

Measure Name	Citation	Number of Items	Subscales/Domains	Reliability	Validity	Type (e.g., Likert)	Scoring Manual	Actual Measure Items Available from Listed Source	Discipline
Professional Working Relationships	Adams, A., Bond, S., & Arber, S. (1995). Development and validation of scales to measure organizational features of acute hospital wards. <i>International Journal of Nursing Studies</i> , 32 (6), 612-627.	26	3 subscales: 1. Collaboration with Medical Staff (9 items) 2. Collaboration with Other Health Care Professionals (7 items) 3. Cohesion Amongst Nurses (10 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Collaboration with Medical Staff (0.86) 2. Collaboration with Other Health Care Professionals (0.84) 3. Cohesion Amongst Nurses (0.91) Test-Retest Coefficients: 1. Collaboration with Medical Staff (0.83) 2. Collaboration with Other Health Care Professionals (0.70) 3. Cohesion Amongst Nurses (0.84)	Yes (Criterion and construct validity; factor analysis)	Not available from this source	No	Yes	
The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory	Amherst H. Wilder Foundation. (2001). <i>The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory</i> . Saint Paul, MN: Author.	40	20 Factors: 1. History of collaboration or cooperation in the community (2 items) 2. Collaborative group seen as a legitimate leader in the community (2 items) 3. Favorable political and social climate (2 items) 4. Mutual respect, understanding, and trust (2 items) 5. Appropriate cross section of members (2 items) 6. Members see collaborative as in their self-interest (1 item) 7. Ability to compromise (1 item) 8. Members share a stake in both process and outcome (3 items) 9. Multiple layers of participation (2 items) 10. Flexibility (2 items) 11. Development of clear roles and policy guidelines (2 items) 12. Adaptability (2 items) 13. Appropriate pace of development (2 items) 14. Open and frequent communication (3 items) 15. Established informal relationships and communication links (2 items) 16. Concrete, attainable goals and objectives (3 items) 17. Shared vision (2 items) 18. Unique purpose (2 items) 19. Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time (2 items) 20. Skilled leadership (1 item)	Not reported	Not reported	5-point Likert	Yes	Yes	
Team Climate Inventory	Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: Development and validation of the team climate inventory. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i> , 19 (3), 235-258.	61	4 Subscales: 1. Vision (12 items) 2. Participative Safety (14 items) 3. Task Orientation (17 items) 4. Support for Innovation (4 items)	Cronbach's Alphas range between 0.84 and 0.94	Yes (predictive validity; factor analysis)	5-point and 7-point Likert	No	Yes	
Untitled	Ansari, W. E., & Phillips, C. J. (2001). Interprofessional collaboration: A stakeholder approach to evaluation of voluntary participation in a community partnership. <i>Journal of Interprofessional Cares</i> , 15 (4), 351-368.	33	8 Domains: 1. Benefits of participation (11 items) 2. Costs of participation (5 items) 3. Satisfaction with the partnership (4 items) 4. Resource allocation satisfaction (1 item) 5. Ownership (4 items) 6. Community representation (1 item) 7. Contributions (4 items) 8. Commitment (3 items)	Not reported	Not reported	7-point Likert	No	No	
Collaborative Practice Scales	Baggs, J. G. & Ryan, S. A. (1990). Intensive care unit nurse-physician collaboration and nurse satisfaction. <i>Nursing Economics</i> , 8 (6), 386-392. This article uses this scale, and the original citation for the scale is: Weiss, S. J., & Davis, H. P. (1985). Validity and reliability of the collaborative practice scales. <i>Nursing Research</i> , 34, 299-305. The original work is not available.	Not available from this source	None	Cronbach's Alpha: 0.83	Not reported	Not available from this source	No	No	
Collaboration and Satisfaction About Care Decisions	Baggs, J.G. (1994). Development of an Instrument to measure collaboration and satisfaction about care decisions. <i>Journal of Advanced Nursing</i> , 20, 176-182.	7	None	Cronbach's Alpha: 0.93	Yes (Criterion, construct, and content validity; factor analysis)	7-point Likert	No	Yes	
