

2010 EGN 1 Survey Summary
September 30, 2010

Center for Public Administration and Public Policy
Kent State University

Josh Filla
Matt Flemming
John Hoornbeek

Purpose:

This report summarizes a recent survey of EfficientGovNow (EGN) 1.0 applicants. The EGN program, designed by the Fund for Our Economic Future, includes a grant competition designed to create an incentive for local governments to collaborate with one another. The first round of the EGN program was completed in 2009. The Center for Public Administration and Public Policy has undertaken the task of surveying the 39 applicants considered for EGN 1.0 in an attempt to gauge the applicants' progress towards greater collaboration since the conclusion of EGN 1.0, and to determine how the program affected their collaborative efforts.

Background on EGN 1.0:

The EfficientGovNow program was designed by the Fund for Our Economic Future as a way to accelerate local government collaboration in the 16-county Northeast Ohio region. The first round of EGN was conducted in 2009, attracting 65 abstracts from local governments around the region. Out of the 45 qualifying projects, 39 responded with full proposals, and nine finalists were selected. Residents of Northeast Ohio voted to determine which of the nine projects would receive funding. Three projects were awarded grants through the EGN program: Rollin' on the River: The Mahoning River Corridor Redevelopment Project Website; the Westshore Regional Fire District Project— Cuyahoga and Lorain Counties; and the Mahoning-Youngstown Regional Information System (MYRIS). The Center for Public Administration and Public Policy has developed a survey which was distributed to the 39 applicants considered for EGN 1.0 in order to learn more about the motivations, goals, and results of collaborative efforts in Northeast Ohio, and how the EGN program may have contributed to collaborative and efficient local government.

The Survey:

The 10-question survey was distributed to the 39 EGN 1.0 applicants in July of 2010, and as of the last week of August, 2010, there had been 20 returned: a response rate of 51%. Six of the nine finalists, and two of the three award recipients returned a completed survey. The survey was distributed via email as a PDF document attachment. It was either to be completed on the user's PC and returned by email or printed out and mailed back to the Center via traditional mail. Center staff made follow-up calls and emails to the 39 applicants in an effort to encourage responses. The results, discussed in detail below, show that the majority of respondents are moving forward with the implementation of their projects, albeit at different rates of implementation. Many have already begun to reap positive results.

A number of different types of questions were used in the survey in order to learn more about the progress made by the EGN applicants, including: multiple-choice with instructions to

select one answer or select all that apply, likert-scale based rating, and short answer response.¹ The survey had a branching design. When completing question one, if a respondent indicated they were moving forward with their collaboration project, they were to complete questions two and three; however, if they did not indicate that they were moving forward with their collaborative projects they were not to answer the two following questions.² All respondents were asked to answer questions 4 through 10.

The Results:

A breakdown of the survey results proceeds below. The results are organized into five subsections, which are based on the questions found in the survey: the status of EGN projects; present and future benefits of collaboration; obstacles to collaboration; EGN 1.0's impact on collaboration in Northeast Ohio; and the motivations and goals of collaboration. The results are broken down both visually and in narrative form.

¹ A copy of the survey (with tabulated responses) is provided in the appendix.

² See question 1 in the appendix for question wording and response options. Four surveys had to be altered in order to match the branching design. The four respondents indicated they were not currently moving forward with their collaboration projects; therefore, their responses to questions two and three were not applicable.

The Status of EGN 1.0 Projects

According to the results, 10 of the 20 (50%) respondents are moving forward with their projects in some fashion.³ Three respondents are in the process of establishing an agreement to collaborate, and five projects have established agreements and are in the process of implementation. Two other projects are partially implemented and are slowly moving forward with implementation. Five of the 20 (25%) respondents have decided not to move forward with the proposed projects. Additionally, five of the 20 (25%) respondents are not currently proceeding with the proposed project, but are either discussing the proposed collaboration or conducting a formal study of the collaboration.

