

The Downeast Housing Collaborative Self-Evaluation Report

December 22, 2023



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
The Self-Evaluation/Scoring.....	3
Self-Evaluation Results.....	3
Factor Breakdown.....	5
Open Response Feedback.....	10
Technical Assistance Feedback.....	11
Recommendations.....	12
Appendix A.....	13

Introduction

The sustainability of a partnership depends in part on the quality of the partnership. The more partners work together effectively, the more shared trust and commitment they will have, and the more likely it is that the partnership will last. By frequently utilizing the process of self-evaluation, partnerships can reflect upon the quality of their partnership and take steps to strengthen collaboration. Therefore, evaluation is a great tool for helping ensure the sustainability of partnerships.

MCD Global Health, the Technical Assistance Hub (TA Hub) for the three Rural Community Health Improvement Partnership (R-CHIP) sites, recommended that each site utilize a self-evaluation tool to assess their readiness to collaboratively implement the RCHIP project. In September 2023, MCD administered the evaluation to the Somerset and Kennebec County Community Partnership (SKCCP) and created a summary report based on the findings.

MCD Global Health has since subcontracted with the University of Southern Maine (USM) to serve as an independent evaluator for Phase 1 of the RCHIP project. To maintain consistency among the demonstration sites, the USM evaluators duplicated the TA Hub's evaluation efforts with the remaining two sites, which includes the Downeast Housing Collaborative. Additional questions have been added to assess the demonstration site's technical assistance needs.

This report provides an overview of the evaluation tool, the scoring of the responses, and a summary of the results. The objective of this report is to provide useful insight into your partnership's internal strengths and challenges and technical assistance needs. Please note that any time this report refers to *"Downeast Housing Collaborative members"* it is referring to the partners that completed this survey.



The Self-Evaluation Tool

The content for the self-evaluation was adapted from the [Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory](#), an evaluation tool developed by Paul Mattessich and Kirsten Johnson from the Amherst H. Wilder Foundation. This tool was created to assess how well a collaboration is doing based on twenty-two research-tested success factors covering a range of topics such as mutual respect, understanding, and trust, ability to compromise, development of clear roles, open and frequent communication, shared vision, skilled leadership, etc. Eighteen of the twenty-two success factors from the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory were included in the R-CHIP demonstration sites' self-evaluation tool. The questions were slightly modified to fit the goals and expectations of the first six months of the R-CHIP project.

To field the Downeast Housing Collaborative self-evaluation, the USM evaluators used Qualtrics, an online survey platform. A survey link was e-mailed to the nineteen partners identified by the director of the demonstration site. The survey was fielded from November 10 through December 15, 2023, and included six email reminders. By close of the survey, thirteen of the nineteen organizations responded for a 68% response rate.

Scoring of the Self-Evaluation Responses

Thirty-seven questions in the self-evaluation tool contained Likert scale responses to measure the degree partner organizations agreed with a statement about how the Downeast Housing Collaborative was performing on the eighteen success factors. Answers that contained "strongly agree" were assigned 5 points, "agree" were assigned 4 points, "neutral" were assigned 3 points, "disagree" were assigned 2 points, and "strongly disagree" were assigned 1 point. The USM evaluation team exported the results from Qualtrics and averaged the scores for each Likert survey question. The average scores were interpreted as follows:

Strengths: questions with an average score of 4.0-5.0, do not require special attention

Borderline: questions with an average score of 3-3.99, deserve discussion

Concerns: questions with an average score of 1.0-2.99, should be addressed as soon as possible

Additionally, partner organizations were asked to provide general feedback about the Downeast Housing Collaborative through an open-ended question as well as answer questions that assessed their technical assistance needs. These questions were not scored, but a summary of the responses will also be provided in this report.