The Collaborative Member Survey	Barile, J. P., Darnell, A. J., Erickson, S. W., & Weaver, S. R. (2012). Multilevel measurement of dimensions of collaborative functioning in a network of collaboratives that promote child and family well-being. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 49, 270-282.	56	5 Domains (number of items per domain is unclear): 1. Participatory planning process 2. Internal communication 3. Leadership effectiveness 4. Family member involvement 5. Budgeting	Not reported	Yes (factor analysis)	5-point Likert	No	No	
Community School Assessment Checklist	Blank, M. J., & Langford, B. H. (2000). <i>Strengthening partnerships: Community School Assessment Checklist</i> . Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools and The Finance Project.	9	None	Not reported	Not reported	5-point Likert	No	Yes	
Collaboration Checklist	Borden, L. M., & Perkins, D. F. (1999). Assessing your collaboration: A self-evaluation tool. <i>Journal of Extension</i> , 37. Retrieved from http://www.joe.org .	12	None	Not reported	Not reported	5-point Likert	No	Yes	

Measure Name	Citation	Number of Items	Subscales/Domains	Reliability	Validity	Type (e.g., Likert)	Scoring Manual	Actual Measure Items Available from Listed Source	Discipline
Community Organizational Assessment Tool	Bright, R. D. (1998). <i>Community Organizational Assessment Tool</i> . Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension, Family Living Programs.	23	9 Subscales: 1. Mission, Purpose, and Goals (4 items) 2. Organizational Structure (5 items) 3. Board Participation (1 item) 4. Membership Participation (1 item) 5. Group Relationships (3 items) 6. Leadership Effectiveness (5 items) 7. Fiscal Resources (31 item) 8. Community Networking and Coalition Building (1 item) 9. Organizational Assessment (1 item)	Not reported	Not reported	Yes/No, followed by 3-point Likert, for each item	No	Yes	
Index of Interdisciplinary Collaboration	Bronstein, L. R. (2002). Index of Interdisciplinary Collaboration. <i>Social Work Research, 26</i> (2), 113-1232	42	5 Domains: 1. Interdependence (13 items) 2. Newly Created Professional Activities(6 items) 3. Flexibility (5 items) 4. Collective Ownership of Goals (8 items) 5. Reflection on Process (9 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Interdependence (0.78) 2. Newly Created Professional Activities (0.75) 3. Flexibility (0.62) 4. Collective Ownership of Goals (0.80) 5. Reflection on Process (0.82) Test-Retest Coefficient for Entire Scale: 0.82	Yes (face validity; factor analysis)	5-point Likert	No	No	
The Coalition Effectiveness Inventory (CEI)	Butterfoss, F. D. (1994). <i>The Coalition Effectiveness Inventory</i> . Columbia, South Carolina: Center for Pediatric Research, Center for Health Promotion, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Care.	75	3 Domains: 1. Coalition Participants (37 items) 2. Coalition Structures (9 items) 3. Coalition Processes (29 items)	Not reported	Not reported	3-point Likert	No	Yes	
Partnership Self-Assessment Tool	Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health. (n.d.). Partnership Self-Assessment Tool. Retrieved from http://cacsh.org	67	11 Domains: 1. Synergy (9 items) 2. Leadership (11 items) 3. Efficiency (3 items) 4. Administration and Management (9 items) 5. Non-financial Resources (6 items) 6. Financial and Other Capital Resources (3 items) 7. Decision-Making (3 items) 8. Benefits of Participation (11 items) 9. Drawbacks of Participation (6 items) 10. Comparing Benefits and Drawbacks (1 items) 11. Satisfaction with Participation (5 items)	Not reported	Not reported	5-point Likert	Yes	Yes	
Partnership Self-Assessment Tool	Cramm, J. M., Strating, M. M. H., & Nieboer, A. P. (2011). Development and validation of a short version of the Partnership Self-Assessment Tool (PSAT) among professionals in Dutch disease-management partnerships. <i>BMC, 4</i> , 224-332.	29	4 Subscales: 1. Leadership (12 items) 2. Efficiency (3 items) 3. Administration and Management (9 items) 4. Non-financial Resources (6 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Leadership (0.87) 2. Efficiency (0.75) 3. Administration and Management (0.83) 4. Non-financial Resources (0.84)	Yes (Convergent validity; factor analysis)	5-point Likert	Yes	Yes	
