

# How Can Child Welfare Organizational Capacity Be Measured?

Evaluation Brief  
May 2017

## Introduction

This is the second of three briefs about organizational capacity in child welfare. It reviews measures of child welfare organizational capacities found in the literature, including measures of resources, infrastructure, knowledge and skills, organizational culture and climate, and engagement and partnership.

The first brief in the series, *What Is Organizational Capacity and What Does It Look Like in Child Welfare?* (James Bell Associates & ICF International, 2016), describes key capacities including resources, infrastructure, knowledge and skills, organizational culture and climate, and engagement and partnership. The third brief in the series, *How Do We Build Organizational Capacity in Child Welfare?* (James Bell Associates & ICF International, 2017), explores models for building capacity that have been applied in child welfare organizations, including the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA) Organizational Effectiveness Capacity Building Model; the Interactive Systems Framework (ISF), which incorporates Getting to Outcomes (GTO) and the Evidence Based System for Innovation Support (EBSIS); and the Children's Bureau (CB) Capacity Building Collaborative approach.

---

The Collaborative is a partnership of the Center for States, Center for Tribes, and Center for Courts. The cross-center evaluation examines the services and level of collaboration across the Centers.

---

## Background

The Children's Bureau's Child Welfare Capacity Building Collaborative uses a set of organizational capacities (figure 1) to guide its capacity-building efforts in state and tribal child welfare agencies and court systems (James Bell Associates, 2016).

Figure 1. Child Welfare Capacity Building Collaborative Organizational Capacities



## Existing Measures of Child Welfare Organizational Capacities

Although currently there are no instruments designed to assess all five primary child welfare organizational capacities, the following sections describe instruments that could be useful in evaluating specific capacities of interest. Each section includes relevant citations and descriptions of these measures. While not an exhaustive list of all instruments that address organizational capacities, these examples were found to incorporate assessment of at least some of the constructs that are consistent with child welfare capacities, as figure 1 illustrates.

### A. Measures of Child Welfare Resource and Infrastructure Capacities

The literature identified 10 components that describe resource needs in an organization: (1) predictable sources and adequate levels of funding (financial assets) and in-kind assets; (2) access to policy makers, funders, and public relations outlets to make the case

for increased funding; (3) adequate pay for staff; (4) adequate staffing levels (including the right type of staff to do the job), workload and caseload sizes; (5) adequate access to support services; (6) resources to provide new programming to meet client needs; (7) adequate facilities to house staff; (8) appropriate equipment to deliver services; (9) adequate levels of discretionary funds for special projects; and (10) adequate service array for clients (see James Bell Associates, 2016).

Infrastructure capacities the literature identifies include (1) structures in the organization that delineate policies, procedures, and practices; (2) structures that allow for strategic and tactical planning and successful decision-making frameworks; and (3) structures that operationalize management of finances, buildings and equipment, personnel, data systems (IT), and quality assurance/continuous quality improvement systems.

Child and Family Service Review systemic factors assess some aspects of the child welfare system, including resources and infrastructure. However, the

Child and Family Service Review was not developed for, and is not utilized for, capacity measurement purposes. The McKinsey Capacity Assessment Grid (McKinsey and Company, 2001) has been widely used in nonprofit organizations to assess capacities (Guthrie & Preston, 2005). The tool evaluates resource capacities along with some aspects of infrastructure and organizational culture and climate. Items related to infrastructure and resource capacities are often embedded in implementation measures and resource capacities. Recent work on implementation of child welfare initiatives has underscored the importance of resources (Lambert,

Richards, & Merrill, 2016), including an emphasis on staffing, and functioning implementation teams to manage change initiatives (Armstrong et al., 2014; Flashpohler, Duffy, Wandersman, Stillman, & Maras, 2008; Permanency Innovations Initiative Training and Technical Assistance Project & Permanency Innovations Initiative Evaluation Team, 2013; Wandersman et al., 2008).

Table 1 identifies several of the more salient measures that could be considered to measure child welfare resource and infrastructure capacity.