Self-Evaluation Results

Findings from the self-evaluation show that the Downeast Housing Collaborative has many important strengths to build upon. Members trust and respect one another and view the partnership as representing a cross section of community organizations who have a stake in what the collaborative is trying to accomplish. Members view the collaborative as operating in their organization's self-interest. They feel confident that partners can find common ground or compromise on important aspects of the project if needed and that all the members want the project to succeed. Members see that there is a clear process for decision making and find that partners are flexible when decisions are made and are

open to discussing different options or approaches. Members think the collaborative has been diligent about developing a timeline, coordinating organizations and activities, and staying on track. Members view data sharing as an important part of cross-sector alignment and are confident in other members' willingness to invest in improving each other's capacities for data sharing. Members communicate openly with one another and feel they are well informed about what is happening within the collaborative. Finally, the members view the leaders as possessing the necessary skills to work collaboratively with people and organizations.

The findings also show that although there are no immediate concerns, there is room for improvement in specific areas. For example, some members are unsure that those who participate in decision making for the collaborative can speak for the entire organization they represent. Some also see the need for the collaborative to strengthen their system to monitor and report their activities, services, and outcomes and use this information to improve the collaborative's work. Some members expressed uncertainty of their roles and responsibilities and some question if the level of commitment among members is high enough and are concerned that there may not be enough staff, materials, or time needed. Additionally, some members are uncertain if the collaborative has established realistic goals or if the members understand the goals. Although most members think the partners are dedicated to the shared vision and mission, not as many think their ideas about what they hope to accomplish with the collaborative is the same as the ideas of others. Lastly, there may be a need for more opportunities to encourage formal and informal communication among partners and engagement with stakeholders outside of the collaborative.

Table 1: The Downeast Housing Collaborative's Strengths and Areas in Need of Improvement

Strength	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mutual respect, understanding, and trust -4.5 • Appropriate cross-section of members -4.2 • Members see the collaborative as operating in the member's self-interest -4.4 • Ability to compromise/find middle ground -4.2 • Members share a stake in both process and outcome -4.0 • Flexibility -4.5 • Development of clear roles and policy guidelines -4.0 • Appropriate pace of project -4.2 • Data and data sharing -4.1 • Open and frequent communication -4.3 • Established informal relationships and communication links -4.0 • Shared mission and vision -4.1 • Skilled leadership -4.4
Borderline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple layers of participation -3.9 • Internal evaluation and continuous learning -3.9 • Concrete, attainable goals and objectives -3.9 • Sufficient staff, materials, and time -3.7 • Engaged Stakeholders -3.8
Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None noted

Factor Breakdown

This following section provides the overall weighted score for each of the eighteen success factors and the breakdown of how the Downeast Housing Collaborative members responded to each of the thirty-seven statements that evaluated each factor. Refer to Appendix A for a copy of the the Downeast Housing Collaborative self-evaluation tool.



Factor # 1: Mutual respect, understanding, and trust

Score: 4.5 – Strength

Key findings:

- 100% of members either agreed (61.5%) or strongly agreed (38.5%) that members involved in the partnership trust one another.
- 100% of members either agreed (46.2%) or strongly agreed (53.8%) that they have a lot of respect for the other members.

Factor #2: Appropriate cross section of members

Score: 4.2 – Strength

Key findings:

- 92.3% of members either agreed or strongly agreed that the people involved in the partnership represent a cross section of those who have a stake in what the Downeast Housing Collaborative is trying to accomplish while 7.7% were neutral regarding this statement.

- 76.9% of members either agreed or strongly agreed that all community partners needed for Phase 1 of the project have been identified and kept up to date on project progress while 23.1% of members were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #3: Members see the Downeast Housing Collaborative as being in their self-interest

Score: 4.4 - Strength

Key findings:

- 100% of members either agreed (69.2%) or strongly agreed (30.8%) that their organization will benefit from being involved in the Downeast Housing Collaborative.
- 100% of members either agreed (46.2%) or strongly agreed (53.8%) that the partnership will provide their organization opportunities to collaborate with existing or new organizations in the future.