Coalition Web-Based Self-Report Questionnaire	Feinberg, M. E., Gomez, B. J., Puddy, R. W., & Greenberg, M. T. (2008). Evaluation and community prevention coalitions: Validation of an integrated web-based/technical assistance consultant model. <i>Health Education & Behavior, 35</i> (1), 9-21.	Wave 1: 60 Wave 2: 66	14 Scales: 1. Community readiness (7 items in Wave 1; NA in Wave 2) 2. Board directedness (5 items in Wave 1; 5 items in Wave 2) 3. Staff-board communication (2 items in Wave 1; 2 items in Wave 2) 4. Board efficiency (3 items in Wave 1; 3 items in Wave 2) 5. Board cohesion (2 items in Wave 1; 3 items in Wave 2) 6. Board conflict (3 items in Wave 1; 2 items in Wave 2) 7. Board leadership style (3 items in Wave 1; 3 items in Wave 2) 8. Board leadership competence (5 items in Wave 1; 5 items in Wave 2) 9. Board membership (2 items in Wave 1; 2 items in Wave 2) 10. Barriers (13 items in Wave 1; 11 items in Wave 2) 11. Implement fidelity (4 items in Wave 1; 5 items in Wave 2) 12. Sustainability (3 items in Wave 1; 10 items in Wave 2) 13. TA needed (8 items in Wave 1; 10 items in Wave 2) 14. Community support (NA in Wave 1; 5 items in Wave 2) Wave 1 and wave 2 are different measures, with wave 2 being a refinement of wave 1.	Wave 1: Cronbach's Alphas range from 0.54 to 0.86 and r ranges from 0.40 to 0.84 Wave 2: Cronbach's Alphas range from 0.72 to 0.92 and r ranges from 0.46 to 0.76 Test-Retest Coefficients: 1. Community readiness (not reported) 2. Board directedness (0.78) 3. Staff-board communication (0.65) 4. Board efficiency (0.65) 5. Board cohesion (0.80) 6. Board conflict (0.38) 7. Board leadership style (0.56) 8. Board leadership competence (0.89) 9. Board membership (0.52) 10. Barriers (0.86) 11. Implement fidelity (not reported) 12. Sustainability (0.77) 13. TA needed (0.70) 14. Community support (0.62)	Yes (convergent validity)	Wave 1: 4-point and 5-point Likert; yes/no Wave 2: 7-point Likert; yes/no	No	No	
Strategic Alliance Formative Assessment Rubric (SAFAR)	Gajda, R. (2006). Safe schools through strategic alliances: How assessment of collaboration enhances school violence prevention and response. <i>Journal of School Violence, 5</i> (1), 63-80. Gajda, R. (2004). Utilizing collaboration theory to evaluate strategic alliances. <i>American Journal of Evaluation, 25</i> (1), 65-77.	Not available from this source	None	Not reported	Not reported	5-point (1-networking; 2-cooperating; 3-partnering; 4-merging; 5-unifying)	No	Yes	
Meeting Effectiveness Inventory	Goodman, R. M.,Wandersman, A., Chinman, M., Imm, P., & Morrissey, E. (1996). An ecological assessment of community-based interventions for prevention and health promotion: Approaches to measuring community coalitions. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology, 24</i> (1), 33-61.	10	None	Not reported	Not reported	5-point Likert	No	Yes	

Measure Name	Citation	Number of Items	Subscales/Domains	Reliability	Validity	Type (e.g., Likert)	Scoring Manual	Actual Measure Items Available from Listed Source	Discipline
Untitled	Hays, C. E., Hays, S. P., DeVille, J. O., & Mulhall, P. F. (2000). Capacity for effectiveness: the relationship between coalition structure and community impact. <i>Evaluation and Program Planning</i> , 23, 373–379.	6	None	Cronbach's Alpha: 0.87	Not reported	5-point Likert	No	No	
Process Quality Rating Scale	Hicks, D., & Larson, C., (n.d.). The Process Quality Rating Scale. Used in the Early Childhood Councils of Colorado.	20	4 Subscales: 1. Structural Integrity (13 items) 2. Authenticity (3 items) 3. Equity (2 items) 4. Treatment (2 items)	Not reported	Not reported	6-point Likert	No (but did indicate that 4.25 or higher indicates a "good" collaborative process)	Yes	
Untitled	Kegler, M. C., & Swan, D. W. (2011). An initial attempt at operationalizing and testing the community coalition action theory. <i>Health Education & Behavior</i> , 38 (3), 261-270.	Not available from this source	5 Domains: 1. Coalition membership (unclear) 2. Coalition processes (8 items) 3. Leadership and staffing (16 items) 4. Indicators of member engagement (unclear) 5. Indicators of community capacity (13 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Coalition membership (Not reported) 2. Coalition processes (0.73 to 0.86) 3. Leadership and staffing (0.88 and 0.92) 4. Indicators of member engagement (0.78 and 0.92) 5. Indicators of community capacity (0.70 to 0.93)	Not reported	4 and 5-point Likert	No	No	
