**Communities Supporting Youth Collaborative Criteria and Considerations for Strategy Development**

**Continuous Improvement Framework Criteria:**

1. Quick wins (within a year) – using metrics that are outcome-based (for a quick win, we can’t build it from scratch)
2. Evidence-based (data tells us the practice is effective, and can be so within the communities we’ve said we want to focus on)
3. The resources needed to do them exist within the Collaborative membership
4. Fits within the Scope articulated in the Charter

**Collaborative Input for Consideration (from August 10, 2012 meeting):**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Involvement of** **Family, Community & District** **(11)** | **Measurable &** **Data/Evidence Based****(9)** | **Sustainable & Scalable****(9)** | **Culturally Relevant & Eliminates Disparities****(7)** |
| * Does it expand “ownership” for attendance beyond school staff?
* Multi-domain holistic approach
* Requires cross-sector solutions (youth & family schools, government entities, nonprofits, others)
* The set of strategies include places/roles for multiple collaborative stake holder groups to participate (not just districts)
* Relevant to each school district
* Can be applied across 6 districts
* Covers all groups/sub sets
* Strategies should emphasize community (vs. instructional) efforts
* Engage a large/broad array of providers/community groups
* Invite family involvement (clear to families where / how to engage in strategy)
* Add all levels of strategies. Individual, school, community, etc.
 | * Must have way to measure strategy easily
* Data driven
* Research – backed (does homework; don’t reinvent the wheel; stand on broad shoulders)
* Consider lessons learned from prior local efforts to address the issue
* Efficient approaches to different focus areas
* Measurable/accountable
* Evidence based but allows for innovation (because many evidence based federally approved practices don’t work well in non-dominant culture settings -- they weren’t tested or developed there)
* Been there done that? Do previous efforts support rather than contradict this approach?
* Fast iteration of strategies. Can we see what is working well and modify? (Within the quick win time frame?)
 | * Long term impact, sustainability
* Scalable
* Within resource availability – addressing re-allocation of resources and restructuring of how resources are spent
* Ability to scale through “replication” strategies that produce outcomes
* Sustainable
* Strategic and long term focused (quick wins don’t hurt long term goal)
* Are resources sustainable and growth capable?
* Builds systemic, sustainable partnerships
* Collaborative and sustainable
 | * Strategy must be culturally sensitive
* Does it focus on eliminating disparities?
* Is it language/culture appropriate?
* Not only culturally specific organizations deliver culturally specific programming
* Culturally relevant (2)
* Culturally specific
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Resources****(6)** | **Relationship Based** **(5)** | **Easy for Public to Understand & Easily Communicated (4)** | **Age & Developmentally Appropriate (3)** | **Targeted & Focused****(3)** | **Accountability****(3)** |
| * Does it have multiple sources of financial support to pay for it?
* What has worked before, but was stopped due to funding?
* Are there system resources to support interventions?
* There are clear incentives and capacity for the system to adopt the strategies
* Take into account history of funding cuts and initiative locally
* Builds on or coordinates with current projects (e.g. Trauma informed community project)
 | * Success is relationship based
* Does not harm or ding other programs or students
* Multi-pronged: i.e. mind – cognition; body – behavioral; spirit – emotional
* Relationship based, personalized
* Meaningfulness (not just a number)
 | * Easily explained to general public (KISS)
* Ability to report results to youth and families
* Broadly communicated across organizations
* Easily communicated
 | * Age appropriate.
* Developmentally appropriate
* Predictive of better results downstream (age wise)
 | * Addresses a priority population (connected to disproportionality). Relates to the disaggregation of data – in goal definition.
* Targeted and focused
* Relevant to particular community
 | * Allows for a clear, defined lead entity for accountability
* Strategies are within the control of one or a few entities (e.g., a school district) vs. “the community”
* Accountability – There is a clear locus of responsibility for implementing the strategy
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Access Point for All to Engage****(2)** | **Coordinated & Complimentary Strategies (2)** | **Theory of Change****(1)** | **Span of Control****(1)** | **Feedback Loop****(1)** |
| * Incorporate volunteers to help achieve goal
* Strategies provide an access point for all collaborative partners to engage
 | * Ability to coordinate strategies to prevent duplication
* Complimentary to related strategies (value is compounded)
 | * Create theory of change that connects specific strategies with the goal
 | * Strategies are within the “span of control” of the collaborative (things we can effect)
 | * Inclusion of feedback loop
 |