Table 1. Instruments That Assess Resource and Infrastructure Capacities

RESOURCES AND INFRASTRUCTURE		Capacity Constructs				
Author(s)/Publications and Instrument Access	Content and Applicability	Resources	Infrastructure	Knowledge and Skills	Culture and Climate	Engagement & Partnership
<b>Child and Family Services Reviews</b>						
Children’s Bureau <a href="https://training.cfsportal.org/resources/1159">https://training.cfsportal.org/resources/1159</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources (e.g., service array and resource development)</li> <li>Infrastructure (e.g., information system, case review system, quality assurance system)</li> <li>Engagement and partnership (e.g., agency responsiveness to the community—foster and adoptive parents)</li> </ul>	X	X	na	na	X
<b>McKinsey Capacity Assessment/Marguerite Casey Foundation</b>						
McKinsey and Company (2001) <a href="https://caseygrants.org/what_we_are_learning/capacity-building-tools/">https://caseygrants.org/what_we_are_learning/capacity-building-tools/</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources (e.g., funding, staffing levels, technology/facilities)</li> <li>Infrastructure (e.g., organizational processes, performance measures)</li> <li>Engagement and partnership (e.g., community presence, partnership)</li> <li>High-level organizational culture and climate (e.g., vision)</li> </ul>	X	X	na	X	na
<b>Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practice</b>						
Bertram, Blase, & Fixsen (2015) <a href="http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resources/implementation-drivers-assessing-best-practices">http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resources/implementation-drivers-assessing-best-practices</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drivers assessment designed to be completed through expert facilitation with a group of implementation team members; consensus scores used for each driver component</li> <li>Specific operationalization of infrastructure capacity in support of innovation; some items address aspects of organizational culture and climate (e.g., leadership involvement, development of champions)</li> </ul>	na	X	na	X	na

## Implementation Process Measure

Armstrong et al. (2014) See article	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measure designed to serve a broad array of child welfare change initiatives</li> <li>• Expands the NIRN model to incorporate engagement and partnership (e.g., stakeholder engagement); knowledge and skills (e.g., cultural competency); and organizational culture and climate (e.g., shared vision, leadership)</li> </ul>	na	X	na	X	X
--	--	----	---	----	---	---

### B. Measures of Child Welfare Knowledge and Skills Capacities

Measures of child welfare knowledge and skills assess competencies explicitly related to job responsibilities in child welfare among staff. Instruments that assess knowledge and skills are therefore highly specific and closely aligned to the content area of focus. Several attitudes and traits have been shown to facilitate child welfare workers' ability to gain knowledge and skills (Yankeelov, Barbee, Sullivan, & Antle, 2009), to transfer the learning to practice in the field (Antle, Barbee, & van Zyl, 2008), and to practice with integrity (Johnson, Antle, & Barbee, 2009). While they are not measures of knowledge, they do assess aspects of organizational culture that influence incorporation of new learning, and they can

be useful in exploring evaluation of changes in knowledge and skills; they should be used in conjunction with instruments that measure changes in knowledge and skills (e.g., pre- and posttesting of knowledge, skill observation, cultural competency changes).

Several instruments, outlined in table 2, have been developed that assess an individual's cultural competence by tapping into prejudicial attitudes and/or understanding of discrimination, privilege, and other key concepts that promote cultural competence with good psychometric properties (e.g., Siegel et al., 2011).

Table 2. Instruments That Assess Knowledge and Skills Capacities

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS: INDIVIDUAL INFLUENCES			Capacity Constructs				
Author(s)/Publications Access	Psychometrics	Content and Applicability	Resources	Infrastructure	Knowledge & Skills	Culture & Climate	Engagement & Partnership
<b>Learning Readiness Scale</b>							
van Zyl & van Zyl (2000); Antle et al. (2008) Available from developer	Validity: Face Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 items assess readiness to learn and have been found to predict knowledge gain and transfer of learning</li> </ul>	na	na	X	X	na
<b>Transfer of Learning Scale</b>							
Curry, Lawler, Donnenwirth, & Bergeron (2011) Available from developer	Validity: Face Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 33 items assess perception of trainee that his or her learning is supported by organization, supervisor, coworkers, and his or her willingness and ability to apply what he or she has learned after returning to the field</li> </ul>	na	na	X	X	na