Untitled	Kegler, M. C., Steckler, A., McLeroy, K., & Malek, S. H. (1998). Factors that contribute to effective community health promotion coalitions: A study of 10 Project ASSIST coalitions in North Carolina. <i>Health Education & Behaviors</i> , 25 (3), 338-353.	55	14 Coalition Factors: 1. Leadership (6 items) 2. Decision making (4 items) 3. Communication (4 items) 4. Conflict (1 item) 5. Costs and benefits (1 item) 6. Organizational climate (8 items) 7. Staffing (8 items) 8. Capacity building (1 item) 9. Member profile (11 items) 10. Recruitment pattern (2 items) 11. Complexity (NA) 12. Formalization (NA) 13. Community capacity (2 items) 14. Coalition effectiveness (7 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Leadership (0.86) 2. Decision making (0.84) 3. Communication (0.87) 4. Conflict (not applicable) 5. Costs and benefits (not applicable) 6. Organizational climate (0.83 to 0.85) 7. Staffing (.83) 8. Capacity building (not applicable) 9. Member profile (not applicable) 10. Recruitment pattern (not applicable) 11. Complexity (not reported) 12. Formalization (not reported) 13. Community capacity (not reported) 14. Coalition effectiveness (not reported)	Yes (construct validity, measured by reporting associations between subscales, which ranged from not significant to .89)	4 and 5-point Likert; open-ended	No	No	
Coalition Self-Assessment Survey	Kenney, R., & Sofaer, S. (2000). <i>Allies against asthma: Coalition Self-Assessment Survey</i> . New York, New York: School of Public Affairs, Baruch College, City University of New York.	41	None	Not reported	Not reported	Open-ended; yes/no; 3-point, 4-point, and 5-point Likert	No	Yes	
Index of Interprofessional Team Collaboration for Expanded School Mental Health (IITC-ESMH)	Mellin, E. A., Bronstein, L., Anderson-Butcher, D., Amorose, A. J., Ball, A., & Green, J. (2010). Measuring interprofessional team collaboration in expanded school mental health: Model refinement and scale development. <i>Journal of Interprofessional Care</i> , 24(5), 514-523.	26	4 Domains: 1. Reflection on Process (8 items) 2. Professional Flexibility (9 items) 3. Newly Created Professional Activities (5 items) 4. Role Interdependence (4 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Reflection on Process (0.91) 2. Professional Flexibility (0.91) 3. Newly Created Professional Activities (0.84) 4. Role Interdependence (0.80)	Yes (content validity, factor analysis)	5-point Likert	No	No	
Collaboration Practice Assessment Tool (CPAT)	Office of Interprofessional Education and Practice, Queen's University. (2009). <i>Collaboration Practice Assessment Tool</i> . Kingston, Ontario, Canada: Author.	56	8 Domains: 1. Mission, Meaningful Purpose, Goals (8 items) 2. General Relationship (8 items) 3. Team Leadership (9 items) 4. General Role Responsibilities, Autonomy (10 items) 5. Communication and Information Exchange (6 items) 6. Community Linkages and Coordination of Care (4 items) 7. Decision-Making and Conflict Management (6 items) 8. Patient Involvement (5 items)	Not reported	Yes (factor analysis)	Not available from this source	No	No	
Working Together Scale	OMNI Institute (1992). <i>Working Together: A Profile of Collaboration</i> . Denver, CO: Author.	40	5 Subscales: 1. The Context of Collaboration (3 items) 2. The Structure of the Collaboration (12 items) 3. Collaboration Members (8 items) 4. The Collaborative Process (11 items) 5. The Results of the Collaboration (6 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. The Context of Collaboration (0.46) 2. The Structure of the Collaboration (0.77) 3. Collaboration Measures (0.87) 4. The Collaborative Process (0.85) 5. The Results of the Collaboration (0.80)	Yes (face validity)	4-point Likert	Yes	Yes	
The Pacific Regional Cancer Coalition Partner Assessment Survey	Sy, A. U., Heckert, K. A., Buenconsejo-Lum, L., Hedson, J., Tamang, S., & Palafox, N. (2011). An assessment of the Pacific Regional Cancer Coalition: Outcomes and implications of a regional coalition internal and external assessment. <i>Hawaii Medical Journal</i> , 70 (11), 47-53.	44	6 Characteristics: 1. Satisfaction (4 items) 2. Resource Sharing (8 items) 3. Partnership (3 items) 4. Sustainability (5 items) 5. Use of Findings (3 items) 6. Regionalism (5 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Satisfaction (0.690) 2. Resource Sharing (0.849) 3. Partnership (0.764) 4. Sustainability (0.758) 5. Use of Findings (0.699) 6. Regionalism (0.705)	Not reported	Close-ended (38 items; no further information was provided about the nature of the close-ended items) and open ended (6 items)	No	No	