Factor # 4: Ability to find middle ground

Score: 4.2- Strength

Key findings:

- 84.6% of members either agreed or strongly agreed that members were willing to compromise or find middle ground on important aspects of the project while 15.4% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #5: Members share a stake in both process and outcome

Score: 4.0 - Strength

Key findings:

- 61.5% of members agreed that members invest the right amount of time in the collaborative effort while 30.8% were neutral and 7.7% disagreed with this statement.
- 100% of members either agreed (69.2%) or strongly agreed (30.8%) that everyone who is a member of the partnership want the project to succeed.
- 61.5% of members agreed that the level of commitment among the members is high while 38.5% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #6: Multiple layers of participation

Score: 3.9 - Borderline

Key findings:

- 53.8% of members either agreed or strongly agreed that everyone who participates in decision making for the partnership can speak for the entire organization they represent, and not just a part while 30.8% were neutral and 15.4% disagreed with this statement.
- 69.2% of members either agreed or strongly agreed that when the partnership makes major decisions, there is always enough time for members to take information back to their organizations to confer with executive leadership about what the decision should be while 30.8% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #7: Flexibility

Score: 4.5 - Strength

Key findings:

- 100% of members either agreed (46.2%) or strongly agreed (53.8%) that there is a lot of flexibility when decisions are made within the Downeast Housing Collaborative and that people are open to discussing different options.
- 92.3% of members either agreed or strongly agreed that members are open to different approaches on how the partnership does its work while 7.7% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #8: Development of clear roles and policy guidelines

Score: 4.0 - Strength

Key findings:

- 53.8% of members agreed or strongly agreed that members have a clear sense of their roles and responsibilities while 46.2% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 92.3% of members agreed that there is a clear process for making decisions among the members while 7.7% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #9: Appropriate pace of project

Score: 4.2 - Strength

Key findings:

- 92.3% of members agreed or strongly agreed that the Downeast Housing Collaborative has been diligent about developing a timeline and staying on track, while 7.7% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 61.5% of members agreed or strongly agreed that the Downeast Housing Collaborative is currently able to keep up with the work necessary to coordinate all the people, organizations, and activities related to the project while 38.5% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #10: Internal evaluation and continuous learning

Score: 3.9 - Borderline

Key findings:

- 61.5% of members agreed or strongly agreed that a system exists to monitor and report the activities and/or services and outcomes of the Downeast Housing Collaborative while 38.5% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 76.9% of members agreed or strongly agreed that information about the partnership's activities, services, and outcomes are used by members to improve the Downeast Housing Collaborative's work while 23.1% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #11: Data and data sharing

Score: 4.1- Strength

Key findings:

- 84.6% of members agreed or strongly agreed that formal data sharing across partner organizations is an important part of cross-sector alignment while 15.4% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 69.2% of members agreed or strongly agreed that having a comprehensive data sharing agreement is important to the partners while 30.8% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 76.9% of members agreed or strongly agreed that members are willing to invest in improving each other's capacities for sharing data while 23.1% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #12: Open and frequent communication

Score: 4.3 -Strength

Key findings:

- 92.3% of members agreed or strongly agreed that partners communicate openly with one another while 7.7% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 84.6% of members agreed or strongly agreed that they are informed as often as they should be about what is going on within the Downeast Housing Collaborative while 15.4% were neutral regarding this statement.
- Similarly, 84.6% of members agreed or strongly agreed that the leaders of the Downeast Housing Collaborative communicate well with members while 15.4% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #13: Established informal relationships and communication links

Score: 4.0 -Strength

Key findings:

- 84.6% of members agreed or strongly agreed that communication among the the Downeast Housing Collaborative members happens both at formal meetings and in informal ways while 15.4% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 61.5% of members agreed or strongly agreed that they personally have informal conversations about R-CHIP with other Downeast Housing Collaborative members while 15.4% were neutral and 23.1% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

Factor #14: Shared mission and vision

Score: 4.1 -Strength

Key findings:

- 84.6% of members agreed or strongly agreed that members are dedicated to the Downeast Housing Collaborative 's shared vision and mission while 15.4% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 69.2% of members agreed or strongly agreed that their ideas about what they want to accomplish with the Downeast Housing Collaborative seem to be the same as the ideas of others while 30.8 % were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #15: Concrete, attainable goals and objectives

Score: 3.9 - Borderline

Key findings:

- 76.9% of members agreed or strongly agreed that they have a clear understanding of what the Downeast Housing Collaborative is trying to accomplish while 15.4% were neutral and 7.7% disagreed with this statement.
- 61.5% of members agreed or strongly agreed that the Downeast Housing Collaborative has established realistic goals while 38.5% were neutral regarding this statement.
- 61.5% of members agreed or strongly agreed that members know and understand the Downeast Housing Collaborative 's goals while 38.5% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #16: Sufficient staff, materials, and time

Score: 3.7 - Borderline

Key findings:

- 69.2% of members agreed or strongly agreed that the Downeast Housing Collaborative has adequate "people power" to do what it wants to accomplish while 23.1% were neutral and 7.7% disagreed with this statement.

