropriate pace of development	3.0
Open and frequent communication	3.0
Established informal relationships and communications links	3.0
Concrete, attainable goals and objectives	3.0
Shared vision	3.0
Unique purpose	3.0
Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time	3.0
Skilled leadership	3.0
What is working well in your collaborative? (optional)	
<i>[no response]</i>	
What needs improvement in your collaborative? (optional)	
<i>[no response]</i>	
<i>As a general rule...</i> Scores of 4.0 to 5.0 - strengths, don't need attention Scores of 3.0 to 3.9 - borderline, deserve discussion Scores of 1.0 to 2.9 - concerns that should be addressed	

THE WILDER COLLABORATION FACTORS INVENTORY ¹

Factor	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
History of collaboration or cooperation in the community	1. Agencies in our community have a history of working together.	1	2	3	4	5
	2. Trying to solve problems through collaboration has been common in this community. It's been done a lot before.	1	2	3	4	5
Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community	3. Leaders in this community who are not part of our collaborative group seem hopeful about what we can accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5
	4. Others (in this community) who are not a part of this collaboration would generally agree that the organizations involved in this collaborative project are the "right" organizations to make this work.	1	2	3	4	5
Favorable political and social climate	5. The political and social climate seems to be "right" for starting a collaborative project like this one.	1	2	3	4	5
	6. The time is right for this collaborative project.	1	2	3	4	5
Mutual respect, understanding, and trust	7. People involved in our collaboration always trust one another.	1	2	3	4	5
	8. I have a lot of respect for the other people involved in this collaboration.	1	2	3	4	5
Appropriate cross section of members	9. The people involved in our collaboration represent a cross section of those who have a stake in what we are trying to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5
	10. All the organizations that we need to be members of this collaborative group have become members of the group.	1	2	3	4	5
Members see collaboration as in their self-interest	11. My organization will benefit from being involved in this collaboration.	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to compromise	12. People involved in our collaboration are willing to compromise on important aspects of our project	1	2	3	4	5

¹ From *Collaboration: What makes it work?* (p. 37), by P. Mattessich, M. Murray-Close, and B. Monsey, 2001, Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Publishing Center. Reprinted with permission.

Members share a stake in both process and outcome	13. The organizations that belong to our collaborative group invest the right amount of time in our collaborative efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
	14. Everyone who is a member of our collaborative group wants this project to succeed.	1	2	3	4	5
	15. The level of commitment among the collaboration participants is high.	1	2	3	4	5
Multiple layers of participation	16. When the collaborative group makes major decisions, there is always enough time for members to take information back to their organizations to confer with colleagues about what the decision should be.	1	2	3	4	5
	17. Each of the people who participate in decisions in this collaborative group can speak for the entire organization they represent, not just a part.	1	2	3	4	5
Flexibility	18. There is a lot of flexibility when decisions are made; people are open to discussing different options.	1	2	3	4	5
	19. People in this collaborative group are open to different approaches to how we can do our work. They are willing to consider different ways of working.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of clear roles and policy guidelines	20. People in this collaborative group have a clear sense of their roles and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	21. There is a clear process for making decisions among the partners in this collaboration.	1	2	3	4	5
Adaptability	22. This collaboration is able to adapt to changing conditions, such as fewer funds than expected, changing political climate, or change in leadership.	1	2	3	4	5
	23. This group has the ability to survive even if it had to make major changes in its plans or add some new members in order to reach its goals.	1	2	3	4	5
Appropriate pace of development	24. This collaborative group has tried to take on the right amount of work at the right pace.	1	2	3	4	5
	25. We are currently able to keep up with the work necessary to coordinate all the people, organizations, and activities related to this collaborative project.	1	2	3	4	5

Open and frequent communication	26. People in this collaboration communicate openly with one another.	1	2	3	4	5
	27. I am informed as often as I should be about what goes on in the collaboration.	1	2	3	4	5
	28. The people who lead this collaborative group communicate well with the members.	1	2	3	4	5
Established informal relationships and communication links	29. Communication among the people in this collaborative group happens both at formal meetings and in informal ways.	1	2	3	4	5
	30. I personally have informal conversations about the project with others who are involved in this collaborative group.	1	2	3	4	5
Concrete, attainable goals and objectives	31. I have a clear understanding of what our collaboration is trying to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5
	32. People in our collaborative group know and understand our goals.	1	2	3	4	5
	33. People in our collaborative group have established reasonable goals.	1	2	3	4	5
Shared vision	34. The people in this collaborative group are dedicated to the idea that we can make this project work.	1	2	3	4	5
	35. My ideas about what we want to accomplish with this collaboration seem to be the same as the ideas of others.	1	2	3	4	5
Unique purpose	36. What we are trying to accomplish with our collaborative project would be difficult for any single organization to accomplish by itself.	1	2	3	4	5
	37. No other organization in the community is trying to do exactly what we are trying to do.	1	2	3	4	5
Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time	38. Our collaborative group had adequate funds to do what it wants to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5
	39. Our collaborative group has adequate “people power” to do what it wants to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5
Skilled leadership	40. The people in leadership positions for this collaboration have good skills for working with other people and organizations.	1	2	3	4	5