The Pacific Regional Cancer Coalition Self-Assessment Survey	Sy, A. U., Heckert, K. A., Buenconsejo-Lum, L., Hedson, J., Tamang, S., & Palafox, N. (2011). An assessment of the Pacific Regional Cancer Coalition: Outcomes and implications of a regional coalition internal and external assessment. <i>Hawaii Medical Journal</i> , 70 (11), 47-53.	47	9 Characteristics: 1. Communication (6 items) 2. Respect (6 items) 3. Partnership (7 items) 4. Organization (5 items) 5. Satisfaction (5 items) 6. Regionalism (4 items) 7. Sustainability (7 items) 8. Decision-Making (3 items) 9. Resource Sharing (4 items)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Communication (0.833) 2. Respect (0.905) 3. Partnership (0.870) 4. Organization (0.804) 5. Satisfaction (0.912) 6. Regionalism (0.702) 7. Sustainability (0.780) 8. Decision-Making (0.679) 9. Resource Sharing (0.816)	Not reported	Close-ended (no further information was provided about the nature of the close-ended items)	No	No	

Measure Name	Citation	Number of Items	Subscales/Domains	Reliability	Validity	Type (e.g., Likert)	Scoring Manual	Actual Measure Items Available from Listed Source	Discipline
Untitled	The Center for Prevention Research and Development, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois (1999). <i>Building coalition effectiveness for sustainability: An evaluation rubric</i> . Champaign, IL: Author.	35	5 Scales: 1. Community Ownership (10 items) 2. Organizational Effectiveness (10 items) 3. Comprehensive Prevention Approach (6 items) 4. Commitment to Results Orientation (6 items) 5. Linkage Relationship between Coalition and Communities CANI Funded Prevention Programs (3 items)	Not reported	Not reported	Rating (low, medium, high)	No	Yes	
Untitled	Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (2008). Linking collaboration processes and outcomes: Foundations for advancing empirical theory. In L. B. Bingham & R. O'Leary (Eds.), <i>Big ideas in collaborative public management</i> (pp. 97-120). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe Publishers.	17	5 Scales: 1. Joint Decision Making (2 items) 2. Administration (4 items) 3. Autonomy (3 items) 4. Mutuality (5 items) 5. Trust (3 items)	Not reported	Not reported	7-point Likert	No	Yes	
Untitled	Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (2009). Conceptualizing and measuring collaboration. <i>Journal of Public and Administration Research and Theory</i> , 19 (1), 23-56.	56	5 Scales: 1. Governance (12 items) 2. Administration (11 items) 3. Autonomy (10 items) 4. Mutuality (13 items) 5. Norms (10 items)	Not reported	Yes (construct validity, factor analysis)	7-point Likert	No	Yes	
Coalition Self-Assessment Tool	Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation. (n.d.). <i>Coalition Self-Assessment Tool</i> . Calverton, MD: Author.	77	4 Subscales: 1. Coalition Participants (39 items) 2. Coalition Structure (9 items) 3. Coalition Process (7 items) 4. Stages of Coalition Development (22 items)	Not reported	Not reported	3-point Likert	No	Yes	
Untitled	Weiss, E. S., Anderson, R. M., & Lasker, R. D. (2002). Making the most of collaboration: exploring the relationship between partnership synergy and partnership functioning. <i>Health Education and Behavior</i> , 29 (6), 683-698.	45	8 Scales: 1. Synergy (9 items) 2. Leadership (10 items) 3. Administration & Management (10 items) 4. Efficiency (3 items) 5. Nonfinancial Resources (6 items) 6. Partner Involvement Challenges (3 items) 7. Community-related Challenges (3 items) 8. Duration of Partnership (1 item)	Cronbach's Alphas: 1. Synergy (0.93) 2. Leadership (0.97) 3. Administration & Management (0.94) 4. Efficiency (0.82) 5. Nonfinancial Resources (0.83) 6. Partner Involvement Challenges (0.85) 7. Community-related Challenges (0.83) 8. Duration of Partnership (Not applicable)	Yes (construct validity, for synergy scale only)	3-point, 4-point, and 5-point Likert	No	Yes	

*(Numbers in parentheses indicate which subscales address the component)

Measure Name	Citation	Early Childhood Development	Healthcare	Public Administration/ Public Policy	Psychology	Other	*Inputs to Collaboration: Stakeholder	*Inputs to Collaboration: Stakeholder			*Inputs to Collaboration: Design Components	Correct number and representation of stakeholders	Clear decision-making rules	Delineated roles and responsibilities	Clear meeting design
								Organizational time and resource commitment to the collaboration	Sending a powerful agent	Level of commitment to the collaborative mission					
Professional Working Relationships	Adams, A., Bond, S., & Arber, S. (1995). Development and validation of scales to measure organizational features of acute hospital wards. <i>International Journal of Nursing Studies</i> , 32 (6), 612-627.		X										X (1,2)		