Factor #17: Skilled leadership

Score: 4.4 - Strength

Key findings:

- 92.3% of members agreed or strongly agreed that the people in leadership positions for the Downeast Housing Collaborative have good skills for working collaboratively with other people and organizations while 7.7% were neutral regarding this statement.

Factor #18: Engaged stakeholders

Score: 3.8 - Borderline

Key findings:

- 61.5% of members agreed or strongly agreed that the Downeast Housing Collaborative engages other stakeholders outside the group as much as they should while 30.8% were neutral and 7.7% disagreed with this statement.
- 69.2% of members agreed or strongly agreed that they personally have informal conversations about R-CHIP with stakeholders not formally involved in the Downeast Housing Collaborative while 15.4% were neutral and 15.4% disagreed with this statement.

Open Response Feedback

The final question in the self-evaluation was an open response question which gave respondents an opportunity to provide general feedback about the Downeast Housing Collaborative. This feedback was not included in the scoring. Twelve of the thirteen respondents provided feedback. The evaluators analyzed the open-ended responses and found they aligned under six themes; the number of respondents per theme are noted within ().

- Satisfaction with how the Downeast Housing Collaborative is developing (6)
 - “We enjoy being a part of this Collaborative.”
 - “The Collaborative is working well together and eager to move into the planning and visioning stage of the project.”
 - “The process so far has been productive and timely.”
 - “This is an important collaboration to address the social needs of our residents.”
 - “Very well organized, focused meetings, collaborative participation.”
 - “Great work happening in Washington and Hancock Counties.”
- Direction of the Downeast Housing Collaborative (1)
 - “There is a tendency to focus on shelter and warming center activities, as they are understandably urgent. These conversations get into the weeds at the expense of broader goals, however. Appreciate housing specificity, but not sure how other HRSN will be incorporated into planning or if they need to be.”
- Community needs assessment (2)

- “My initial findings with the survey are that patients and clients see how many pages the survey is and decide not to partake due to its length, even with an explanation of the "check box" format.”
- “It is good that there are discussions and an assessment occurring across the two counties.”
- Acknowledgement that the Downeast Housing Collaborative is in the beginning stages (1)
 - “Just getting started.”
- Member participation (1)
 - “My attendance and participation have been sporadic, due to other agency competing priorities; thus, it has impaired my contributions accordingly.”
- Self-evaluation tool (1)
 - “Assessing collaboration at this planning stage is difficult. Many of these questions will be more relevant to the implementation stage.”

It is anticipated that the Downeast Housing Collaborative will include this open-response feedback in their conversation regarding the self-evaluation, as the responses align well with the results from the previous quantitative section. The neutral responses in the Likert scale questions are likely due to the fact that the collaborative is still in the early stages of development.



Technical Assistance Feedback

All thirteen of the Downeast Housing Collaborative respondents were asked if they had received technical assistance (TA) from the RCHIP TA Hub (MCD Global Health). If they had received TA, they were then asked what their most significant TA needs were and how well those TA needs were met. Only three of the thirteen organizations received TA for the following reasons: information and training on community health workers, help relaying important messaging from the “Department” to their

organization, and to gain additional perspective and resources. Using a five scale Likert response, the three members said their TA needs were met very well or extremely well.

All thirteen respondents were then asked if they had unmet TA needs. Only one organization responded that they would appreciate technical assistance to assess the impact that seasonal and short-term rental use of homes has on the housing market and how that affects year-round residents.