Table 1: The Status of EGN 1.0 Collaboration Projects⁴

| Stage of Project | % of Responses | # of Responses |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Moving forward with collaboration | 50% | 10/20 |
| Decided not to move forward with collaboration | 25% | 5/20 |
| Discussing or researching proposed collaboration but have not yet proceeded. | 25% | 5/20 |

³ See Table 1 as well as questions 1 and 2 in the appendix.

⁴ The results have been consolidated into three stages (moving forward, not moving forward, and discussing/researching proposal but not yet moving forward). The “moving forward” stage includes those respondents who indicated they had established an agreement and are moving forward; in the process of establishing an agreement to move forward, and; the two “other” responses, both of whom indicated they were moving forward with implementation.

Present and Future Benefits of Collaboration

Those respondents moving forward with implementation were asked what benefits they had already begun to experience.⁵ Of the ten projects moving forward, half (50%) indicated that they have already begun to save money, 30% said they have improved service delivery, and 20% said they have not experienced benefits at this time.⁶ One project official responded, “Still implementing, so nothing yet” while another replied, “No benefits have been experienced at this time, but progress is being made. The real savings will occur when the project is completed.” Those moving forward with implementation were also asked what impacts their communities expect in the future as a result of this collaboration project. All ten respondents expect to both save money and improve service delivery, and 40% expect to increase economic benefits.⁷ Thus, all of these respondents expected some sort of positive benefits.

Table 2: Present and Future Benefits of EGN 1.0 Projects

| Benefits/Impacts | % of Projects Already Experiencing Benefit | % of Projects who Foresee Experiencing Benefit in Future |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Save Money | 50% (5/10) | 100% (10/10) |
| Improve Service Delivery | 30% (3/10) | 100% (10/10) |
| Increased Economic Development | 0% | 40% (4/10) |
| No Benefits | 20% (2/10) | 0% |
| Other ⁸ | 20% (2/10) | 0% |

⁵ Projects were counted as “moving forward” based on whether they answered either D or E on question one of the survey or by indicating implementation is moving forward via answering F and writing in their response.

⁶ See table 2 as well as questions 2 and 3 in the appendix.

⁷ Of the ten projects moving forward most deal with the provision of services rather than focusing on economic development.

⁸ Other responses: “Still implementing so nothing yet.” “No benefits have been experienced at this time but progress is being made. The real savings will occur when the project is completed.”

Obstacles to Collaboration

The survey also collected information on the setbacks local governments faced during the process of collaboration.⁹ Respondents were given a list of nine potential complications and asked to select yes, they experienced the indicated setback, or no, they did not face the setback. The respondents were also given the option of selecting no complications, as well as the ability to write in any additional complications they faced. The most common setbacks noted by the respondents were: the project lost momentum (5/19 26.32%)¹⁰ and there are no funds available to implement their idea but they foresee being able to raise their own funds (5/19, 26.32%). Other setbacks noted by respondents were the inability to raise needed funds, and not knowing enough about the desirability and feasibility of the project to implement it with confidence. One respondent noted the need to address a change in the licensing costs since the grant application for their project was submitted, while another faced “Legal issues surrounding construction - EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, and local government departments.” Also, roadblocks at the county level were mentioned as an obstacle to collaboration. The results shown in Table 4, which represents the written responses to the question regarding statutory impediments to collaboration, indicate that most EGN 1.0 projects did not encounter major setbacks as a result of statutes or regulations. See Tables 3, 4, and 5 below for more information on some of the impediments faced by governments attempting to collaborate.

Table 3: Obstacles to Successful Collaboration

| Problem | % of Projects Experiencing Problem |
|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Lack of funds but we will be able to raise them | 26.32% (5/19) |
| Project remains good idea, but has lost momentum | 26.32% (5/19) |
| Other ¹¹ | 26.32% (5/19) |
| Don't know enough about the desirability of our idea | 15.79% (3/19) |
| Lack of funds and we do not foresee raising them | 15.79% (3/19) |
| None | 15.79% (3/19) |
| Don't know enough about the feasibility of our idea | 10.53% (2/19) |
| Local government opposition | 5.26% (1/19) |
| Not sufficient support within local community | 0% |
| Project not likely to yield the benefits we thought | 0% |
| Partner communities are no long interested | 0% |

⁹ See tables 3, 4, and 5 as well as questions 4, 9, and 10 in the appendix.