The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory	Amherst H. Wilder Foundation. (2001). <i>The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory</i> . Saint Paul, MN: Author.					X (community programming)		X (8,19)	X (9)	X (8,17)		X (5)	X (11)	X (11)	
Team Climate Inventory	Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: Development and validation of the team climate inventory. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i> , 19 (3), 235-258.		X					X (3, 4)		X (1)					
Untitled	Ansari, W. E., & Phillips, C.J. (2001). Interprofessional collaboration: A stakeholder approach to evaluation of voluntary participation in a community partnership. <i>Journal of Interprofessional Cares</i> , 15 (4), 351-368.					X (community programming)		X (4,7)		X (5,8)		X (6)			
Collaborative Practice Scales	Baggs, J. G. & Ryan, S. A. (1990). Intensive care unit nurse-physician collaboration and nurse satisfaction. <i>Nursing Economics</i> , 8 (6), 386-392. This article uses this scale, and the original citation for the scale is: Weiss, S. J., & Davis, H. P. (1985). Validity and reliability of the collaborative practice scales. <i>Nursing Research</i> , 34, 299-305. The original work is not available.		X												
Collaboration and Satisfaction About Care Decisions	Baggs, J.G. (1994). Development of an Instrument to measure collaboration and satisfaction about care decisions. <i>Journal of Advanced Nursing</i> , 20, 176-182.		X									X			
The Collaborative Member Survey	Barile, J. P., Darnell, A. J., Erickson, S. W., & Weaver, S. R. (2012). Multilevel measurement of dimensions of collaborative functioning in a network of collaboratives that promote child and family well-being. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 49, 270-282.				X			X (5)				X (1)			
Community School Assessment Checklist	Blank, M. J., & Langford, B. H. (2000). <i>Strengthening partnerships: Community School Assessment Checklist</i> . Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools and The Finance Project.					X (education)		X	X	X				X	
Collaboration Checklist	Borden, L. M., & Perkins, D. F. (1999). Assessing your collaboration: A self-evaluation tool. <i>Journal of Extension</i> , 37. Retrieved from http://www.joe.org .			X				X				X			

Measure Name	Citation	Early Childhood Development	Healthcare	Public Administration/ Public Policy	Psychology	Other	*Inputs to Collaboration: Stakeholder	*Inputs to Collaboration: Stakeholder			*Inputs to Collaboration: Design Components	*Inputs to Collaboration: Design Components			
								Organizational time and resource commitment to the collaboration	Sending a powerful agent	Level of commitment to the collaborative mission		Correct number and representation of stakeholders	Clear decision-making rules	Delineated roles and responsibilities	Clear meeting design
Community Organizational Assessment Tool	Bright, R. D. (1998). <i>Community Organizational Assessment Tool</i> . Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension, Family Living Programs.					X (community programming)		X (3,4,7)		X (3,4)		X (3,4)	X (6)	X (2,6)	
Index of Interdisciplinary Collaboration	Bronstein, L. R. (2002). Index of Interdisciplinary Collaboration. <i>Social Work Research, 26</i> (2), 113-1232					X (social work)									
The Coalition Effectiveness Inventory (CEI)	Butterfoss, F. D. (1994). <i>The Coalition Effectiveness Inventory</i> . Columbia, South Carolina: Center for Pediatric Research, Center for Health Promotion, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Care.		X					X (1,2,3)	X (3)	X (1)		X (1,3)	X (2,3)	X (1,2)	X (1,2)
Partnership Self-Assessment Tool	Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health. (n.d.). Partnership Self-Assessment Tool. Retrieved from http://cacsh.org		X					X (3,6)		X (1,2)		X (2)		X (4)	X (4)
Partnership Self-Assessment Tool	Cramm, J. M., Strating, M. M. H., & Nieboer, A. P. (2011). Development and validation of a short version of the Partnership Self-Assessment Tool (PSAT) among professionals in Dutch disease-management partnerships. <i>BMC, 4</i> , 224-332.		X					X (2)		X (1)		X (1)		X (3)	X (3)
Coalition Web-Based Self-Report Questionnaire	Feinberg, M. E., Gomez, B. J., Puddy, R. W., & Greenberg, M. T. (2008). Evaluation and community prevention coalitions: Validation of an integrated web-based/technical assistance consultant model. <i>Health Education & Behavior, 35</i> (1), 9-21.					X (community programming)									