Big Five Personality							
Goldberg (1992) Access article	Validity: Face, Content, Construct, Predictive Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40 items to determine levels of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience and emotional stability</li> <li>Conscientiousness predicted gains in knowledge in training</li> </ul>	na	na	X	X	na

Self-Efficacy							
Ellett (2000) Access article	Validity: Face, Construct Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine levels of self-efficacy to do the job</li> <li>Predicts behavior on the job</li> </ul>	na	na	X	X	na

## CULTURAL COMPETENCE

CoBRRAS (Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale)							
Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne (2000) Access article	Validity: Face Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20 items assess awareness of racial privilege, institutional forms of racial discrimination, and general racial discrimination</li> </ul>	na	na	X	na	na

Intolerant Schema Measure							
Aosved, Long, & Voller (2009) Access article	Validity: Face Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>54 items with 6 subscales assessing sexism, racism, sexual preference prejudice, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance</li> </ul>	na	na	X	na	na

Implicit Bias Test							
Nosek, Greenwald, & Banaji (2005) <a href="https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html">https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html</a>	Validity: Construct, Predictive Reliability: Internal Consistency Test-Retest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computer-assisted forced-choice test using words and pictures to tap into unconscious biases on several dimensions including race, gender, and sexual orientation</li> </ul>	na	na	X	na	na

Note: na = not applicable for this particular instrument. Psychometric information was not available for these four measures that assess resources and infrastructure capacities.

### C. Measures of Child Welfare Organizational Culture and Climate Capacities

Organizational culture and climate have been studied extensively in child welfare settings. The term organizational culture refers to behavioral expectations that workers are expected to meet that prescribe work behavior and establish priorities for the organization; organizational climate refers to individual employees' perceptions of the psychological impact of the work environment on their own functioning and well-being (Glisson, Green, & Williams, 2012). An aspect of culture and climate is organizational readiness—that is, the capacity for change to take place in an organization. This includes

an openness of workers and leaders to change and a willingness to try new practices and make efforts to support innovations.

#### *Organizational Culture and Climate Measures*

Studies using a validated measure called the Organizational Social Context Measure have addressed the six key variables (proficiency, resistance, rigidity, engagement, functionality, and stress) that comprise climate and culture (Glisson et al., 2012) and their impact on performance (Glisson, Hemmelgarn, Green, & Williams, 2013) and on outcomes of safety, permanency, and well-being (Williams & Glisson, 2014). Several measures address

the leadership's (e.g., executive directors, senior management) presence and impact on this capacity. This means leaders who (1) are dedicated to the mission, vision, and goals of the organization; (2) are skilled in strategic thinking, analysis, financial judgment, technical leadership, adaptive leadership, and ensuring effective performance so as to reach outcomes; (3) are "on board" during change and implementation efforts; (4) manage existing resources and gain additional resources to support the work; (5) change structures as necessary to support innovation; (6) communicate clearly with internal and external stakeholders about partnership

and innovation; (7) manage group dynamics; (8) value and are skilled in cultural competence; (9) support a healthy organizational culture and climate dedicated to learning, experimentation, and building on staff strengths; and (10) hold staff accountable through evaluation and continuous quality assurance processes.

Table 3 provides information relevant to organizational culture and climate measures, including relevant citations, psychometric information, and descriptions of instruments.

