Community Ownership Scale

NOTE

This assessment instrument is included as part of the Assessing Meaningful Community Engagement in Health and Health Care Policies and Programs project. For more information on the project visit https://nam.edu/programs/value-science-driven-health-care/assessing-meaningful-community-engagement/, and for more information on the Assessment Instrument Summaries visit https://nam.edu/introduction-to-assessment-instrument-summaries.

Structure, content and scoring for the Community Ownership Scale
The Community Ownership Scale includes 14 items which were rated by community leaders on standardized response structures for the three parties who collaborated on the programs.

Sample item
Please describe how much influence each of the three parties has at the present time for each part of the program described below. Please make your best guess, even if you are not sure, for all three parties.

How much influence would you say that the . . . has on *defining the overall goals* of the Jones County Breast Screening Program? Would you say none, a little, moderate, or a lot?

- University staff: none a little moderate a lot
- Local program staff: none a little moderate a lot
- Community leadership: none a little moderate a lot

Each of the 14 items was structures as shown in the example. The only difference from item to item was the substitution of the phrases on the Key Function List for the italic section above.

Key function list:
(1) Defining the overall goals.
(2) Outlining the annual program plans.
(3) Deciding about long-range plans.
(4) Ways to measure the effect.
(5) Designing the educational programs.
(6) Deciding how educational programs are conducted.
(7) Selecting the volunteer leadership of the Board and committees.
(8) Deciding on the structure of the Board and committees.
(9) Setting the schedule for meetings of the Board and committees.
(10) Setting the agenda for meetings of the Board and committees.
(11) Leading meetings of the Board and committees.
(12) Hiring and evaluating the professional staff.
(13) Deciding how the professional staff is organized.
(14) Developing the program budget.

Responses are coded from 1 (none) to 4 (a lot). Item scores are aggregated separately for the University Team, Program Staff, and Community Leadership responses, and then averaged. For each of these subscales the range of possible responses is 1-4. Examples of working copies may be obtained from the author.