*First Conversation: The BBER Report has suggested seven areas "designed to alleviate barriers specific to central New Mexico to enable the implementations of commonly accepted best practices." What did you think about the recommendations from BBER Report? Strengths and Limitations? Consequences?*

## What is your initial reaction to the recommendations from the BBER report?

- It's stuff you already know. It's really wonderful that there's this highlighted and identified research. These are wonderful recommendations.
- See benefit for family resource centers
- See connection between meeting needs of families and success in schools
- Key: need for respect for idea of education
- Need support from family for support for education
- Very broad scope. Positive. Validating the trends for community schools.
- Like that the report suggests establishing systems; some recommendations were programmatic and not systemic
- How do we assess what's "in the system?" What's there now and how do we prevent throwing it all out and not starting all over?
- Concerns about "funding an early childhood org structure." There are already tons of them.
- Report focused on early childhood and community schools and seemed to miss the middle schools.
- Is the structure of education relevant now the way it's currently structured? The school systems haven't reinvented themselves to be relevant.
- There's a fundamental distrust of the entire educational system
- FINALLY
- Went on site visit to Tulsa and they have all these recommendations in place and it is working. To have someone here looking at this is great!
- Vested interest/Guidelines
- Early childhood is very important
- Few reports that included middle/high school, this is great. A lot of focus on early childhood.
- Glad to see the service learning. Different way of looking at service learning. A way to connect high school students, connect them to themselves and the community. (There are several examples of schools doing this well in the community already.)
- Some schools already require a certain number of community service hours.
- Different from recommendations in the past
- Broad-based screening idea has never been brought to this level of community
- Case management hasn't been focused on before. Partnering is a great idea
- Funding
- All are things that go on, but not together. Good to see a broad recommendation coming from an external source.
- No one beyond those entrenched have talked about it before
- Brings a more community-based lens to talk about it
- Great because the research came from people actually doing the work
- UWCNM can bring a very different strength
- Totally right on and accurate, cover the basics/bases
- Very complex list / large – each individual issue is huge/complex
- How does implementation work with such a complex issue when the recommendations are large issues in themselves?
- Very in depth and difficult to get your arms around
- Daunting
- Not anything different than what we already know about concerns

- We are not talking about what is coming out of APS.
- Positive reactions from agencies
- Starting conversations, talking about our next step, collaborative effort
- No surprise – early childhood
- Where's the money come from
- Not a full assessment of available resources
- Addresses the need for collaborative funding
- Support needed to help the collaborations
- Challenge - Have not shifted the paradigm to long-term funding and collaboration
- Challenge – finding one focus for UW (supporting professional dev. For e childhood professional)
- Challenge – some is already being done
- Very pleased that something is happening
- Good to see the work was done… it's been a long conversation (years)
- Community schools conversation may now be enabled to move forward.
- SILOs are BAD & need to be eliminated
- There's stuff missing
- Early childhood shows up in a major way, support services are important – when they leave early childhood, early childhood has limited resources
- Emphasis on professional development
- Support early childhood workforce
- Nodding in support of recommendations, UWCNM was listening
- Support for early learning systems
- System thinking  p-20
- Alignment of support – alignment of orgs and support mechanisms
- Succinct report, taking best of best and moving it forward
- System support and change
- Service learning
- System work is great
- Organizational networks, collective impact, need to structure and pay for new systems
- Collaborations fail because you don't fund their structure
- Resonated– issues/recommendations are connected
- Need alignment – will improve all areas, lots of connections with recommendations
- Appreciate local and national model references

## Is there anything missing you would include?

- The legal problems/obstacles.  What are the screenings?  What are we screening for and what are those factors that influence college?
- UW leaving whole segments of the community (human service) needs untouched by UW dollars; creates gaps
- Not getting that this is a broader issue
- Interest based programs and how they tie into education; kids like compensation too
- Testing has little relevance to the kids, need to tie education to what is relevant.  Mold no longer fits.
- Priorities.  What is the next step?  Resources.
- A balanced view of all levels of education is missing in the report especially at the later levels
- The middle years for children is an area that is missing services
- Importance of parental involvement and creating a welcoming environments for parents

