Abstract

When more than one person is needed for task completion, the actors (aka stakeholders) must work together in a successful way (aka collaboration). The SPARC framework considers how stakeholder groups conceptualize and actualize collaborative structures and practices in multi-partner STEM and healthcare research and education workforce development (SHREWD) programs. Typically, Sponsor requirements and program management drive what Partners consider when planning programs, and trust what Advisors or evaluators assess. The collected data form the basis of Researchers’ contributions to the academic literature and the value proposition made to the larger Community. Evaluators can facilitate SHREWD program outcomes by spotlighting the conceptualization of collaborative structures and processes across stakeholder groups, providing collaborative feedback and summative evidence about collaboration’s role in improved outcomes. We believe that “fanning the SPARCs” will allow stakeholders to deliver more effective SHREWD programs.
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Collaboration Theory

Collaboration development has predictable stages. The Collaboration, Evaluation and Improvement Framework (CEIF) was applied to the development of collaboration over the four-year multi-institutional project. (Woodland & Hutton, 2012).

Due to Covid-19, the planned in-person annual meeting of all TAMU stakeholders was held virtually on June 3, 2020. In order to understand engagement during the 4-hour virtual meeting, attendance and online data were collected for the 29 attendees who participated in the meeting, which was attended by 99%. The 9 cohort members who prepared the meeting about the SPARCs of the TAMU program had a professional/personal interest in the evaluation and the CEIF framework which guides their engagement. A mechanism which provides benefits for leveraging resources, dealing with scarcities, eliminating duplication, capitalizing on individual strengths, and building internal capacities: 

A Tale of Two NSF Solicitations

SPARC: The 5 project and partner groups were guided by sponsor requirements and in turn by both credible research evidence and partner equity that involved due process to inform feedback.

To understand the conceptual value of collaboration, three collaborative practice rubrics were selected. The rubric value was determined by: 1) evaluating SPARC rubrics; 2) assessing the rubric value (letter A, B, C, D, or E, with A reflecting lowest levels of collaboration and E reflecting highest levels of collaboration in that category) that best reflected the functioning of the Alliance at the end of the academic year. The SPARC provided a resource for the Alliance members to make informed decisions about the SPARC framework.

Collaboration: A mechanism which provides benefits for leveraging resources, dealing with scarcities, eliminating duplication, capitalizing on individual strengths, and building internal capacities. (Woodland & Hutton, 2012).

In the planning stage, the Alliance Advisory Board, TAMU CC, TAMU, TAMU PVAMU, and ORAU selected the rubric value for all categories (A, B, C, D, E) and 27% of the respondents indicated the value was increased by collaboration. To understand the conceptual value of collaboration, 53% of the respondents indicated the value was increased by collaboration. To understand the conceptual value of collaboration, 53% of the responses indicated the value was increased by collaboration. To understand the conceptual value of collaboration, 53% of the respondents indicated the value was increased by collaboration. To understand the conceptual value of collaboration, 53% of the respondents indicated the value was increased by collaboration. To understand the conceptual value of collaboration, 53% of the respondents indicated the value was increased by collaboration. To understand the conceptual value of collaboration, 53% of the respondents indicated the value was increased by collaboration.