¹⁰ The results are out of 19 from here on because one survey was returned half completed.

¹¹ Other responses: “We raised additional funds.” “We are addressing a change in the licensing costs since the grant application.” “Legal issues surrounding construction - EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, and Local government departments.” “There may be roadblocks at the County level that will make the goal of a countywide effort difficult to accomplish.” “We continue to investigate the possibility of implementing the electronic registration, but must reassess availability of district and grant funding.”

Table 4: Are/Were there statutory impediments to implementing your collaboration?

Please Explain:

| |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Written Responses: |
| Cost and time...we need a consultant to do the work. |
| None other than those inherent in the jurisdictional government structures and layers that exist in Ohio |
| No impediments to forming the collaboration. |
| Pharmacy laws in Ohio and Karon's Law for reclaimed medications. |
| Each partner had to get their city councils approval, a Council of Gov't had to be established, and each group had to commit some funding for the process to move forward. The YMCA was the lead applicant but is not a government entity. This is hard for our collaboration to overcome as the YMCA is the glue to the collaboration. |
| There were certain statutory requirements but they did not impede our progress. |

Table 5: Are / were there local impediments to implementing your collaboration? If not, do you expect any in the future?

Please Explain:

| |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Written Responses: |
| The grant money was an incentive to move this project forward. Without it, the communities' portion of the funding was harder to designate for this project. Hopefully, we will be able to do it in the future. |
| Multiple networks to work with. |
| There may be roadblocks at the County level that will make the goal of a countywide effort difficult to accomplish. |
| Like most collaborations, the primary issue is to stop viewing resources and activities as "mine and yours." Everyone involved must be willing to lose more than they gain or compromise is not going to happen. The taxpayer is the true owner of everything. |
| Only financial. |
| Only the transaction, cooperation costs being higher with multiple parties and different organizations working together. |
| Do not anticipate any. |
| Working with 37 separate government entities will always create local self-interest. We are now working through those issues. |

EGN 1.0's Impact on Collaboration in Northeast Ohio

Another goal of the survey was to gauge the impact the EGN 1.0 program had on local governments' willingness and ability to collaborate.¹² Of the 19 respondents, eleven (57.89%) were already working on their collaboration projects before the 2009 EGN 1.0 program was announced, and once it was, they decided to submit a proposal. Three of the 19 (15.79%) formed the proposed collaboration specifically to apply for the EGN grant, and five of the 19 (26.32%) had been collaborating in other areas, but developed a new proposal for the EGN competition.

In order to gauge EGN 1.0's impact on the respondents' efforts to move forward with collaboration the survey lists a number of possible positive impacts the program could have had on the respondents' ability to successfully collaborate, and the respondents were to answer "yes" if they felt EGN helped them in that way and "no" if they did not feel the program helped in the way enumerated on the survey. Thirteen of the 19 (68.42%) respondents felt EGN 1.0 helped clarify the potential rewards of collaboration. Thirteen (68.42%) felt EGN 1.0 helped to foster an environment of collaboration, while eleven (57.89%) felt the program encouraged parties to move forward rather than concentrating on past conflicts. Nine out of 19 respondents (47.37%) felt the program provided an incentive to move past the discussion phase and into the development of a concrete proposal. Lastly, eight (42.11%) felt it encouraged governments to begin talking with one another.

Table 6: Relationship Between Project and the EGN 1.0 Program

| Relationship | % of Projects |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| We were working on this collaboration before 2009 and decided to submit a proposal to the EGN program. | 57.89% (11/19) |
| Our group had been collaborating in other areas, but we developed this specific proposal for the EGN grant competition | 26.32% (5/19) |
| We formed the proposed collaboration in 2009 to apply for the EGN program | 15.79% (3/19) |
| Other | 0% |

Table 7: Did the EGN Program Help?

| Potential Benefits of EGN Program | % of Respondents who agree |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Helped clarify the potential rewards of collaboration | 68.42% (13/19) |
| Fostered an environment of collaboration | 68.42% (13/19) |
| Encouraged parties to move forward rather than concentrating on past conflicts | 57.89% (11/19) |
| Provided an incentive to move past the discussion phase and into the development of a concrete proposal | 47.37% (9/19) |
| Governments began talking to one another | 42.11% (8/19) |

¹² See tables 6 and 7 as well as questions 5 and 6 in the appendix.

