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What is CLiPSE?

- Climate Literacy Partnership in the SouthEast
- NSF-funded CCEP Phase I project
- Climate change education addressing unique regional demographic, cultural, values context
  - Religion and faith
  - Race and ethnicity
  - Economic factors (agriculture, fossil fuels)
  - Leisure activities
What is CLiPSE?

• Network of organizations
• Develop climate education leaders
  • Bank of climate education resources
  • Regular training
• Community education events
  • Dialog sessions
  • Book or study groups
  • Service learning
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Opportunities & Barriers

• **Opportunities**
  - K-12 and Higher Ed contexts, but more
  - Meet people where they already are – E.g., community groups, church groups
  - Relationships matter

• **Barriers**
  - Difficulty/ time to build trust in relationships
  - Different assumptions about need for evidence and what counts as evidence
Intersecting Levels of Analysis

• Organizational Partnerships...
  ... are made of Individual relationships

• Individual Values/ Capacities...
  ... create Organizational values/capacities...
  ...which affect Individual behaviors

• Organizational activities...
  ...impact larger Communities...
  ...and increase Organizational membership
Partner Outcomes

• For Partners
  • Robust, growing, self-sustaining network
  • Increased collaboration/ synergistic exchange
  • Increased capacity to reach the public
  • Increased capacity to produce resources
  • Resources used by broader community

• What evidence needed to demonstrate these outcomes?
  • Change requires longitudinal data
Audience Outcomes

- **For Target Audiences**
  - Engagement/interest in climate change
  - Deeper understanding of climate change and its impacts
  - Increased critical thinking
  - Understanding of others’ perspectives
  - Change in attitudes or beliefs or actions

- **What evidence needed to demonstrate these outcomes?**
  - Change requires longitudinal data
Impact: Distant or Indirect Outcomes

• Looking for evidence of CLiPSE’s impact beyond those directly reached
  • Who else do participants talk to? How are they affected?
  • How do CLiPSE events affect the ongoing conversation in groups reached and their non-CLiPSE associates?
  • How does public understanding of climate change and its impacts change in SE US?
  • Other impacts?
Network Focus: Many Approaches/ Metrics

• For Phase I & II
  • Commitment to the partnership
  • Partner connections (Social Network Analysis)
  • Vibrancy/ participation
  • Sector dispersion
  • Geographic dispersion
  • Beliefs about organizational integration

• For Phase II
  • Demographic representativeness
  • Level of climate education activities
  • Self-sustaining
Knowledge & Commitment

- Participants became more committed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Kick-off (N=37)</th>
<th>Spring 2012 (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand what CLiPSE is</td>
<td>4.11 (.614)</td>
<td>4.57 (.414)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how I can be a part of CLiPSE</td>
<td>3.97 (.897)</td>
<td>4.45 (.680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel ready to participate in CLiPSE</td>
<td>4.19 (.967)</td>
<td>4.52 (.598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am excited about participating in CLiPSE</td>
<td>4.41 (.762)</td>
<td>4.59 (.492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe CLiPSE can make a difference</td>
<td>4.14 (.855)</td>
<td>4.52 (.625)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Scores on a 5 point scale. All differences statistically significant at p<0.005.

- Organizational commitment (Spring ‘12)
  - Ratings of 4.72 on 5 point scale
SNA: Feb 2011 Network

Net Density = 0.0623
Mean Degree = 6.36
Mean Betweenness = 14.32
SNA: Feb 2012 Network

Net Density = 0.2103
Mean Degree = 21.43
Mean Betweenness = 25.13
Network Vibrancy

• CLiPSE held 7 webinars & 2 workshops
  • Average of 9 partners attend webinars
  • Average of 35 partners attend workshops

• High participation
  • 62% of partners attend 1 or more webinars
  • 85% of partners attend 1 or more workshops

• Online network community
  • 60 members
  • Online book study group
  • Not much other regular activity
Network Sector Dispersion

- Increase from 32...
Network Sector Dispersion

- Increase from 32…to 53 partners

- New Faith communities
- Still disproportionately Higher Ed
Geographical Dispersion

- Percent of 133 SE Congressional Districts with at least 1 CLiPSE partner
  - Increased from 13...
Geographical Dispersion