Recommendations

We recommend the Downeast Housing Collaborative use the results from the self-evaluation to guide internal conversations about how to leverage your strengths and work on factors that need improvement. It may be beneficial to use a neutral facilitator in these discussions. The following are some suggested questions for the Downeast Housing Collaborative to consider:

- Are there any community organizations that are not involved in the collaborative that should be?
- What is the collaborative's short-term and long-term goals? How can the collaborative ensure all members are aware of these goals? Are these goals in alignment with what all the members want to achieve through the collaborative? Are these goals realistic?
- For those organizations who have representatives that are unable to speak for their entire organization, should they consider including upper-level staff in the collaborative? If needed, can the timeline for major decisions be lengthened for representatives to take information back to their organizations to confer with executive leadership about what the decision should be?
- At this stage of development, is there a need for members to increase their level of commitment or time invested in the collaborative activities?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of the members? How do members know what is expected of them?
- How can the collaborative work more efficiently to keep up with the work necessary to coordinate all the people, organizations, and activities related to the project? Is there a way to increase "people power" by enlisting high-school and college students or faith based and other community volunteers?
- How can the collaborative strengthen their system to monitor and report the activities and/or services and outcomes and then use that information to improve its work?
- How can the collaborative provide more opportunities for informal communication/conversation both internally and externally?
- How can the collaborative best utilize the RCHIP TA Hub?

The TA Hub recommends that the Downeast Housing Collaborative discuss the results of the self-evaluation during the planning phase (Phase 1) of the R-CHIP project so that steps can be taken to prioritize areas that the partnership identifies as important to improve. In doing so, it is anticipated that the effectiveness of the Downeast Housing Collaborative will improve, allowing the partnership to focus your attention on planning, organization, and implementation and therefore improve health outcomes for individuals residing in the Downeast.

Appendix A

Self-Evaluation of the Downeast Housing Collaborative

The purpose of this survey is to evaluate the Downeast Housing Collaborative’s progress during the first half of the project based on the scope of work outlined in the RFP (request for proposal). All member organizations will individually answer the following set of questions based on research-tested success factors adapted from the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory. Please answer the questions from the perspective of your organization and remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Completing the survey should take about ten (10-15) minutes.

Once all partner organizations have responded, the USM evaluation team will deidentify the data and compile the results into a report that includes an “average” score for each question. Then, USM will share the summary report with all members for further discussion.

The average scores will be interpreted as follows:

1.0-2.9: concerns that should be addressed

3-3.9: borderline, deserves discussion

4.0-5.0: strengths, don't need special attention

Towards the end of the survey you will be also asked about your technical assistance needs and how well they have been met.

Note: please respond to the following questions from your own perspective as a member.

Factor	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral, No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Mutual respect, understanding, and trust Score: 4.5– Strength	1. Members involved in this community partnership trust one another.	1	2	3	4	5
	2. I have a lot of respect for the other members involved in this community partnership.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Appropriate cross section of members	3. The people involved in this community partnership represent a cross section of those who have a	1	2	3	4	5

<p>Score: 4.2 - Strength</p>	<p>stake in what we are trying to accomplish.</p> <p>4. All community partnership members needed for Phase 1 of the project have been identified and kept up to date on project progress.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>3. Members see the Downeast Housing Collaborative as being in their self-interest</p> <p>Score: 4.4 - Strength</p>	<p>5. The organization(s) I represent will benefit from being involved in this community partnership.</p> <p>6. This community partnership provides an opportunity for my organization(s) to further collaborate with new or more organizations now or in the future.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>4. Ability to find middle ground</p> <p>Score: 4.2 - Strength</p>	<p>7. The members are willing to find middle ground on important aspects of our project.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>5. Members share a stake in both process and outcome</p> <p>Score: 4.0 - Strength</p>	<p>8. The members invest the right amount of time in our collaborative efforts.</p> <p>9. Everyone who is a member of this community partnership wants this project to succeed.</p> <p>10. The level of commitment among the members is high.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>6. Multiple layers of participation</p>	<p>11. Everyone who participates in</p>	1	2	3	4	5