- Schools should go out into the communities to seek out the parents

- Not a lot of talk of transition pieces (6-7, 8-9, 12-College)
- Parents feel a drop off after 3rd and 4th grade support
- Middle school is very important, some are doing it well
- High School needs it as well.
- Government level of funding? Successful Community Schools have government funding behind them. There is a big part that is political. People in government pushing for funding (Tulsa had a bond specifically to fund this structure, need help with this in NM)
- Government programs are within the silos. Government silos don't work with each other internally
- Addressing class size
- Generic – misses the why, disconnect from what the local industries need from an education standard in our state
- What could we do at a systemic level, things done on a macro level
- Paradigm shift needs to be addressed
- Need support in collaboration
- Revisit how to get away from a political perspective to something more manageable (APS)
- Data systems
- Accountability
- Continuum of support for kids of all ages / elementary seems to be missing
- There's an assumption that this is all about a formalized system – which may NOT yet exist. E.g. parental choice (awareness, e.g.) / possible lack of infrastructure / systems to support engagement of the proposal
- It is a comprehensive start
- Revisit, reassess after it is going
- Underlying principles – is the role of inclusion vs exclusion, impact of racism on families, needs to be stated, it affects families and the kids before they are even born. Equity is missing – state it. How do you allocate resources fairly
- How can we make sure recommendations are implemented to benefit all children
- Language is at individual level, programs would change community too, address community inequalities

## What are the strengths of the recommendations?

- The idea of screening all children right away and that data is accessible to many different institutions is a strength and very beneficial to the community.
- It's great--the cradle to career and look at the entire spectrum. The recognition for cross-sector partnerships. Having in writing the support of professional development in early child development is crucial.
- Love emphasis on early childhood piece. If we don't get it, we don't get it again.
- Community schools help address community need
- Once a single child in a family gets a good education, it has a ripple effect
- Recommendations are right on; engagement of middle school and older kids, not just service learning, but also the arts and sports, get a system of breadth. Help the children to connect in.
- Career development and/or shadowing; help kids get connected to how education can leads to particular jobs
- Community-oriented. Engages the parents. Realistic, not coming from left field. Recognition of siloing. Both sides politically can come together on this.

- UW has the opportunity to grade funding sources in our state. Kellogg, Crescent aren't working together either, doing it in silos
- Just like with title 1: can only use money for specific things, if something great comes up they aren't allowed to use their funding. Not allowing organizations to do what they need to do.
- This is saying this is the time to all come together and figure this out! Drop territory or political will
- Very comprehensive
- Covers every aspect
- Newer ideas like service learning
- Already identified some models to look into to help us get there faster
- Addresses the basic needs of children in order to help them learn in the classroom
- Acknowledged what we all know
- Directs money to the community in tandem with schools
- UWs ability to create a system language
- Community Schools
- There are already conversations in the community – e.g. re community schools & the social safety net – around this topic. How do we get these conversations together?
- System change


## What are the limitations of the recommendations?

- Sharing of data is nearly impossible. Parents should sign off to share data/information.
- Funding. Supporting professional development requires lots of funding.
- The realities of braiding funding and building coalitions are huge.
- Accountability issues – how can you say this, that and another. Trying to get three companies to come together around kids is nearly impossible.
- Funding time for research and analyzing the detail and people aren't educated properly to anaylze the data and that the right data is being collected and used.
- Territorial issues- lack of trust.
- Adversity makes this difficult.
- There's no plan for implementation. People are saying there are obstacles and no one's talking about them.
- A lot more meetings
- You're changing the whole system.
- Parents and students' input is missing.
- Concerned that we don't have the infrastructure developed that does what is being recommended; don't have good systems for doing assessment or track progress
- Need a large level of commitment and buy in from the cabinet level on down
- Build partnerships between city, county, nonprofits, business, and school districts to implement interest based programs and tie it into career/ compensate young people for attendance.
- Fiscal. It's too much, needs refinement. We need to identify existing models that are successful.
- What about adult basic ed… 18, 19, 20 coming out of schools not prepared/skilled.
- Need to really embrace cradle to career
- Those pieces should be included in a community school… have older students come back
- Too many rules & regulations within the silos to perform this now
- You can focus on all these pieces and still not touch everyone that needs the help.
- Implementation – how much we can do with each recommendation to be effective enough

- Who's the hub of the wheel? What's the umbrella? Who's the "owner"? Who coordinates? Who's ultimately responsible for moving this along?
- The control is at the top, but the changes need to come from the bottom
- Demands are large, and the pot is small
- It didn't address any other problem than funding
- Don't create another org. to be accountable to
- There are some assumptions (e.g. that 0-5 kids are attending some form of school or have the opportunity to do that) built in that could be erroneous
- There is a bias built into the recommendations – e.g. that parents WANT this for their kids – which may not be true
- Frame - Equity, racism


