



Community Connection Luncheons Report Executive Summary

Introduction

One of the primary roles of the Colorado AfterSchool Network (CAN) is to create a statewide infrastructure committed to improving the quality of after school programs and influencing policies that support those programs. In order to be effective and sustainable, the Network requires the support and guidance of local communities. As an initial step in strengthening regional connections, in April 2005 the Colorado AfterSchool Network convened a series of five “Community Connection Luncheons” in Alamosa, Ft. Collins, Pueblo, Durango, and Grand Junction. The primary goals of these regional forums were to:

- ❑ Engage communities outside of metro Denver and create a credible statewide presence
- ❑ Inform local stakeholders about CAN and gather feedback on its emerging strategies, roles, and resources
- ❑ Identify local issues, needs, priorities, and champions
- ❑ Create local networking opportunities by bringing together local practitioners and city and county officials to discuss local needs, issues and strategies to support after school programming

Themes

Overall, the analysis identified four key themes or areas in which CAN could play a critical role: Facilitating Local Collaborations, Education and Outreach, Securing Sustainable Funding, and Making the Case for After School through Data.

Facilitating Local Collaborations

Participants identified the issue of collaboration the most frequently. Overall, participants broadly felt that local collaborations provided a useful structure in which to address a multiplicity of needs, such as information sharing and networking, mapping existing programs, needs, and resources, and avoiding duplication of services. As well, there was consensus that rather than creating a new local collaboration, it would be beneficial to explore partnering with or engaging an existing local network.

At the same time, participants noted several barriers to collaborations. Principal concerns revolved around “turf” issues (i.e. ensuring that all groups are represented equally and committed to action around a common goal) and leadership and coordination (i.e. who or what organization will assume the local leadership to ensure accountability, planning, and action?).

Education and Outreach

The various discussions around education and outreach were primarily focused under three interrelated topics: 1) clarifying the purpose of conducting education and outreach, 2) identifying the target audiences, and 3) crafting and conveying a clear message.

Participants regularly noted that appropriately defining and marketing after school programs remains a critical first step in building public and political support.

Securing Sustainable Funding

The need for long-term funding was an omnipresent issue throughout the luncheons. In specific, participants noted the scarcity of ongoing funding for after school programs and the need to develop both state and local funding streams. At a local level, specific sources identified were local businesses or business groups, foundations, and the leveraging of city and/or county resources. At the same time, there was concern over the competition for funds. Participants noted that in a climate of competitive funding, there is a need to conceptualize new ways of leveraging funding and that local and state advocacy will play an important role in this effort.

Making the Case for After School through Data

There was broad consensus that data and the use of data was a critical component in influencing policymakers. In particular, participants noted the need to identify and collect local data as a way to “make the case” to key county and city officials. Additional reasons for data collection included, connecting need for after school programs to benefits, identifying gaps in service and barriers to youth participation, and providing reliable statistical information regarding issues such as crime rates and general demographics that establish the local case and context for after school.

Potential Strategies

Facilitating Local Collaborations

- ❑ Develop a short Request for Proposal to support regional technical assistance mini-grants to a select number of local communities or local collaboratives to address a specific after school issue or need in their community (such as funding, transportation, data collection).
- ❑ Contract with regional consultants to provide collaboration facilitation to select technical assistance grantees during the initial phase of work with selected local communities.
- ❑ The models, strategies, best practices, and lessons generated from these pilot communities could be used to inform other communities struggling with similar issues.

Securing Sustainable Funding

- ❑ Create a clearinghouse of available funding opportunities on CAN’s website
- ❑ Send out regular e-mail blasts to subscribers with updates on funding opportunities
- ❑ Continue to engage and work closely with county officials (human service directors and county commissioners) to explore areas of partnership aimed at supporting strategies to enhance resources for after school programs

Outreach and Education

- ❑ Offer regional trainings on selected topics, such as outreach and messaging
- ❑ Offer messaging “toolkits” via the website

Making the Case for After School Programming through Data

- ❑ Offer data “toolkits” on identifying, collecting, analyzing, and messaging
- ❑ Utilize the various data currently being collected including the CAN luncheon report and The Colorado Trust’s statewide assessment as an advocacy tool to engage school districts and city and county officials

Conclusion

Informing and being informed by local communities is an essential ingredient to the success of the Colorado AfterSchool Network. This report is designed to mark an initial path in which CAN begins to document and connect the variety of regional issues that make up Colorado’s out-of-school time landscape. It is our hope that this report will continue to further the local and state-level conversations around the importance of after school programs for all youth.