Motivations and Goals of Collaboration

According to the results, saving money and improving service delivery were the two main goals the EGN 1.0 projects hoped to achieve.¹³ Seven out of 19 (36.84%) respondents identified saving money as the main goal, while another seven respondents (36.84%) chose improving service delivery as the primary ambition behind their projects. Three respondents (15.79%) identified economic development as the main aspiration of their projects. One response noted that sharing ideas and collaboration to better help students in the region as the primary goal of its project.

Table 8: Primary Goal of Collaboration

| Goals of Collaboration | % of Projects Selecting Goal as their primary motivation |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Save Money | 36.84% (7/19) |
| Improve Service Delivery | 36.84% (7/19) |
| Economic Development | 15.79% (3/19) |
| No Clear Goals | 0 |
| Other ¹⁴ | 5.26% (1/19) |

Similarly, the survey used a 7-point likert-scale to identify the factors that spurred the original motivation behind the EGN 1.0 projects. As shown in table 9 below, respondents were asked to score twelve potential reason for their collaboration projects based on a 7-point likert-scale, with seven being a strong motivating factor, four being neutral, and one not being a motivating factor. Improving access to services (in ways that require collaboration) scored the highest average score, 5.74 (out of seven), and avoiding annexation scored the lowest as a motivating factor, with a score of 1.63.

¹³ See tables 8 and 9 as well as questions 7 and 8 in the appendix.

¹⁴ Other response: "Share ideas and collaborate to better help students in the region."

Table 9: What were the main reasons for creating the collaboration? (For each reason, use the scale of 1 being not a motivating factor at all and 7 being a very important motivating factor.)

| Reason for Creating Collaboration | Average Score (out of 7) | Standard Deviation | Min (out of 7) | Max (out of 7) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Improve access to services (in ways that require collaboration) | 5.74 | 1.10 | 4 | 7 |
| The partners to this proposal have built trust and believe we can succeed together | 5.63 | 1.01 | 3 | 7 |
| Receive EGN grant money. | 4.79 | 2.10 | 1 | 7 |
| A persistent leader/convener | 4.63 | 1.83 | 1 | 7 |
| A desire to reduce future risks to our community | 4.63 | 1.71 | 1 | 7 |
| Budget shortfall | 4.63 | 1.57 | 1 | 7 |
| Take advantage of economic development opportunities | 3.84 | 2.22 | 1 | 7 |
| Receive grant money from another (non-EGN) source. | 3.63 | 1.89 | 1 | 6 |
| Requested by the Public | 3.16 | 2.03 | 1 | 6 |
| We tried to address this problem as a single community but were not successful | 3.0 | 1.97 | 1 | 6 |
| Federal/State Mandate | 2.79 | 2.07 | 1 | 7 |
| Avoid Annexation | 1.63 | 1.12 | 1 | 4 |

Conclusion:

There are a number of observations that can be made based on the results of the EGN 1.0 survey. First and perhaps the most encouraging is that collaboration is happening. One half of the respondents are moving forward with their projects, even though only two of them were awarded an EGN 1.0 grant. Also, only a quarter of respondents have thrown in the towel and decided not to pursue the project they submitted. Another five respondents are stuck somewhere in-between the two groups noted above. They are still discussing and researching the idea of moving forward on the project. This means that up to three-quarters of the respondents may end up implementing the collaborative project they submitted to EGN, regardless of whether they were awarded a grant or not.

Respondents indicated that some of the projects that have begun to move forward are already having a positive impact on the communities in which they were implemented. Half of those moving forward have begun to save money while others have begun the process of improving services to their communities; these are two of the main motivations behind the EGN 1.0 collaborations. Respondents who noted they were moving forward, but are at too early of a stage to begin to see the rewards of their labor, are optimistic about the future impacts of collaboration.