**What do you believe will be the consequences if the United Way adopts one or more of these recommendations?**

- You can't adopt one without adopting them all.
- It'd be hard to adopt one, because some of them go together.They could just start with A, but that's the only one that could be initiated on its own.  If they all could play a role that would be perfect – that would be wonderful.
- Current stakeholders, teachers, teacher unions, bold that it involves community stakeholders.  Some concern about the traditional power elements about education.  How involved are the traditional stakeholders in this process?
- Initiatives tend to be short lived.  Something like this needs to have staying power and go for many, many years to have real outcomes.
- Community Fund could see another decrease and other community programs may not get the funding they need.
- Going out on a limb to adopting what the limitation to what these recommend.  Create a challenge to those who don't want this kind of funding structure (get away from Community Fund may upset a lot of supporters).
- Accountability needs to be determined first.
- Measurable outcomes need to be identified.
- Better collaboration through UW involvement – but need to limit to one or two
- Focused on early-childhood, could isolate donors or give people the impression that we do not support other community causes
- Not enough donors to address the needs that are put forth
- It would change the politics attached to the funding
- Perhaps it would facilitate a paradigm shift
- It would make a more strategic investment for funders
- Policy hurdles will be potentially insurmountable
- What will United Way NOT do in order to pursue these goals?
- These might help – but where do we start?
- UWCNM should do all not just one or two
- Too many connections to only pick one, braiding is critical
- UWCNM should lead on this coherent whole vs pieces

*Second Conversation:  The BBER Report has suggested a collective impact approach. Why is a collective approach to solving problems so difficult? What have been the barriers to collective approaches in the past? What are the hopes and fears when partnering? What are the consequences?*

## Why is a collective approach to solving problems so difficult?

- We're seeing huge successes where people are pooling their resources.  Pooling together for a common goal can be confusing since we're so used to working for ourselves.
- It's hard to agree.  Finding agreement is the hardest part, especially since everyone has different opinions.
- Allowing individuals groups to maintain their autonomy  in their approach, and if one of those groups isn't doing the job they should be in their community then there should be some sort of system set up for accountability.
- A collective approach at a systemic level, to collaborate you have to get everyone talking the same vision and understand what that same vision is.
- Where to start?  Internally and then to a collective approach."
- Problems that we're talking about here are going to transcend the political boundaries we've established.  Society has become so complex that it makes it difficult to come to an agreement, and we have a relatively weak private sector here and we've depended largely on government to fund so much of what we're talking about and relating that to the first step is that these don't respect the political boundaries established.
- The money gets spread lots of different ways and there's very little in terms of accountability systems.  Needs to be evidence-based and understand that some things can't be streamed through a government official.  Decisions need to be based on the evidence.
- There's a disconnect between this model and how society actually works.  How society works is to grab as much market share as you can for your company.  We're getting pulled in two different directions at the same time.
  There's a lot of territorialism and getting people off of that is hard.
- Different points of view and everyobne thinks their way is the right way
- Focus on egos instead of outcomes
- <mark>Change is scary</mark>.  There is entrenched power, entrenched funding, etc.
- <mark>Parent and child should be in the middle of the second model</mark>.  Needs to start at 0-5.  Alignment is missing.  Barriers to access.
- Each organization needs to reflect on what they are doing and their effectiveness with respect to end goal.
- Different styles.  Needs to take into consideration different communication styles, cultural identities, etc.
- Everyone within their own organization is already overwhelmed.  Planning tends to be one year at most.  Lack of understanding of what it means to collaborate.  Portland has community wide measurements.
- Collective approach among the funders is easier than among the providers.  With limited resources the providers have to chase the dollars.
- No partnerships exist between government, business, funders
- Identity and ego prevent collective impact
- We're siloed because of the funding
- The CBO's have been socialized to think in silos
- This would take a lot of will and funding to get the CBOs to work
- The people around the table feel that they have to give up something in the process in order to be a part of the bigger conversation
- Your organization's mission is the same as other organizations/same clients… hard to see this
- Funding… fight for, When there is a lot of funding it is easier to share
- <mark>Individuals are part of agencies/organizations.  Fear of having to give up what your role is</mark>