- Percent of 133 SE Congressional Districts with at least 1 CLiPSE partner
  - Increased from 13…to 22
Organizational Integration

• Using Strategic Alliance Formative Assessment Rubric (SAFAR)
  1 Networking
  2 Cooperating
  3 Partnering
  4 Merging
  5 Unifying

• Participants asked (Spring, 2012) to assess Current and Ideal level of organizational integration
### Strategic Alliance Formative Assessment Rubric (SAFAR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Integration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Strategies &amp; Tasks</th>
<th>Leadership &amp; Decision-Making</th>
<th>Interpersonal &amp; Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Networking        | • Create a web of communication  
                     • Identify and create a base of support  
                     • Explore interests | • Loose or no structure  
                     • Flexible, roles not defined  
                     • Few if any defined tasks | • Non-hierarchical  
                     • Flexible  
                     • Minimal or no group decision making | • Very little interpersonal conflict  
                     • Communication among all members infrequent or absent |
| 2 Cooperating       | • Work together to ensure tasks are done  
                     • Leverage or raise money  
                     • Identify mutual needs, but maintain separate identities | • Member links are advisory  
                     • Minimal structure  
                     • Some strategies and tasks identified | • Non-hierarchical, decisions tend to be low stakes  
                     • Facilitative leaders, usually voluntary  
                     • Several people form “go-to” hub | • Some degree of personal commitment and investment  
                     • Minimal interpersonal conflict  
                     • Communication among members clear, but may be informal |
| 3 Partnering        | • Share resources to address common issues  
                     • Organizations remain autonomous but support something new to reach mutual goals together | • Strategies and tasks are developed and maintained  
                     • Central body of people, who have specific tasks | • Autonomous leadership  
                     • Alliance members share equally in the decision making  
                     • Decision making mechanisms are in place | • Some interpersonal conflict  
                     • Communication system and formal information channels developed  
                     • Evidence of problem solving and productivity |
| 4 Merging           | • Merge resources to create or support something new  
                     • Extract money from existing systems/ members  
                     • Commitment for a long period of time to achieve short and long-term outcomes | • Formal structure to support strategies and tasks is apparent  
                     • Specific and complex strategies and tasks identified  
                     • Committees and sub-committees formed | • Strong, visible leadership  
                     • Sharing and delegation of roles and responsibilities  
                     • Leadership capitalizes upon diversity and organizational strengths | • High degree of commitment and investment  
                     • Possibility of interpersonal conflict high  
                     • Communication is clear, frequent, and prioritized  
                     • High degree of problem solving and productivity |
| 5 Unifying          | • Unification or acquisition to form a single structure  
                     • Relinquishment of autonomy to support surviving organization | • Highly formal, legally complex  
                     • Permanent re-organization of strategies and tasks | • Central, typically hierarchical leadership  
                     • Leadership capitalizes on diversity and organizational strengths | • Possibility of interpersonal conflict very high  
                     • Communication is clear, frequent, prioritized, formal and informal |

SAFAR Results

- Current: 1.8; Ideal: 3.2
- Avg diff = 1.4 ($t_{diff}=9.6$, $df=36$, $p<.0001$)
- All want same or more integration; $r=0.35$

mean ( ) = 2.49333

SAFARIdeal = 0.334CenSAFARCurrent + 3.2; $r^2 = 0.12$

SAFARIdeal = CenSAFARCurrent + 1.7973
Other Network Issues

• **Online network**
  - Didn’t take off as a vibrant community
  - Online book study had similar issues
  - Design of website to facilitate community
  - Ongoing social community-building

• **Moving beyond existing relationships**
  - Takes concerted effort and time
  - Especially across differences
Network – Audience Impact

• Logic of Change: Network expansion supports broader impacts
  • Need evidence from both to test
• Direct effect on target audiences
  • Participation easier to assess
    • E.g. online resource access, event attendance
  • Change in knowledge/attitudes harder
• Population impact measures much more difficult
Conclusion

• Thoughts or Questions?

• Contact info:
  
  Jim Hammerman  
  jim_hammerman@terc.edu  
  http://evaluation.terc.edu