Strategic Alliance Formative Assessment Rubric (SAFAR)	Gajda, R. (2006). Safe schools through strategic alliances: How assessment of collaboration enhances school violence prevention and response. <i>Journal of School Violence, 5</i> (1), 63-80. Gajda, R. (2004). Utilizing collaboration theory to evaluate strategic alliances. <i>American Journal of Evaluation, 25</i> (1), 65-77.				X			X		X			X	X	
Meeting Effectiveness Inventory	Goodman, R. M., Wandersman, A., Chinman, M., Imm, P., & Morrissey, E. (1996). An ecological assessment of community-based interventions for prevention and health promotion: Approaches to measuring community coalitions. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology, 24</i> (1), 33-61.				X								X		X

Measure Name	Citation	Early Childhood Development	Healthcare	Public Administration/ Public Policy	Psychology	Other	*Inputs to Collaboration: Stakeholder	Organizational time and resource commitment to the collaboration			*Inputs to Collaboration: Design Components	Correct number and representation of stakeholders	Clear decision-making rules	Delineated roles and responsibilities	Clear meeting design
								Sending a powerful agent	Level of commitment to the collaborative mission						
Untitled	The Center for Prevention Research and Development, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois (1999). <i>Building coalition effectiveness for sustainability: An evaluation rubric</i> . Champaign, IL: Author.			X				X (1,2)	X (1,2)	X (2)		X (1)		X (2)	
Untitled	Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (2008). Linking collaboration processes and outcomes: Foundations for advancing empirical theory. In L. B. Bingham & R. O'Leary (Eds.), <i>Big ideas in collaborative public management</i> (pp. 97-120). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe Publishers.			X				X (4)	X (2)			X (2)			
Untitled	Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (2009). Conceptualizing and measuring collaboration. <i>Journal of Public and Administration Research and Theory</i> , 19 (1), 23-56.			X				X (1,3,4,5)	X (1,2)	X (4,5)		X (2)	X (1)	X (2)	
Coalition Self-Assessment Tool	Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation. (n.d.). <i>Coalition Self-Assessment Tool</i> . Calverton, MD: Author.					X (community development)		X (1,4)	X (1)	X (1)		X (4)	X (3)	X (1) X (2)	
Untitled	Weiss, E. S., Anderson, R. M., & Lasker, R. D. (2002). Making the most of collaboration: exploring the relationship between partnership synergy and partnership functioning. <i>Health Education and Behavior</i> , 29 (6), 683-698.		X					X (3,4)	X (1)			X (1)			

*(Numbers in parentheses indicate which subscales address the component)

Measure Name	Citation	Explicated purpose for the collaboration	*Process Components	Norms	Inclusion	Authenticity	Equality	Problem Focus	Support	Identification	Facilitation	Generative Purpose
Professional Working Relationships	Adams, A., Bond, S., & Arber, S. (1995). Development and validation of scales to measure organizational features of acute hospital wards. <i>International Journal of Nursing Studies</i> , 32 (6), 612-627.					X (1)	X (1)			X (1)		
The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory	Amherst H. Wilder Foundation. (2001). <i>The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory</i> . Saint Paul, MN: Author.	X (16)			X (5)		X (10)		X (2,3,19)	X (9,16)		X (16)
Team Climate Inventory	Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: Development and validation of the team climate inventory. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i> , 19 (3), 235-258.	X (1)					X (2)				X(3,4)	
Untitled	Ansari, W. E., & Phillips, C.J. (2001). Interprofessional collaboration: A stakeholder approach to evaluation of voluntary participation in a community partnership. <i>Journal of Interprofessional Cares</i> , 15 (4), 351-368.				X (6)		X (5)		X (4,7)			
Collaborative Practice Scales	Baggs, J. G. & Ryan, S. A. (1990). Intensive care unit nurse-physician collaboration and nurse satisfaction. <i>Nursing Economics</i> , 8 (6), 386-392. This article uses this scale, and the original citation for the scale is: Weiss, S. J., & Davis, H. P. (1985). Validity and reliability of the collaborative practice scales. <i>Nursing Research</i> , 34, 299-305. The original work is not available.											