Table 3. Instruments That Assess Organizational Culture and Climate

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE			Capacity Constructs				
Author(s)/Publications Access	Psychometrics	Content and Applicability	Resources	Infrastructure	Knowledge & Skills	Culture & Climate	Engagement & Partnership
<b>Organizational Social Context Measure</b>							
Glisson, Williams, Green, Hemmelgarn, & Hoagwood (2014)  Contact developers	Validity: Face Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Items assess culture items of proficiency, resistance, and rigidity, and climate items of engagement, functionality, and stress; also includes work attitudes such as satisfaction and organizational commitment</li> </ul>	na	na	na	X	na
<b>Learning Organizational Measure</b>							
Harvard Business School (Garvin, Edmondson, & Gino, 2008)  See article	Validity: Face	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures constructs in Senge's Learning Organizational Theory</li> </ul>	na	na	na	X	na
<b>Child Welfare Organizational Culture Inventory</b>							
Westbrook, Ellett, & Asberg (2012)  Contact Dr. Ellett	Validity: Face Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>64 items that measure some dimensions of organizational culture in child welfare agencies, including supervisory support, administrative support, professionalism, collegiality, organizational ethos, autonomy, and beliefs about parents</li> </ul>	na	na	X	X	na
<b>Professional Organization Culture Questionnaire</b>							
Westbrook, Ellett, & DeWeaver (2009), based on Bobbett, Olivier, Ellett, Rugutt, & Cavanagh (1998)  Contact Dr. Ellett	Validity: Face, Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>34 items that assess leadership, collegial learning, and professional commitment</li> </ul>	na	na	X	X	na

## Texas Christian University Survey of Organizational Functioning

Greener, Joe, Simpson, Rowan- Szal, & Lehman (2007) <a href="http://ibr.tcu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/SOF-sg.pdf">http://ibr.tcu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/SOF-sg.pdf</a>	Validity: Face, Construct, Content, Predictive Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>162 items measuring job attitudes (e.g., burnout, satisfaction, director leadership); workplace practices (e.g., peer collaboration, collective responsibility, outcomes); motivational factors; resources; staff attributes; and organizational climate</li> </ul>	X	na	X	X	na
--	---	--	---	----	---	---	----

## Survey of Organizational Excellence

Lauderdale & Kelly (1999); Collins-Camargo, Ellett, & Lester (2012) See developer	Validity: Face Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>86-item scale with 20 constructs including self-reflection and learning, group work, work setting, organizational features, community, and person</li> </ul>	X	X	na	X	na
--	---	---	---	---	----	---	----

## COHA (Comprehensive Organizational Health Assessment)

Potter, Leake, Longworth-Reed, Altschul, & Rienks (2016) See developers	Validity: Face Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>97 items broken down into subscales, many of which originated in the literature but were modified by this research team over time</li> </ul>	na	na	X	X	na
--	---	---	----	----	---	---	----

Note: na = not applicable for this particular instrument. Psychometric information was not available for these four measures that assess resources and infrastructure capacities.

### Organizational Readiness Measures

Organizational readiness to change is organizational members' collective motivation and capability to implement change. It is theorized that when readiness is at an optimum level, staff are more likely to initiate changes, exert efforts in support of these changes, and demonstrate persistence in the face of obstacles or setbacks (Weiner, 2009). As a result, building staff's engagement and commitment prior to change efforts is vital in ensuring new practices can effectively take root. Recent evidence also suggests increased readiness leads to more thorough implementation of programs (Bice, Brown, & Parry, 2014).

Many instruments have been developed to assess organizational readiness in the fields of public health and mental health services delivery (Helfrich, Li, Sharp, & Sales, 2009; Lehman, Greener, & Simpson, 2002; Shea, Jacobs, Esserman, Bruce, & Weiner, 2014; Duckers, Wagner, & Groenewegan, 2008).

In the area of child welfare, an instrument for assessing organizational readiness to implement permanency initiatives specifically in child welfare settings was developed under the CB's Permanency Innovations Initiative (Permanency Innovations

Initiative Training and Technical Assistance Project & Permanency Innovations Initiative Evaluation Team, 2013).

Provider attitudes toward innovations and evidence-based practices can affect the implementation of innovations (Aarons et al., 2010). The Evidence-Based Practice Assessment Scale, which measures attitudes toward evidence-based practices, can be used either as a readiness measure, when the change involves introducing and embedding an EBP, or as an implementation and dissemination tool.

Table 4 on the next page lists the most relevant instruments that can be used to assess organizational readiness for change.