- Requires more work on part of people. It takes more intention, work, purpose… a clear purpose to work together. For community based orgs to work together successfully we want to know that our funders are doing that too.
- A whole different way of thinking, needs work/trust/communications/a lot more time!!
- Hard for partner organizations to take time for meetings. Must have CLEAR mission, goal, measurable outcomes… this takes a lot of time to develop
- Trust is necessary and takes time. Need to develop culture of trust, transparency, collaborative.
- Hard to be authentic
- All find our niche and fill in gaps that we see. When you work as colleagues within an organization
- Can't imagine this ever being accomplished. UW can bring together people occasionally. But maintaining this on, don't see how UW can do this thoroughly.
- Needs a very long time commitment
- UW can look around at the different types of groupings and how they can collaborate (early childhood, connect with each other)
- Figure out who are all the players… what might be a better role for them, determine what exactly some can come together on occasionally to fill a gap
- Idea is to focus by school. Supporting infrastructure.
- Challenge still arises when there is no money. Very willing to partner when there is money. But if focus is on each school partnerships will be easier to do.
- Look at examples of where it has been successful on a larger scale. It is possible. Strive, Cincinnati, not to underestimate how difficult it is but it has been done.
- Try on a smaller scale and then move up
- Choose to align community not just organizations. What is the crisis for the children we are all working for, one goal.
- Collaborate what we are going to the funders for
- UW can help smaller organization to connect and formulize their approach and collaboration
- Collective impact has a few different focuses, but can determine key things.
- Everybody thinks they're right from their perspective and have trouble opening up to the ideas of others – more specifically to funders – needs to be more focused on the end result
- Currently set up to compete for dollars – working in silos/against each other
- Lacking a revolutionary approach to change current method
- Relationships have brought power, inside knowledge that isn't replaced through
- Current structure doesn't lend itself to shared outcomes – no neutral support system – you're busy doing the work
- Pride of ownership, control over use of dollars = control over outcomes (current thought process)
- Sense of "who's my community? Who do I owe? Who do I answer to?" "Community" view is very small and very personal. How do we expand that so that community approach encompasses the geographical community?
- Breaking out of the "me" mentality.
- Lacking education
- Finding time and coordinating schedules
- Shifting priorities
- Limited funding, collaborating would mean less funding
- We are not seeing the issue through a collective lens
- Don't want to give up my funders
- "I'm right, they're wrong"
- Because there isn't one
- Time requirements for providers x3

- Non-Common Definitions
- Data Collection/Sharing
- Staffing the connection
- Education is a universal – everyone has had it & has a perspective on how to fix it
- Prejudice / people put themselves in certain economic situations / have a preconceived notion about what they should aspire to
- There's a lack of expressed outrage re NM's poor performance
- Communication between agencies; agencies doing the same thing and not communicating, while trying to achieve the same goal
- Blind men and the elephant story: everyone comes at it from their own perspective. There are so many pieces and we aren't stopping to let go of our own piece so we can look at the complex whole.
- Time – people working in nonprofits have limited amt of time to do enormous task, taking out time to coordinate takes time away from current programs , even when providing services we are competing and we don't get socialist values, how to take care of each other s – always difficult arena, also hard to get people to think outside of their box

## What have been the barriers to collective approaches in the past?

- The funding structure.
  There's agreed upon metrics, there's not a way to evaluate approaches on a neutral setting.
  There's some political barriers.  The politics changes and the direction changes.  It's kind of two steps forward and one step back, and that's kind of normal in terms of way we live and that's a barrier.
- It's not easy, we don't know how to do it, it takes time, process and conversation and people are action-oriented and if nothing happens in awhile, people get grumpy.
- Accountability is a huge barrier that needs to be addressed.
- People would like things to be different without having to go through change
- It takes time
- Access.  People don't necessarily know what each other is doing.  Overlap services and create splinter groups.
- Entities follow the money instead of the goal.  Budgetary constraints.
- Sustainability
- Politics
- Everyone has "dug in" regarding their positions.  There is a gap between the administrators and the community.   People protect their funding.  Instead of focusing on differences, let's work together. Funders need to learn to collaborate.
- Funding has caused many barriers to working together among the CBOs
- Even among programs like Community Schools that is a collective impact model, there isn't agreement among the participants what the community schools approach should look like
- Government funding guidelines cause some of the silos – you can't provide services to a child that doesn't meet the funding guidelines of a particular program like early headstart
- Zero collaborative data in a political sense
- Competing for scarce resources
- In past collaborations, big players cut out smaller organizations once the funding came through.  CEO no longer wanted to compete to spending time & resources, changed the mind set of why should we partner at all
- A lot of energy and effort in the beginning, then everyone realizing how difficult it really is.  No staying power, sustainability.
- Too much turnaround within organizations

- Need resources to keep it going.  Can't have time to let it breath, must not stop
- Personal agenda
- Red tape
- Lack of significant change in policy
- Collaboration means less funding for specific organizations (at least in people's minds)
- Priorities of each constituency are different
- Agencies are afraid/threatened of change
- Bureaucracy challenges
- Lack of interest from potential collaborators
- Educators are slow to innovate
- Schools don't go to the public, public has to go to them
- Consistent Visionary Leadership
- There has to be value
- No Accountability for collaboration
- We value individualism
- We don't have the luxury to be dogmatic / idiomatic about education
- Family expressions of expectations (high and low)
- Too many competing ideas… school is happening while we're busy thinking about how to fix it (changing the wheels on the bus while it's rolling)
- Different cultures express different aspirations
- Difficulties breed additional difficulties
- Apathy / complacency in NM vs other states
- Funding – can limit thinking outside the box
- After school work – competition for funds and programs, why can't we make one big great program – funding streams separate us
- We in this culture we don't co-own our children, we don't care about other people's children. Educating children is based on politics and our belief systems (non-teachers believe teaching should look a certain way, sometimes based on religion).
- Children and the families don't own the schools, if they feel like it is part of them then they will take care of their schools (no graffiti)
- As long as we call children products of education then they won't care