The survey also shows that governments attempting to work together may face a number of obstacles on their way to success. Respondents noted that funding issues were often slowing down the process, whether they were eventually able to raise the needed funds or not. The survey also illustrates the danger of losing momentum while working on a collaboration project. A number of respondents noted that while the idea of collaboration was a good one, the lack of momentum within the team was a detriment to the possibility of successful implementation. Also, while a few respondents mentioned having to wrangle with legal obstacles at the local and county levels, most did not experience impediments that they tied specifically to statutes or regulations.

Lastly, the survey suggests that the EGN program has helped the applicants in their attempts to forge partnerships and collaborate with one another. The program got governments talking with one another, which is the first step in building partnerships. The program created an environment of cooperation that allowed governments to begin moving beyond past conflicts and to work towards a common goal. Incentives were created by the program that clarified the rewards of collaboration, and motivated groups to move beyond the talking phase to actually developing a concrete plan. In short, the EGN helped many local governments in the region work together, and in doing so, it appears to have taken useful steps to strengthen a culture of cooperation within Northeast Ohio.

Appendix:

This narrative will provide a breakdown of the 20 responses in the Center’s possession, and to start as a guideline for analyzing future survey responses. Percentages are rounded. The same tables seen above are repeated below, and are organized around the questions to which they refer.

Question 1: Which of the following statements best reflects the current stage of implementation of this collaborative effort? (Please check only one)

- A. We have decided not to proceed with the collaboration we proposed (5/20, 25%)
- B. We are discussing *this* proposed collaboration, but have not yet proceeded with it (4/20, 20%)
- C. We are conducting a formal study of a specified collaboration (1/20, 5%)
- D. We are in the process of establishing an agreement to collaborate (3/20, 15%)
- E. We have an established agreement to collaborate, and we are implementing it (5/20, 25%)
- F. Other, Please Specify (2/20, 10%)

Responses:

- “We are slowly moving forward with implementation.”
- “... is about connectivity, and these physical connections are now just past the discussion phase and into planning. However, certain aspects of ... have been completed in regard to access to data, by using the internet.”

Table 1: The Status of EGN 1.0 Collaboration Projects

| Stage of Project | % of Responses | # of Responses |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| A. Decided not to move forward with collaboration | 25% | 5/20 |
| B. Discussing this proposed collaboration, but have not proceeded | 20% | 4/20 |
| C. Conducting formal study of proposed collaboration | 5% | 1/20 |
| D. Process of establishing an agreement to collaborate | 15% | 3/20 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|
| E. Established agreement and moving forward with proposed collaboration | 25% | 5/20 |
| F. Other (see question 1) | 10% | 2/20 |

If Question 1 was not labeled “D” or “E” or shown to be making progress in “F,” then Questions 2 and 3 were to be unanswered. 4 of the 20 had to be altered to match this format.

Question 2: Which of the following benefits has your community already experienced due to the collaboration proposed to EfficientGovNow? (Please check all that apply)

- A. Saved Money (5/10, 50%)
- B. Improved Service Delivery (3/10, 30%)
- C. Increased Economic Development (0/10)
- D. No benefits have been experienced (2/10, 20%)
- E. Other, please specify: (2/10, 20%)

Response:

- “Still implementing so nothing yet.”
- “No benefits have been experienced at this time but progress is being made. The real savings will occur when the project is completed.”