Table 4. Instruments That Assess Organizational Readiness for Change

ORGANIZATIONAL READINESS FOR CHANGE			Capacity Constructs				
Author(s)/Publications Access	Psychometrics	Content and Applicability	Resources	Infrastructure	Knowledge & Skills	Culture & Climate	Engagement & Partnership
<b>Organizational Readiness for Change Assessment Instrument</b>							
Helfrich et al. (2009); Hagedorn & Heideman (2010)  Available from developers; view form at <a href="http://www.implementation-science.com/content/supplementary/1748-5908-4-38-s1.pdf">http://www.implementation-science.com/content/supplementary/1748-5908-4-38-s1.pdf</a>	Validity: Face Validity Reliability: Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluative, research capacity, culture, and climate in general, and with regard to proposed innovation; implementation planning and support (e.g., leadership, resources, infrastructure); and communication to management and field</li> <li>Specific to health care field; would require translation to serve child welfare</li> </ul>	na	X	na	X	X
<b>TCU Organizational Readiness for Change Scale (TCU-ORC)/TCU ORC-D4 (Treatment Staff Version)</b>							
Lehman et al. (2002); Greener et al. (2007); Courtney, Joe, Rowan-Szal, & Simpson (2007)  Open – forms available (TCU ORC-D4)  <a href="http://ibr.tcu.edu/forms/organizational-staff-assessments/">http://ibr.tcu.edu/forms/organizational-staff-assessments/</a>	Validity: Predictive Reliability: Internal Consistency Test-Retest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human resource systems, training needs, culture and climate, adequacy of resources</li> <li>Specific to mental health and substance abuse; would require translation to serve child welfare</li> <li>Does not capture staff perceptions regarding implementation of new practices</li> </ul>	X	X	X	X	na
<b>Organizational Readiness for Implementing Change</b>							
Shea et al. (2014)  See article; full text access: <a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3904699/">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3904699/</a>	Inter-item Consistency, High Inter-rater Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief 12-item measure assessing attitudes of staff toward innovation in practice and toward confidence and commitment of organization</li> <li>Does not assess resource or infrastructure</li> </ul>	na	na	na	X	na
<b>Duckers Organizational Measure</b>							
Duckers et al. (2008)  Table in article contains instrument questions; full text access:  <a href="http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6963/8/172">http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6963/8/172</a>	Internal Item Consistency; Divergent Validity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief (15 items) measure focusing on functioning of project team, leadership support of project, and support from external change agents</li> <li>Questions focused on influence of external change agent could be useful to assess consultant/liason-tailored services support</li> </ul>	X	na	na	X	X



Permanency Innovations Initiative Organizational Readiness Survey						
Adapted from the OCM (Patterson et al., 2005) and the Evidence-Based Practice Assessment Scale (Aarons et al., 2010)	na	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals' perception of skills to make change, organization's and individuals' benefit from change, and leadership support for change</li> <li>Specific measure to assess permanency innovations in child welfare</li> </ul>	na	na	X	na
Readiness for Organizational Change						
Holt, Armenakis, Field, & Harris (2007)  Contac developer: <a href="http://misweb.cbi.msstate.edu/~COBI/faculty/professor.shtml?dholt">http://misweb.cbi.msstate.edu/~COBI/faculty/professor.shtml?dholt</a>	Construct Validity, Internal Consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals' change confidence, whether individual will benefit from change, need for change, organization benefit from change</li> <li>Self-efficacy scales useful to assess whether staff need additional training/coaching support</li> </ul>	na	na	X	na
Evidence-Based Practice: The Evidence-Based Practice Attitude Scale						
Aarons et al. (2010)  Article contains the instrument in appendix; full text access at <a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15224451">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15224451</a>	Face Validity, Content Validity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focused on individual's acceptance of evidence-based practices</li> </ul>	na	na	X	X

Note: na = not applicable for this particular instrument. Psychometric information was not available for these four measures that assess resources and infrastructure capacities.

**D. Measures of Engagement and Partnership Capacities**

The literature identifies three main types of engagement and partnership capacities: (1) responsiveness to the community, (2) internal and external communication, and (3) collaboration—within organizations' units, across units, with external partnering organizations, and with cultural groups representing clients.