## Who benefits?

Fiscally speaking, the community in terms of citizens, the provider community, the business organizations can all benefit from the collective approach if everyone's on the same page, because we can use our money much more efficiently.
Our teachers, our families, people who receiving services, those people will be impacted.
Community and kids benefit
School as community center
Students, organizations, families, the entire community.
Families and their kids will benefit
You can accomplish much more for children & families
Work in Cincinnati around Strive, establishing common benchmarks and aligning to those… report that it has made a big difference, District wide Community School system
In NM a benefit would be if we could just align to common benchmarks and goals.  Will need different benchmarks when moving between grades.
Need to look at health indicator in the community.  These needs to be focused on benchmarks too.

More families, more children, more students
The "collective community"
Children and families
The whole economy would benefit
The community
We all do
Must be real collaboration, not just meetings
Everyone who's positively participating
People who are disenfranchised win if we act collectively

## Who loses?

- People who don't want to play.  The loss that is not ok is someone who has a good idea/product but isn't good at marketing it to the collective.  That small voice isn't being heard.
  Some organizations and positions will disappear.
  Would-be power brokers could potentially loose.
- If we were working together collectively, we might not need as many administrative positions, which could cause fear about losing jobs that might not be needed anymore, and heightening unemployment rates.
- "Queen Bees" will lose their position of power
- People will have to give up preconceived ideas
- Potentially lose some creative ideas and approaches because of streamlining
- Students, organizations, families, the entire community.
- Those CBOs and entities that refuse to participate
- With limited resources, those that refuse to collaborate will be left behind
- Those that have been able to maintain those relationships and receive more funds than others.
- Families who are more concerned with putting food on the table and can't be concerned with some of these other items; will continue to fall through the cracks
- Small budget non-profits unless they can be brought in and supported
- Potential loss of organizations and staff
- Clients - Potential loss of privacy
- Vested / special interest groups may lose
- People who are prejudiced lose
- People who are interested in the $$$$ vs the educational outcome
- People currently in power will lose, need to show them how they will win

## What are the consequences of a collective impact approach to your organization? To our community?

- City of Rio Rancho- we could use resources more efficiently, and can establish through some process that these services that are funded are the priority of the community.
- From the corporate perspective- don't have to shop for the best practice, and can develop some consistency as the power shifts and if people stick with the program, you can get more people to think long-term.
- The general moral is that if they see they're a part of a collective initiative and they see that their role is furthering something, it will make them feel more connected to work and affect their quality of life on the job, but you got to get them to see their work matters.

- Some organizations will go away because of efficiencies; possibly lose jobs.
- Requires re-tooling of organizations and people (need to be to do a different job). Redefinition
- Organization: broaden the approach; beneficial
- Organization: initial transition difficult from dealing with emergencies to working in collective approach.
- Transition phase could be challenging. Handle immediate need and plan for long term.
- People will have to give up (isolation, territoriality) to align services. (STRIVE)
- Schools need to focus on just teaching and learning, not all the other stuff. Different specialists will get to know one another and work together more effectively.
- Possible room for "collapse" of programs that currently exist that do the same thing; coordination of those that offer the same services
- Collective approach needs to be across all ages/range of school age
- Identifying where the focus needs to be – which came first? The chicken or the egg? Early childhood vs. college/career prep
- We need a network to hold things together
- Allows people to enbrace a variety of perspectives
- Brings the most important issues to the forefront
- Money given by donors would be used more strategically and most effectively
- Private money has fewer limitations than federal
- Gained efficiency
- Great for the detention center
- Benefit for future employees (better educated)
- Better educated constituency / positive impact on reducing social ills
- We still feel that education is a way UP
- Positive impact on education providers / improved access to support
- Reduces fragmentation
- Improves overall collaboration
- Small successes can lead to better / higher achievements
- Very positive consequence
- Our organization has the model of collective impact – resource poor community has come together to address needs through cornucopia of services, one stop shopping place for services
- Collective approach to after school =results in higher quality of program
- Collective vision, etc. – benefit is to see causes of problems so we aren't just trying to fix problems after the fact – can see and try to fix problem upstream - i.e. why are kids not ready for school
- UWCNM sets up agencies to compete against each other for funds
- Orgs don't know enough about each other to make referrals to each other