Question 3: What impacts does your community expect in the future as a result of this collaboration? (Please check all that apply)

- A. Save Money (10/10, 100%)
- B. Improve Service Delivery (10/10, 100%)
- C. Increase Economic Development (4/10, 40%)
- D. No benefits are expected (Please Answer Question 9) (0/10)
- E. Other, please specify: (0/10)

Table 2: Present and Future Benefits of EGN 1.0 Projects

| Benefits/Impacts | % of Projects Already Experiencing Benefit | % of Projects who Foresee Experiencing Benefit |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| A. Save Money | 50% (5/10) | 100% (10/10) |
| B. Improve Service Delivery | 30% (3/10) | 100% (10/10) |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| C. Increased Economic Development | 0% | 40% (4/10) |
| D. No Benefits | 20% (2/10) | 0% |
| E. Other (See Questions 2 and 3) | 20% (2/10) | 0% |

Question 4: What setbacks have you experienced while attempting to implement this collaboration? (Please check all that apply)

- A. Our partner communities are no longer interested (0/19)
- B. Opposition has surfaced within our local government (1/19, 5.26%)
- C. There is not sufficient support within our community for the collaboration we proposed (0/19)
- D. We have determined that the project is not likely to yield the benefits we thought (0/19)
- E. The project remains a good idea, but the effort has lost momentum (5/19, 26.32%)
- F. There are no funds available to implement our idea and we do not foresee raising them (3/19, 15.79%)
- G. There are no funds available to implement our idea but we will be raising them in the future (5/19, 26.32%)
- H. We do not yet know enough about the desirability of our idea to implement it with confidence. (3/19, 15.79%)
- I. We do not yet know enough about the feasibility of our idea to implement it with confidence. (2/19, 10.53%)
- J. None (3/19, 15.79%)
- K. Other, please specify: (5/19, 26.32%)
 - Responses:
 - "We raised additional funds."
 - "We are addressing a change in the licensing costs since the grant application."
 - "Legal issues surrounding construction - EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, and Local government departments."
 - "There may be roadblocks at the County level that will make the goal of a countywide effort difficult to accomplish"
 - "We continue to investigate the possibility of implementing the electronic registration, but must reassess availability of district and grant funding."

Table 3: Obstacles to Successful Collaboration

| Problem | % of Projects Experiencing Problem |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| A. Partner communities are no long interested | 0% |
| B. Local government opposition | 5.26% (1/19) |
| C. Not sufficient support within local community | 0% |
| D. Project not likely to yield the benefits we thought | 0% |
| E. Project remains good idea, but has lost momentum | 26.32% (5/19) |
| F. Lack of funds and we do not foresee raising them | 15.79% (3/19) |
| G. Lack of funds but we will be able to raise them | 26.32% (5/19) |
| H. Don't know enough about the desirability of our idea | 15.79% (3/19) |
| I. Don't know enough about the feasibility of our idea | 10.53% (2/19) |
| J. None | 15.79% (3/19) |
| K. Other (See appendix) | 26.32% (5/19) |

Question 5: Please check the statement which best specifies the relationship between the project you proposed and the EGN grant program. (Please check only one)

- A. We formed the proposed collaboration in 2009 to apply for the EGN program (3/19, 15.79%)
- B. Our group had been collaborating in other areas, but we developed this specific proposal for the EGN grant competition (5/19, 26.32%)
- C. We were working on this collaboration before 2009 and decided to submit a proposal to the EGN program. (11/19, 57.89%)
- D. Other, Please Specify: (0/19)

Table 6: Relationship Between Project and the EGN 1.0 Program

| Relationship | % of Projects |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| A. We formed the proposed collaboration in 2009 to apply for the EGN program | 15.79% (3/19) |
| B. Our group had been collaborating in other areas, but we developed this specific proposal for the EGN grant competition | 26.32% (5/19) |
| C. We were working on this collaboration before 2009 and decided to submit a proposal to the EGN program. | 57.89% (11/19) |
| D. Other | 0% |

Question 6: Did the EGN program help your effort move forward in one or more of the following ways? (Please check Yes or No as appropriate)

- Governments began talking to one another (8/19 yes, 42.11%)
- Helped clarify the potential rewards of collaboration (13/19 yes, 68.42%)
- Fostered an environment of collaboration (13/19 yes, 68.42%)
- Encouraged parties to move forward rather than concentrating on past conflicts (11/19 yes, 57.89%)
- Provided an incentive to move past the discussion phase and into the development of a concrete proposal (9/19 yes, 47.37%)

Table 7: Benefits of the EGN 1.0 Program

| Potential Benefits of EGN Program | % of Projects who agree |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Governments began talking to one another | 42.11% (8/19) |
| Helped clarify the potential rewards of collaboration | 68.42% (13/19) |
| Fostered an environment of collaboration | 68.42% (13/19) |
| Encouraged parties to move forward rather than concentrating on past conflicts | 57.89% (11/19) |
| Provided an incentive to move past the discussion phase and into the development of a concrete proposal | 47.37% (9/19) |

Question 7: What were the main reasons for creating the collaboration? (For each reason, use the scale of 1 being not a motivating factor at all and 7 being a very important motivating factor.)