Community Connection Luncheons Report

Introduction

One of the primary roles of the Colorado AfterSchool Network (CAN) is to create a statewide infrastructure committed to improving the quality of after school programs and influencing policies that support those programs. In order to be effective and sustainable, the Network requires the support and guidance of local communities. As well, it requires a commitment by CAN to examine the complexity and diversity inherent in local communities across the state and engage local afterschool stakeholders in meaningful dialogue and action. This commitment becomes increasingly important in a state as geographically and culturally diverse as Colorado where contextual differences present unique challenges and opportunities for how the Colorado AfterSchool Network formulates effective regional strategies.

As an initial step in strengthening regional connections, in April 2005 the Colorado AfterSchool Network convened a series of five “Community Connection Luncheons” across the state. The luncheons were designed to build off of the stakeholder focus groups held in 2004, which helped provide key guidance in originally developing CAN, and engage local communities in an information sharing/discussion forum. The primary goals of these regional forums were to:

- ❑ Engage communities outside of metro Denver and create a credible statewide presence
- ❑ Inform local stakeholders about CAN and gather feedback on its emerging strategies, roles, and resources
- ❑ Identify local issues, needs, priorities, and champions
- ❑ Create local networking opportunities by bringing together local practitioners and city and county officials to discuss local needs, issues and strategies to support after school programming

The following report identifies and analyzes the major themes from the “Community Connection Luncheons” and offers a set of potential next step strategies to inform the Colorado AfterSchool Network’s efforts to create an effective statewide presence.

“Community Connection Luncheon” Participants

“Community Connection Luncheons” were held in five communities throughout the state: Alamosa, Fort Collins, Pueblo, Durango, and Grand Junction. These luncheons drew in a broad array of after school stakeholders representing multiple institutions. In addition, participants attended from surrounding communities thereby adding further substance to the discussions. While it is acknowledged that these five cities are not wholly representative of all Colorado’s communities, they are a sample of several key communities and are broadly representative of the types of communities and issues found across the state. Hence, it is from this sample that the report’s analyses and potential strategies emanate.

Overall, 105 participants attended the five luncheons. Participants represented a diverse array of sectors, including: after school programs (school-based, community-based), nationally governed youth serving organizations (Boys & Girls Club, 4-H, YMCA, Junior Achievement), school leadership, county and city officials, libraries, and child care programs. In addition, several lunches included representatives from state and nationally elected congressional representatives. The majority of participants represented organizations with a specific after school program component: community-based after school programs (18%), national youth serving organizations (17%), and school-based after school programs (11%). [See Appendix A for a complete breakdown of organization types]

Methodology

“Community Connection Luncheons” were structured into two main sections: 1) Presentation by CAN staff on the Network’s goals, structure, and work-to-date and 2) Small group discussions wrapped around a set of key questions. Within this structure, data were collected using two sources. The first source was a survey [Appendix B] that gathered information on local after school programs and community needs. The second source was qualitative data gathered from small group discussions. Each group responded to a series of key questions aligned to CAN’s three main goals:

- ❑ **Goal One – Build Public Will**
What can after school programs and youth advocates specifically do in your community to advocate for an increased resource investment in after school programs? Who do you need to reach? Why them?
- ❑ **Goal Two – Inform Policy Development**
What needs to be in place in your community to create a coordinated system that supports high quality after school programs? (Who should be at the table? What resources need to be in place?)
- ❑ **Goal Three – Improve the Quality of After School Programs**
What types of resources (training, research, evaluation tools, etc.) do programs in your community need to improve or maintain quality programming?

Groups had the option to answer any or all of the discussion questions. During the analysis phase, responses from each of the data sources were coded and categories developed in order to identify overall themes.