The ability to engage and partner with other organizations is central to child welfare systems. Child welfare agencies, dependency courts, tribal communities, mental health service providers, medical providers, juvenile justice systems, educational systems, and other private and social service agencies routinely interact with one another while serving children and families. This interaction

necessitates the ability to engage in several partnerships to function effectively and to provide continuity of the services required to meet the needs of children and families. Partnerships among agencies can occur at numerous levels, ranging from loose levels of collaboration, such as networking, to deeper working relationships that result in true collaborations characterized by frequent communication and joint decision making (Frey, Lohmeier, Lee, & Tollefson, 2006). Collaboration and partnership are also of critical importance when an organization plans to change its practice.

Several measures have been developed to assess the depth and quality of collaborative functioning. Table 5 on the next page provides the most relevant instruments found in the literature that can be used to assess engagement and partnership capacities.

Table 5. Instruments That Assess Engagement and Partnership Capacities

ENGAGEMENT AND PARTNERSHIP			Capacity Constructs				
Author(s)/Publications Access	Psychometrics	Content and Applicability	Resources	Infrastructure	Knowledge & Skills	Culture & Climate	Engagement & Partnership
<b>The Levels of Collaboration Survey</b>							
Frey et al. (2006) <a href="http://signetwork.org/content/page_assets/content_page_68/MeasuringCollaborationAmongGrantPartnersArticle.pdf">http://signetwork.org/content/page_assets/content_page_68/MeasuringCollaborationAmongGrantPartnersArticle.pdf</a>	Preliminary test-retest reliability of instrument has been established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures the level of collaboration among agencies using a six-point scale to indicate depth of partnership, ranging from networking to collaboration</li> <li>Adaptable <b>content</b> useful for inter- and intra-agency collaboration assessments</li> <li>Brief measure; respondent burden is minimal</li> </ul>	na	na	na	na	X
<b>The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory</b>							
Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey (2001) <a href="http://wilderresearch.org/tools/cfi/index.php">http://wilderresearch.org/tools/cfi/index.php</a>	Instrument used and tested for reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40 <b>items</b> measuring quality of organizational interactions and collaboration success</li> <li>Encourages <b>deeper</b> thought into what organizational processes should look like</li> <li>Includes questions regarding both interpersonal and interagency relationships</li> </ul>	na	na	na	na	X
<b>Network Analysis</b>							
Provan, Veazie, Teufel-Shone, & Huddleston (2004) <a href="http://hnp.sagepub.com/content/5/2/174.abstract">http://hnp.sagepub.com/content/5/2/174.abstract</a>	na	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Behaviorally focused; examines whether certain types of interactions occurred between organizations (e.g., sharing of information or resources, referrals made or received); meant to be customized to groups that are being assessed; indicates whether particular benefits or drawbacks resulted from the partnership</li> <li>Depth/level of partnerships and quality of relationships are minimally addressed</li> </ul>	na	na	na	na	X
<b>Partnership Self-Assessment Tool Questionnaire</b>							
Lasker, Weiss, & Miller (2001) <a href="http://www.nccmt.ca/uploads/registry/PSA%20Tool%20Questionnaire.pdf">http://www.nccmt.ca/uploads/registry/PSA%20Tool%20Questionnaire.pdf</a>	Construct Validity, Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instrument meant for partnerships that have (1) been in existence for at least 6 months, (2) begun to take action to implement their plans, and (3) have at least 5 active partners</li> </ul>	na	na	na	na	X

Note: na = not applicable for this particular instrument. Psychometric information was not available for these four measures that assess resources and infrastructure capacities.



This brief was developed by James Bell Associates and ICF under Contract No. HHSP233201400026C, funded by the Children's Bureau, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and does not necessarily reflect its official views. For more information, see [capacity.childwelfare.gov/about/](http://capacity.childwelfare.gov/about/).