Table 8: Statistical Results of Question 7

| Reason for Creating Collaboration | Average Score (out of 7) | Standard Deviation | Min (out of 7) | Max (out of 7) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Improve access to services (in ways that require collaboration) | 5.74 | 1.10 | 4 | 7 |
| The partners to this proposal have built trust and believe we can succeed together | 5.63 | 1.01 | 3 | 7 |
| Receive EGN grant money. | 4.79 | 2.10 | 1 | 7 |
| A persistent leader/convener | 4.63 | 1.83 | 1 | 7 |
| A desire to reduce future risks to our community | 4.63 | 1.71 | 1 | 7 |
| Budget shortfall | 4.63 | 1.57 | 1 | 7 |
| Take advantage of economic development opportunities | 3.84 | 2.22 | 1 | 7 |
| Receive grant money from another (non-EGN) source. | 3.63 | 1.89 | 1 | 6 |
| Requested by the Public | 3.16 | 2.03 | 1 | 6 |
| We tried to address this problem as a single community but were not successful | 3.0 | 1.97 | 1 | 6 |
| Federal/State Mandate | 2.79 | 2.07 | 1 | 7 |
| Avoid Annexation | 1.63 | 1.12 | 1 | 4 |

Question 8: What is the primary goal of the collaboration? (Please check only one)

- A. Save Money (7/19, 36.84%)
- B. Improve Service Delivery (7/19, 36.84%)
- C. Economic Development (3/19, 15.79%)
- D. No Clear Goals (0/19)
- E. Other, Please Specify (1/19, 5.26%)

Responses:

- "Share ideas and collaborate to better help students in the region."

Table 9: Primary Goal of Collaboration

| Goals of Collaboration | % of Projects Selecting Goal as their primary motivation |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| A. Save Money | 36.84% (7/19) |
| B. Improve Service Delivery | 36.84% (7/19) |
| C. Economic Development | 15.79% (3/19) |
| D. No Clear Goals | 0 |
| E. Other (See Appendix) | 5.26% (1/19) |

**Question 9: Are/Were there statutory impediments to implementing your collaboration?
Please Explain:**

| |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Written Response |
| Cost and time...we need a consultant to do the work. |
| None other than those inherent in the jurisdictional government structures and layers that exist in Ohio |
| No impediments to forming the collaboration. |
| Pharmacy laws in Ohio and Karon's Law for reclaimed medications |
| Each partner had to get their city councils approval, a Council of Gov't had to be established, and each group had to commit some funding for the process to move forward. The YMCA was the lead applicant but is not a government entity. This is hard for our collaboration to over come as the YMCA is the glue to the collaboration. |
| There were certain statutory requirements but they did not impede our progress. |

Question 10: Are / were there local impediments to implementing your collaboration? If not, do you expect any in the future?

Please Explain:

| |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Written Responses: |
| The grant money was an incentive to move this project forward. Without it, the communities' portion of the funding was harder to designate for this project. Hopefully, we will be able to do it in the future. |
| Multiple networks to work with |
| There may be roadblocks at the County level that will make the goal of a countywide effort difficult to accomplish. |
| Like most collaborations, the primary issue is to stop viewing resources and activities as "mine and yours." Everyone involved must be willing to lose more than they gain or compromise is not going to happen. The taxpayer is the true owner of everything. |
| Only financial |
| Only the transaction, cooperation costs being higher with multiple parties and different organizations working together. |
| Do not anticipate any. |
| Working with 37 separate government entities will always create local self-interest. We are now working through those issues. |