Looking across the Luncheons: Themes and Analysis

One of the primary goals of the “Community Connection Luncheons” was to identify a set of cross-cutting issues that appeared salient across the various communities. In turn, these issues and “themes” would provide a basis for formulating a set of potential regional strategies. Overall, the analysis identified four key themes or areas in which CAN could play a critical role: Facilitating Local Collaborations, Education and Outreach, Securing Sustainable Funding, and Making the Case for After School through Data. [See Appendix C for list of all identified themes]

Facilitating Local Collaborations

Participants identified the issue of collaboration the most frequently. At the same time, the need for, and application of collaborations was defined fairly broadly. Participants gave many and varied examples of possible reasons for “collaborations” including:

- Information sharing and networking
- Developing a local structure to pursue funding opportunities
- Addressing broad community issues such as transportation
- Creating central locations for the provision of after school programming from multiple programs and organizations
- Mapping existing programs, needs, and resources
- Avoiding duplication of services in order to serve youth most effectively

In addition, collaborations were identified as taking place both at a city and county level. While there were a variety of suggestions/comments on the role collaborations can play, most comments essentially indicated a general belief that coordinating efforts through some collaborative structure is an important ingredient in addressing locally identified issues. However, there was also consensus that it would be beneficial to partner with or engage existing networks rather than to create new local collaborative structures. Possible networks mentioned include the Consolidated Child Care Pilots, Build a Generation, and Safe and Drug Free Communities.

The list of possible collaborators was equally as broad. Participants cited a wide array of critical partners ranging from youth to state institutions and the variety of roles that each of these potential partners might play. The most frequently cited potential collaborators were schools/school leadership, service providers (school-based and non-school based), and parents. In describing schools/school leadership, participants primarily pointed to the role schools can play in disseminating information to youth and parents, the role service providers can play in educating school leadership on the value of after school programs, and the role school leadership (e.g. principals and superintendents) can play in supporting a variety of opportunities for both school-based and community-based after school programming through the sharing of space, staff, and other resources. In reference to service providers, information sharing, training opportunities, and coordination of services appeared to be the primary reasons for collaboration. In reference to parents, comments revolved around the challenge of engaging parents and the need to generally connect them more with programs. It should also be noted that city and county officials, particularly county commissioners, were also cited as critical partners in supporting after school programs.

Despite overall consensus that local collaborations were important, participants also noted barriers to successful collaborations. The two most frequently cited barriers were: 1) “Turf” issues – ensuring that all groups are represented equally and committed to action around a common goal and 2) Leadership and coordination – who or what organization will assume the local leadership to ensure accountability, planning, and action?

Analysis

The wide-ranging set of comments around collaboration appear to cluster along three related strands: 1) local collaboration and a commitment to it can be an effective mechanism to coordinate services, share resources and information, and increase cooperation, 2) new collaborations are difficult to operationalize and sustain due to a variety of issues (buy-in, consensus-building, historical relationships) therefore existing local networks are a useful place to begin, and 3) collaborations alone serve little purpose without addressing some concrete goal or issue. Furthermore, in the absence of some form of leadership, whether it comes from schools, service-providers, municipalities or counties, it will be challenging to mount any sustained effort. A local champion is critical.

It appears, however, there is genuine interest in exploring how CAN could support local efforts to enhance or develop local collaboratives. In this vein, CAN's role as a convener may be useful to help facilitate the process.

Education and Outreach

The various discussions around education and outreach were primarily focused under three interrelated topics: 1) clarifying the purpose of conducting education and outreach, 2) identifying the target audiences, and 3) crafting and conveying a clear message.

Participants generally defined the purpose of education and outreach as promoting community awareness as to what after school programs were doing and educating a wide range of community stakeholders on the value of after school programs. As part of the education process, participants discussed the importance of sharing success stories in addition to informing the community on the need for additional resources. Key target audiences identified for outreach included businesses, state legislators, local policymakers (city and county officials), schools, parents, and to a lesser degree, the media.