## References

- Aarons, G. A., Glisson, C., Hoagwood, K., Kelleher, K., Landsverk, J., & Cafri, G. (2010). Psychometric properties and U.S. national norms of the Evidence-based Practice Attitude Scale (EBPAS). *Psychological Assessment, 22*(2), 356–365. doi:10.1037/a0019188.
- Antle, B. F., Barbee, A. P., & van Zyl, M. A. (2008). A comprehensive model for child welfare training evaluation. *Children and Youth Services Review, 9*, 1063–1080.
- Aosved, A. C., Long, P. J., & Voller, E. K. (2009). Measuring sexism, racism, sexual prejudice, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance: The intolerant schema measure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(10), 2321–2354.
- Armstrong, M. I., McCrae, J. S., Graef, M. I., Richards, T., Lambert, D., Bright, C. L., & Sowell, C. (2014). Development and initial findings of an implementation process measure for child welfare system change. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 8*(1), 94–117.
- Bertram, R. M., Blase, K. A., & Fixsen, D. L. (2015). Improving programs and outcomes implementation frameworks and organization change. *Research on Social Work Practice, 25*(4), 477–487.
- Bice, M. R., Brown, S. L., & Parry, T. (2014). Retrospective evaluation of factors that influence the implementation of CATCH in Southern Illinois schools. *Health Promotion Practice, 15*(5), 706–713. doi:10.1177/1524839914526206
- Bobbett, J., Olivier, D. H., Ellett, C. D., Rugutt, J. K., & Cavanagh, R. (1998). *Cross-cultural replications of a multi-dimensional measure of teacher perceptions of school culture*. Presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Houston, TX.
- Collins-Camargo, C., Ellett, C. D., & Lester, C. (2012). Measuring organizational effectiveness to develop strategies to promote retention in public child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*(1), 289–295.
- Courtney, K. O., Joe, J. W., Rowan-Szal, G. A., & Simpson, D. D. (2007). Using organizational assessment as a tool for program change. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 33*(2), 131–137. doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2006.12.024
- Curry, D., Lawler, M., Donnenwirth, J., & Bergeron, M. (2011). Application potential of professional learning inventory: APPLI-33. *Training and Development in Human Services, 6*, 1–11.
- Duckers, M., Wagner, C., & Groenewegan, P. (2008). Developing and testing an instrument to measure presence of conditions of successful implementation of quality improvement collaboratives. *BMC Health Services Research, 8*, 172.
- Ellett, A. J. (2000). *Human caring, self-efficacy beliefs, and professional organizational culture correlates of employee retention in child welfare*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- Flashpohler, P., Duffy, J., Wandersman, A., Stillman, L., & Maras, M.A. (2008). Unpacking prevention capacity: An intersection of research-to-practice models and community-centered models. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41*, 182–196.
- Frey, B. B., Lohmeier, J. H., Lee, S. W., & Tollefson, N. (2006). Measuring collaboration among grant partners. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*(3), 383–392. doi:10.1177/1098214006290356
- Garvin, D. A., Edmondson, A. C., & Gino, F. (2008). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review, 86*(3), 109–116.
- Glisson, C., Green, P., & Williams, N. J. (2012). Assessing the organizational social context (OSC) of child welfare systems: Implications for research and practice. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 36*(9), 621–632.
- Glisson, C., Hemmelgarn, A., Green, P., & Williams, N. J. (2013). Randomized trial of the availability, responsiveness and continuity (ARC) organizational intervention for