Collaboration and Satisfaction About Care Decisions	Baggs, J.G. (1994). Development of an Instrument to measure collaboration and satisfaction about care decisions. <i>Journal of Advanced Nursing</i> , 20, 176-182.						X			X	X	
The Collaborative Member Survey	Barile, J. P., Darnell, A. J., Erickson, S. W., & Weaver, S. R. (2012). Multilevel measurement of dimensions of collaborative functioning in a network of collaboratives that promote child and family well-being. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 49, 270-282.			X (2)	X (1)				X (5)			
Community School Assessment Checklist	Blank, M. J., & Langford, B. H. (2000). <i>Strengthening partnerships: Community School Assessment Checklist</i> . Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools and The Finance Project.	X			X				X			X
Collaboration Checklist	Borden, L. M., & Perkins, D. F. (1999). Assessing your collaboration: A self-evaluation tool. <i>Journal of Extension</i> , 37. Retrieved from http://www.joe.org .	X		X		X		X	X	X	X	X

Measure Name	Citation	Explicated purpose for the collaboration	* Process Components	Norms	Inclusion	Authenticity	Equality	Problem Focus	Support	Identification	Facilitation	Generative Purpose
Community Organizational Assessment Tool	Bright, R. D. (1998). <i>Community Organizational Assessment Tool</i> . Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension, Family Living Programs.	X (1,2)		X (5)	X (3,4)		X (6)		X (7)	X (1,2,6)		X (1)
Index of Interdisciplinary Collaboration	Bronstein, L. R. (2002). Index of Interdisciplinary Collaboration. <i>Social Work Research, 26</i> (2), 113-1232											
The Coalition Effectiveness Inventory (CEI)	Butterfoss, F. D. (1994). <i>The Coalition Effectiveness Inventory</i> . Columbia, South Carolina: Center for Pediatric Research, Center for Health Promotion, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Care.	X (2,3)		X (1,2,3)	X (1,3)	X (3)	X (1)		X (1,3)			
Partnership Self-Assessment Tool	Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health. (n.d.). Partnership Self-Assessment Tool. Retrieved from http://cacsh.org			X (1,2)	X (2)	X (7)	X (2,7)		X (2,3,4,5,6)	X (1,2)		
Partnership Self-Assessment Tool	Cramm, J. M., Strating, M. M. H., & Nieboer, A. P. (2011). Development and validation of a short version of the Partnership Self-Assessment Tool (PSAT) among professionals in Dutch disease-management partnerships. <i>BMC, 4</i> , 224-332.			X (1)	X (1)		X (1)		X (1,2,3,4)	X (1)		
Coalition Web-Based Self-Report Questionnaire	Feinberg, M. E., Gomez, B. J., Puddy, R. W., & Greenberg, M. T. (2008). Evaluation and community prevention coalitions: Validation of an integrated web-based/technical assistance consultant model. <i>Health Education & Behavior, 35</i> (1), 9-21.											
Strategic Alliance Formative Assessment Rubric (SAFAR)	Gajda, R. (2006). Safe schools through strategic alliances: How assessment of collaboration enhances school violence prevention and response. <i>Journal of School Violence, 5</i> (1), 63-80. Gajda, R. (2004). Utilizing collaboration theory to evaluate strategic alliances. <i>American Journal of Evaluation, 25</i> (1), 65-77.	X					X		X		X	
Meeting Effectiveness Inventory	Goodman, R. M., Wandersman, A., Chinman, M., Imm, P., & Morrissey, E. (1996). An ecological assessment of community-based interventions for prevention and health promotion: Approaches to measuring community coalitions. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology, 24</i> (1), 33-61.						X				X	

Measure Name	Citation	Explicated purpose for the collaboration	* Process Components	Norms	Inclusion	Authenticity	Equality	Problem Focus	Support	Identification	Facilitation	Generative Purpose
Untitled	The Center for Prevention Research and Development, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois (1999). <i>Building coalition effectiveness for sustainability: An evaluation rubric</i> . Champaign, IL: Author.	X (1,2)			X (1)	X (5)	X (1,2)	X (1,3)	X (1,2,4)	X (1,2,3)	X (2)	X (1,3)
Untitled	Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (2008). Linking collaboration processes and outcomes: Foundations for advancing empirical theory. In L. B. Bingham & R. O'Leary (Eds.), <i>Big ideas in collaborative public management</i> (pp. 97-120). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe Publishers.	X (2)					X (1)		X (4)	X (2,3)		
Untitled	Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (2009). Conceptualizing and measuring collaboration. <i>Journal of Public and Administration Research and Theory</i> , 19 (1), 23-56.	X (1,2)		X (1)	X (1)	X (1)	x (1)	x (1)	X (1,4)	X (1,2,3,4,5)	X (1,2,3,4)	X (3,4,5)
Coalition Self-Assessment Tool	Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation. (n.d.). <i>Coalition Self-Assessment Tool</i> . Calverton, MD: Author.	X (2,4)		X (2)	X (1)	X (4)	X (1)	X (2)	X (1,4)	X (1)	X (2,3,4)	
Untitled	Weiss, E. S., Anderson, R. M., & Lasker, R. D. (2002). Making the most of collaboration: exploring the relationship between partnership synergy and partnership functioning. <i>Health Education and Behavior</i> , 29 (6), 683-698.	X (1)			X (1,2)				X (3,4,5)	X (1,2)	X (3)	

*(Numbers in parentheses indicate which subscales address the component)