Finally, crafting and conveying a clear message, generated some interesting discussions around how to adequately define "after school" programs for different target audiences. Several participants noted that there may be public confusion over what after school programs typically do and whom they serve. Specifically, participants identified a need to expand the definition of after school programming to include out-of-school time (before and after school, summer, and weekends) and to fully describe the comprehensive youth development goals of after school programming, which differentiate it from traditional childcare which focuses primarily on safety and supervision. In addition, several participants cited the need to define and view after school programs as a benefit to all youth. Furthermore, this lack of definition makes it difficult to convey a clear unified message around the purpose and value of after school programs to the variety of target audiences identified.

Analysis

The wide array of target audiences identified for outreach and education seems indicative of the broad impacts after school programs can have in a community. After school programs cut across a multiplicity of sectors and institutions in effect providing some potential benefit to each stakeholder group. Given this, it is important for each respective community to identify the

critical audiences and target appropriate messages. A critical role for CAN may be in providing communities with the tools necessary to identify key stakeholders and target audiences and crafting and conveying common messages. As well, it will be important to help communities assess the purpose or desired outcome of targeting a particular audience.

While mentioned less frequently, media engagement remains an important component of outreach. The media provides a useful vehicle to inform an array of audiences on issues such as need, program successes and impacts, and to generally increase visibility. However, as one community noted, outreach through the media can be a challenge, especially in certain rural communities where there may not be a central media source that serves the entire area.

The concern around messaging has implications throughout. The absence of a clear message on after school can derail outreach efforts to any audience. CAN may want to explore a role in supporting local communities to define the issue of after school programs more clearly. To this point, it will be important to explore the different contexts and issues in which after school programs can be linked; for example, further exploring the alignment or distinction to the child care community or, from an issue standpoint, messaging after school programming within a youth development framework.

Securing Sustainable Funding

Participants from each luncheon specifically identified funding as a critical issue in developing and supporting after school programs. The majority of comments centered on the scarcity of existing resources and the need to establish a more diversified funding base. Specific sources identified were local businesses or business groups, foundations, and the leveraging of city and/or county resources. As well, there was some discussion around the prospect of tapping into the individual donor base. Survey responses also underscore the importance of the funding issue whereby state funding (57% of respondents) and local funding (63% of respondents) were the top two policy priorities identified. [See Attachment D for all survey data]

At the same time, there was concern over the competition for funds. In a climate of competitive funding, participants cited the need to think of ways to leverage new local funding opportunities, including the potential development of funding collaborations designed to secure local and state funds. Related to this, participants frequently discussed the need for CAN to catalogue and describe the various available funding streams; this is confirmed by survey data that indicates 82% of respondents identified “funding updates” as the most beneficial resource to their program or community.

Analysis

Participants consistently expressed their concern and struggle with generating new funding opportunities and accessing existing ones. Of particular note, participants seemed to indicate that local funding commitments through businesses, community foundations, and city and county-level support were an essential ingredient in sustaining quality after school programs. And, that reliance on grants alone would not address the sustainability challenge.

The prospect of collaborating to generate funding opportunities seemed to generate both support and apprehension. On one hand, participants viewed collaboration as an effective strategy to pursue or create funding opportunities. As well, some viewed it as a way to maximize existing resources in order to provide more effective services. On the other hand, the culture of collaborating around funding issues seemed to be new territory for many. Hence, it requires a culture shift, to move from “funding silo” to funding collaborator.

CAN’s role in supporting the variety of ideas and strategies offered would seem to fall under the role of information provider and advocate. CAN could serve a useful regional role in identifying different funding streams and disseminating this information statewide. As well, it may be fruitful to explore the notion of developing or enhancing local collaborations, as it relates to generating funding opportunities. Finally, continuing to engage county-level officials will remain an important component of leveraging local funds.

Making the Case for After School Programming through Data

The need for local and state-level data was another common theme throughout the luncheons. Participants identified several different purposes for the use of data:

- Connecting need for after school programs to benefits
- Identifying gaps in service and barriers to youth participation
- Providing reliable statistical information regarding issues such as crime rates and general demographics that establish the local case and context for after school

In addition, participants cited the need for a database of existing programs throughout the state, including information on population served and program typology. Participants also discussed CAN’s role in addressing some of the identified data issues. Primarily, CAN and the CAN website were seen as a central repository of information that stakeholders could tap into statewide.