<p>Score: 3.9 - Borderline</p>	<p>decision making for this community partnership can speak for the entire organization they represent, not just a part.</p> <p>12 When this community partnership makes major decisions, there is always enough time for members to take information back to their organizations to confer with executive leadership about what the decision should be.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>7. Flexibility</p> <p>Score: 4.5 - Strength</p>	<p>13. There is a lot of flexibility when decisions are made; people are open to discussing different options.</p> <p>14. The members are open to different approaches to how we do our work.</p> <p>15. The members are willing to consider new approaches to how we do our work.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>8. Development of clear roles and policy guidelines</p> <p>Score: 4.0- Strength</p>	<p>16. The members have a clear sense of their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>17. There is a clear process for making decisions among the members.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>9. Appropriate pace of project</p>	<p>18. The Downeast Housing Collaborative has been diligent</p>	1	2	3	4	5

<p>Score: 4.2 - Strength</p>	<p>about developing a timeline and staying on track.</p> <p>19. The Downeast Housing Collaborative is currently able to keep up with the work necessary to coordinate all the people, organizations, and activities related to this collaborative project.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>10. Internal evaluation and continuous learning</p> <p>Score: 3.9 - Borderline</p>	<p>20. A system exists to monitor and report the activities and/or services and outcomes of the Downeast Housing Collaborative</p> <p>21. Information about our activities, services, and outcomes are used by the Downeast Housing Collaborative members to improve our work.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>11. Data and data sharing</p> <p>Score: 4.1 - Strength</p>	<p>22. The Downeast Housing Collaborative members view formal data sharing across organizations as an important part of cross-sector alignment.</p> <p>23. Having a comprehensive data sharing agreement is important to the Downeast Housing Collaborative members.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
		1	2	3	4	5

	24. the Downeast Housing Collaborative members are willing to invest in improving each other's capacities for sharing data.					
12. Open and frequent communication Score: 4.3 - Strength	25. People in the Downeast Housing Collaborative communicate openly with one another. 26. I am informed as often as I should be about what is going on within the Downeast Housing Collaborative. 27. The people who lead the Downeast Housing Collaborative communicate well with members.	1 1 1	2 2 2	3 3 3	4 4 4	5 5 5
13. Established informal relationships and communication links Score: 4.0 - Strength	28. Communication among the the Downeast Housing Collaborative members happens both at formal meetings and in informal ways. 29. I personally have informal conversations about R-CHIP with other the Downeast Housing Collaborative members.	1 1	2 2	3 3	4 4	5 5
14. Shared mission and vision Score: 4.1 - Strength	30. the Downeast Housing Collaborative members are dedicated to our shared vision and mission.	1 1	2 2	3 3	4 4	5 5

	31. My ideas about what we want to accomplish with the Downeast Housing Collaborative seem to be the same as the ideas of others.					
15. Concrete, attainable goals and objectives Score: 3.9 - Borderline	32. I have a clear understanding of what the Downeast Housing Collaborative is trying to accomplish. 33. The Downeast Housing Collaborative has established realistic goals. 34. The Downeast Housing Collaborative members know and understand our goals.	1 1 1	2 2 2	3 3 3	4 4 4	5 5 5
16. Sufficient staff, materials, and time Score: 3.7 - Borderline	35. The Downeast Housing Collaborative has adequate “people power” to do what it wants to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Skilled leadership Score: 4.4 - Strength	36. The people in leadership positions for the Downeast Housing Collaborative have good skills for working collaboratively with other people and organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Engaged stakeholders Score: 3.8 - Borderline	37. The Downeast Housing Collaborative engages other stakeholders outside the group as much as we should. 38. I personally have informal	1 1	2 2	3 3	4 4	5 5

	conversations about R-CHIP with stakeholders not formally involved in the Downeast Housing Collaborative.					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

39. General feedback about the Downeast Housing Collaborative (this will not be included in scoring):

This last section contains questions to assess your satisfaction with the technical assistance (TA) provided by the RCHIP TA Hub (the MCD Global Health team). These questions will not be included in scoring.

40. Has your organization received technical assistance (TA) from the RCHIP TA HUB (MCD Global Health)?

Yes, we have received TA

No, we have not received TA – skips to question 43

41. What were your most significant TA needs that you received help for?

42. How well were your TA needs met?

Not well

Slightly well

Moderately well

Very well

Extremely well

43. Do you have unmet technical assistance needs?

Yes

No – skip to end of survey

44. Please describe your unmet technical assistance needs?