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

*Final Conversation: How can the collective relationships among influential organizations support the recommendations in the BBER report? What would be the best role for the United Way in this effort? Consequences?*

## How can the collective relationships among influential organizations support students and educators?

- Influential organizations can be many place and the influence needs to come from communities and families, we need they're influence. The only way we're going to be able to support this process is to buy into the proposition that we've been doing with and for the community. We need to have an integrated

information system to have a collective impact. It's doable.
We can get all the people around the same table and have all the information about a person/child. Finally the right people are at the discussion tables to start to braid all the services together and I'm excited about it. If we had this set up, I can spend my time doing the job I'm supposed to be doing.

- Developing the expectation in the community for service providers to collaborate and coordinate services. It should be an expectations that people will be organized so that the recipients are also invited. Collect data on the success about the community from families. Community engagement is a huge challenge and we need to find what works.
- It doesn't seem like we moved forwards. Hopefully this will work. Maybe the integrated effort will work.
- We're all influential organizations. If there's an interest in the education, then everyone gains from an educated citizen. In the past, it's been so segmented that they were looking for a product/a person who can fill in the shoes, but not someone who was educated. We all need to look at educating the person to become a good citizen; we'll have an immediate impact.
- There's so much need in children in the community and in our lives, and teachers and other providers don't have the time to find out how to make connections and they systems worn out and the kid doesn't get what he needs. It can have another side effect to understand that we all own each other's children – we own the next generation.
- The key to it is as a community is that we need to come together on clear goals that we share. Together we can decide on goals and then move forward.
- They need to generate excitement to bring people in and make people want to be a part of what's going on. That communication is key.
- Needs focus. Pick a goal, don't do them all.
- All seven goals need to be done as a whole. They form a cohesive whole, a continuum.
- Nothing new in the report—we know all this needs to happen.
- Issue is not shifting the paradigm
- Can Sandia and Intel retirees provide volunteerism to school programs (reading, mentoring, etc.)?
- Companies want to know to what end children are being educated.
- We can support them with resources they don't currently have
- There is a gap between the availability of resources and families knowing how to access those resources
- Services and programs are available at many schools but parents and kids don't take advantage of them – collective relationships might help address this
- By raising the awareness that education is a community issue and a community challenge – it isn't just the teachers' challenge
- School readiness is critical - so support to kids and parents is critical
- School based health centers can provide many of the wraparound services a child needs
- Who is working in these areas already? Those would be key organizations that would be required to participate to make this work
- There is no early childhood powerhouse
- It takes a village
- Key individuals as well
- Money?
- An organization is influential if they can impact the issues you are trying to move forward.
- Political
- Financial
- Define as broadly as possible
- Think about how your organization can be one of the influential orgs
- Volunteering, Giving money, employees of the organization. Often these influential people emerge from the landscape of the work.

- People who others will listen to, not necessarily because they are on the podium
- Policy makers/administrators need to be more on the same page with collaborators/organizations
- Collaboration should lead to policy changes
- Too much red tape –
- Research how other communities have developed their "community schools" and why we can't do that here
- Can fund programs and initiatives that might not get funded otherwise
- It can make the major goals happen (service learning projects and gaining real life experience)
- More opportunities
- Gives more relevance to student learning experience and security to teachers and students
- Support a sustained commitment to education initiatives
- Common agenda to reach children that are not doing well in school
- Focuses more on the positive outcomes rather than negative
- Saves time to find resources
- Need a 211/Albuquerque Family Advocacy Center for education
- Leverages resources
- Makes it easy for educators AND families
- Opens channels to existing services
- Navigation of Systems
- Who's an 'influential org'? – Corporate Cornerstones (money generators?)
- Some recommendations are specific enough that we can foresee future impacts, but not all
- If organizations that already have relationships (with clientele) could come together in agreement as to outcomes, there could be positive impacts
- Could possibly help align multiple programs and their respective funding streams
- Evidenced collaborative efforts (synergy) can help create a sense of urgency in the community (effectively connecting providers with recipients)
- Everyone has different perspective, find common ground for students and families, put aside our differences
- Children and families need to be at the center – and services developed form there.  Have others involved schools, churches, orgs, etc.?
- Go back to what is the goal of organizations – how are we each approaching what we are doing for children and families – what are our similarities and what are the gaps?
- Recognize all people who work in the schools as an educational team – including secretaries, etc.
- Equal access and value for school based health, after school programs, etc.
- Everyone has an important role in education
- We can change policies
- Large institutions are suffering from lack of trust, elected officials use lack of trust to not make hard decisions to provide resources that are needed.  If everyone worked together we would increase trust – work outside of silos, reduce duplication.
- Bringing large entities together to work on issues of trust and realize their missions are distinct yet overlapping (serve same people), increase trust and then look at who can best meet needs, offer programs, align services.