- improving youth outcomes in community mental health programs. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 52(5), 493–500.
- Glisson, C., Williams, N. J., Green, P., Hemmelgarn, A., & Hoagwood, K. (2014). The organizational social context of mental health Medicaid waiver programs with family support services: Implications for research and practice. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 41(1), 32–42.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26–42.
- Greener, J. M., Joe, G. W., Simpson, D. D., Rowan-Szal, G. A., & Lehman, W. E. (2007). Influence of organizational functioning on client engagement in treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 33(2), 139–147.
- Guthrie, K., & Preston, A. (2005). *Building capacity while assessing it: Three foundations' experiences using the McKinsey capacity assessment grid*. Seattle, WA: Blueprint Research & Design.
- Hagedorn, H. J., & Heideman, P. W. (2010). The relationship between baseline organizational readiness to change assessment subscale scores and implementation of hepatitis prevention services in substance use disorders treatment clinics: A case study. *Implementation Science*, 5(1), 46. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-5-46
- Helfrich, C. D., Li, Y. F., Sharp, N. D., & Sales, A. E. (2009). Organizational readiness to change assessment (ORCA): Development of an instrument based on the promoting action on research in health services (PARIHS) Framework. *Implementation Science*, 4 (1), 38. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-38
- Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Field, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232–255. doi:10.1177/0021886306295295
- James Bell Associates & ICF International. (2016). *What is organizational capacity and what does it look like in child welfare?* (Evaluation Brief). Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau (Contract no. HHSP233201400026C).
- James Bell Associates & ICF International. (2017). *How do we build organizational capacity in child welfare?* (Evaluation Brief). Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau (Contract no. HHSP233201400026C).
- Johnson, L. M., Antle, B. F., & Barbee, A. P. (2009). Addressing disproportionality and disparity in child welfare: Evaluation of an anti-racism training for community service providers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(6), 688–696.
- Lambert, D., Richards, T., & Merrill, T. (2016). Keys to implementation of child welfare systems change. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 10, 132–151.
- Lasker, R. D., Weiss, E. S., & Miller, R. (2001). Partnership synergy: A practical framework for studying and strengthening the collaborative advantage. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 79(2), 179–205, III–IV.
- Lauderdale, M. L., & Kelly, M. J. (1999). Technology and continuing education in social work. *Professional Development—Philadelphia*, 2, 10–18.
- Lehman, W. E. K., Greener, J. M., & Simpson, D. D. (2002). Assessing organizational readiness for change. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 22(4), 197–209.
- Mattessich, P., Murray-Close, M., & Monsey, B. (2001). *Collaboration: What makes it work?* (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: Fieldstone Alliance.
- McKinsey and Company (2001). *Effective capacity building in nonprofit organizations*. Washington, DC: Venture Philanthropy Partners.
- Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(1), 59.
- Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: II. Method variables and construct validity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(2), 166–180.
- Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., . . . Wallace, A. M. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: Links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 379–408. doi:10.1002/job.312
- Permanency Innovations Initiative Training and Technical Assistance Project & Permanency Innovations Initiative Evaluation Team. (2013). *The PII approach: Building implementation and evaluation capacity in child welfare*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau, and Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation.
- Potter, C. C., Leake, R., Longworth-Reed, L., Altschul, I., & Rienks, S. (2016). Measuring organizational health in child

- welfare agencies. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 61, 31–39.
- Provan, K. G., Veazie, M. A., Teufel-Shone, N. I., & Huddleston, C. (2004). Network analysis as a tool for assessing and building community capacity for provision of chronic disease services. *Health Promotion Practice*, 5(2), 174–181. doi:10.1177/1524839903259303
- Shea, C. M., Jacobs, S. R., Esserman, D. A., Bruce, K., & Weiner, B. J. (2014). Organizational readiness for implementing change: A psychometric assessment of a new measure. *Implementation Science*, 9(1), 7. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-9-7
- Siegel, C. E., Haugland, G., Laska, E. M., Reid-Rose, L. M., Tang, D. I., Wanderling, J. A., . . . Case, B. G. (2011). The Nathan Kline Institute Cultural Competency Assessment Scale: Psychometrics and implications for disparity reduction. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 38(2), 120–130.
- van Zyl, M. A., & van Zyl, K. (2000). *The learning benefits inventory*. Louisville, KY: University of Louisville.
- Wandersman, A., Duffy, J., Flaspohler, P., Noonan, R., Lubell, K., Stillman, L., . . . Saul, J. (2008). Bridging the gap between prevention research and practice: The interactive systems framework for dissemination and implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(3–4), 171–181.
- Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science* 4(1), 67. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-67
- Westbrook, T. M., Ellett, A. J., & Asberg, K. (2012). Predicting public child welfare Employees' intentions to remain employed with the child welfare organizational culture inventory. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(7), 1214–1221.
- Westbrook, T. M., Ellett, A. J., & Deweaver, K. W. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of organizational culture in public child welfare agencies. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 19(6), 730–741.
- Williams, N. J., & Glisson, C. (2014). Testing a theory of organizational culture, climate and youth outcomes in child welfare systems: A United States national study. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38(4), 757–767. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.09.003
- Yankeelov, P. A., Barbee, A. P., Sullivan, D., & Antle, B. F. (2009). Individual and organizational factors in job retention in Kentucky's child welfare agency. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(5), 547–554.