## What would be the best role for the United Way in a collective impact relationship?

- To really fund only those projects that have very clear design and measurable outcomes, they got partners signed up to address the needs articulated.  Every program should have a community engagement place that's quantifiable.

- UWCNM can be the facilitator and keep everyone focused on the goals, since they don't have a stake in the game.
- UWCNM has earned a position in the community as an organization that does good. If the city were doing it there would be doubts, but if UWCNM does it, people will see it's impartial. Impact would be great.
- UWCNM holds a different level of integrity. If UWCNM was seen as having political intent, then they wouldn't be creditable, and it's universally understood that the UWCNM has no political ties and that's why it works.
- Play the role that you're playing, do good research, bring people together, maybe the role will evolve and emerge as the process unravels and maybe the community will tell you your role.
- UWCNM can create at atmosphere of collaboration.
- Staffing and an overview of this work to make it happen. Won't just happen with people's goodwill.
- Working together with community partners
- Commit to it being a long term initiative more than 3 or 5 years. Would like to see 10 -15 years.
- Bring in major players/strategic partners
- Understanding of building on strengths and assets of collaborations
- Support collaborative activities that currently exist (ABC Community School Partnership, Early Childhood Action Partnership)
- Talk about collective investment with other funders and leveraging investments (new business partners)
- Take leadership until the initiative becomes self-sustaining
- Start to help us cross the line to other groups that aren't part of this discussion, i.e., business
- Engage ALL stakeholders, including unlikely partners
- Leverage business investment in education. Need more than talk
- Involve parents and children in the discussion.
- Help nonprofits understand how the other funding is flowing (government, foundation, etc.) Understand the landscape
- If UWCNM steps out loudly that education is prenatal – 20, gives substance to measurement systems.
- To help prioritize. The problem is so overwhelming people don't know where to begin. Become an arbitrator between political differences. As a third party, create the climate for agencies and funders to collaborate better.
- Could UWCNM fund the organizing body to do the collective impact (e.g. STRIVE model was suggested)
- Fund the highest quality organizations – you can't fund everyone
- Financially support "one-stop shop" model of community schools
- The coordination of services would be a great role for UW
- Schools should have programs after school to support kids – high school students can be taught to work with kids in the afternoon and that gives the high school students a role to play
- Been hungry for a neutral organization that will be the magnetic to come together for all those already doing great work
- Only agenda to make this collaboration work; all broader framework is interconnected and you can't just pick one
- The reason collaborations fail because it is nobody's job to take care of the collaboration
- The response to this event today was fabulous. Folks are donating their time and want to be here. Good sign that UWCNM is perfect for it.
- Can they pull it together the way they have done so many other things? Identify right people, and being open to the communication and healthy feedback.
- UWCNM has the infrastructure and staff to get this done
- UWCNM is known for what they do and the way they do it. Simply a good model to put in place for any of these. Educate--bring the group together because they have the reputation to make this happen.

- An umbrella diagram showing the new model.
- The piece that will be difficult is the community providers, but if UWCNM spearheads this they would be the ones to get people to the table.
- UWCNM isn't seen as having any hidden agenda.
- Would love to see the 3 groups of the diagram to completely merge so they aren't fighting for the funding
- Help establish what funders, government, etc. want/need
- Fund a structure… the recommendation in the report to do this would be best (not necessarily just early childhood organization, needs to be broader!)
- Focus on putting together the infrastructure first and being the magnetic. Then take the recommendations on one at a time. Then people will know their very clear role. People understand they may not receive funding from this but they will be a part of it because they want the same outcome
- Corporations are not just generous to UW, they fund others. If we have the ear we should use that relationship to try to focus funding from other entities.
- Tremendous opportunity for UW to shape the focus of funders in our community
- Can we take a political approach to dealing with large school districts that have been reluctant to collaborate in the past?
- Funds being more systemic and strategic
- Could be part of entity that ensures the investments are being made and managed appropriately
- Funding the cost of the overall, strategic approach for the greater good, long term outcomes
- Pearl on a string? The string? Or the clasp?
- Encouraging, supporting, facilitating the large "community will" that it will take to really make an impact in the area of education
- Create a funding model that breaks down the silos
- Provide a sustained funding model that may change and evolve
- Offering an inventory of agencies that are already working toward a collaborative model
- Keep funding outside of the political realm and motivations
- Serve as leaders to help move and align funders in a common direction
- Give voice and publicity to success of these programs
- Lead/facilitate the sustained common agenda of a roadmap of success for students
- Being the entity that is willing to say "no" in evaluation of programs that may not be aligned with the common goal
- Serve as an advocate for students and families, especially those in public schools
- In collaboration with schools, provide accountability for how the funding is working and where it is going
- Strategically target students that are in the greatest needs and provide "wrap-around" services
- Providing Navigators
- Helping build capacity
- Provide linkage (don't get involved, just connect them)
- They can set the expectation and tone
- Front line general (Eisenhower, not MacArthur)
- Creating measurable
- Fund systems, not programs
- Forge relationships among 'influential organizations'
- Encourage development of mutually-supportive objectives
- Marshall collective resources in a more comprehensive manner
- Help us overcome inertia
- Help to maintain focus on mid / long-term objectives & goals
- Provide a clearinghouse for requests
- Help sustain the vision for where we're collectively 'going'

- Grant funding methodologies could be used as leverage to influence provider behavior
- Clearinghouse, track who provides what resources, help match stakeholders to resources
- Serve as a leverage to create two areas – policy language around recommendations, everyone agrees and a set of measures everyone agrees upon, no political stigma
- UWCNM should be creator of more programs or resources - we already have resources. Why is UWCNM guiding AFAC – the agencies should be doing that.
- Look at how UWCNM is using funds – need to grow the Community Fund.
- Large entities bring resources, UWCNM acting as a convener and as a way to bring private dollars to the table
- UWCNM can impact – gathering additional funding – grant guidelines to support collaboration and education support services.
- UWCNM – discussion with other funders who come to NM – influence with other funders
- Carrot and stick – support agencies that collaborate
- Communication and education about family education
- Focus funding on families and children
- Leveraging funds – i.e. Title I funds – matching dollars, etc.
- If schools could just focus on the children and agencies can support families, both can be a real partner for the community.
- School community liaisons – connecting with parents and families – can be he communication hub for collective project and distribute info back to school
- No UWCNM funding stability – hard for nonprofits to secure consistent funds, instead of every year changing funding focus
- The seven recommendations are connected. UWCNM can have a cohesive approach that is consistent and not narrow, not changing every year, commit to approach long term.
- Make sure community partners can influence where UWCNM goes with Education Initiative – listen to community not just UWCNM volunteers
- Evident UWCNM can bring people together – keep doing this. It is hard for others to do and do well, continue this role
- Glad UWCNM is listening to community, asking for our perspective

## What are the consequences for your organization? Our community?

- Implemented correctly, it would be a positive impact on my organization and the community.
- There will be non-profits that wouldn't exist, and some that would be affected negatively and disappear all together, a possible loss in jobs.
- Want to see an analysis of the outcomes and funding and investments
- Worry is that too much time and effort is spent on processes, sustain focus on outcomes
- Better outcomes for children and families will be fantastic. Be stronger, more aligned.
- Involve more families.
- Everybody is involved in the success of everybody.
- Other voices asking hard questions
- Worried about the notion the effort would be diluted, misconstrued, misused. UWCNM will have to get everyone to trust each other. Focus on children!
- Smaller organizations that don't have the structure to work just on development will gain from the collaborative effort
- Right now the smaller organizations don't have the structure or support base to get them done. The whole is greater than the individual parts
- Smaller organizations won't have as much support at the table

- Smaller organizations want to maintain their identity, but will have to play a part in the team.
- Changing attitudes
- Win/win – hopefully
- Taking funding away from other community initiatives that exist
- Deterring donors because of the focus on one thing
- How do you make this focused yet large enough to accomplish the goals around education but not alienate the interests of others?
- It would be easier for agencies to find the right support in aligning with the common goal in order to receive funding
- Agencies can spend more time working toward goals instead of trying to find funding
- Kids would be more motivated to be successful
- Teachers would have a place to refer parents and students that might be in need
- City of Rio Rancho—could rely on legitimacy of United Way's evidence based approach to funding
- Resources would go further because there would be no duplication of investigating agencies
- Better pool of employees
- Being a part of a system that works
- Better educated population
- Lower crime rate
- Validation of work
- Grant funding ($$$$) will impact behavior… so be careful of unintended consequences
- There could be information-withholding implications (those who know – get; those who don't know…)

## "Parking Lot" Notes

- Invest in collaborative leadership development
- We are just beginning to learn about the complexities, but also the tremendous impact that a networked structure offers. We need to learn more so this can be a truly innovative and effective approach. This is not your father's Oldsmobile (read "collaboration").
- When we talk about "greatest need," how do we define that? Numbers, geographic area, intractability, most desperate, most responsive to amelioration, economic impact?