Analysis

The need for comprehensive and useful data is an important element in making the case for supporting quality after school programs. While participants identified a variety of data needs, they also emphasized the importance of gathering information on a local level. However, data collection can be a time and labor-intensive exercise, therefore it is important to identify the goals of data collection and how the data will be useful. At the same time, it would be of great benefit to explore what data sources already exist that might mitigate some of this work.

CAN has begun to address some of the data issues raised by participants through a statewide assessment of after school issues sponsored by The Colorado Trust. This assessment, currently in draft form, will be an initial step towards mapping the state-level landscape. Once specific data needs and gaps are identified CAN will likely conduct additional targeted assessments to gather specific data based on a regional or issue specific basis.

It is also important to carefully interpret data within the context of a community. For example, as one rural community noted, overhead costs for rural programs may be higher because more programs are needed to serve a larger geographic area; hence, a program may serve only 10

youth but have to pay the same facility costs if they were serving 30 youth. As well, outcome data can easily be skewed because one or two youth can dramatically alter the overall results.

Additional Themes of Note

While not raised as frequently, two additional themes deserve brief mention: transportation and cultural competency.

In the majority of luncheons, transportation was cited as a major barrier to program participation. Not surprisingly, this issue seems more acute in rural communities where geography and fewer transportation possibilities play a significant role. Open-ended responses from the survey confirm the importance of transportation wherein several participants identified it as a “pressing issue/need” in the community. Participants in several lunches also discussed unique potential strategies to address this barrier. Participants in the Pueblo luncheon discussed the possibility of the city funding a central location for after school programs to “co-locate” which would create a central site and common timeframe for after school busses to take kids home. Participants in the Durango luncheon discussed the possibility of tapping into existing vans owned and operated by the city and county and local tribes to provide a network of transportation options for kids participating in after school programs.

Cultural competency was another key issue discussed during the luncheons. In several instances, cultural competency was specifically identified as a professional development need, typically framing it in the context of promoting culture as an asset-based approach to youth development. Participants also noted the diversity of youth served by after school programs and the need to develop programming that enhances and supports their cultural heritage. However, there were relatively few comments on the need to specifically engage youth of different cultures with after school programs, which continues to be a key challenge across the state, especially as it relates to engaging youth and families who are English language learners.

Putting This to Use: Lessons Learned and Potential Strategies/Next Steps

So how will the Colorado AfterSchool Network put this information to use? From the outset, CAN has made it an open intention to use information gathered from local constituents to craft potential action strategies designed to support regional needs. To that end, participant feedback from “Community Connection Luncheons” provided valuable insight into potential areas of work for CAN. In addition, the process of developing and implementing the luncheons and engaging local stakeholders provided several useful lessons that should continue to inform CAN’s efforts both at a regional level and as an initiative.

The following section will highlight some key lessons learned and identify potential action strategies to support local efforts around after school programming.

Lessons Learned

- ❑ **CAN needs to provide something concrete to local communities.** Participants expressed a common message across the luncheons that while bringing stakeholders together for a

meeting is important, long-term engagement must be couched in the delivery of some concrete service, whether in the form of technical assistance, information, training, or other resources.

- ❑ **CAN needs to develop or link to existing local collaborations as a mechanism to work regionally.** Local collaboratives were a significant issue raised by participants. Participants seemed to encourage the development of local partnerships but also expressed concerns about the process, implementation, and the leadership necessary to make it a useful enterprise.
- ❑ **CAN needs to formulate strategies that are closely linked and reinforce CAN's three main goals.** While each theme identified from the luncheons was analyzed as a discrete issue, there is a clear relationship between them (e.g. data and outreach has an impact on funding). This finding may indicate that rather than developing goal-specific strategies, it may be more effective and holistic to employ a set of broad-based strategies that cut across the three goals while also developing some goal-specific action steps.
- ❑ **CAN needs to continue to engage schools/school leadership and county officials.** When discussing collaboration and outreach, participants frequently cited schools as critical partners. School leadership was particularly seen as an important engagement partner and as a resource to explore funding and other shared resources. As well, county officials were seen as vital collaborators to inform and influence.

Potential regional strategies for CAN

Strategies for Facilitating Local Collaborations

- ❑ Develop a short Request for Proposal to support regional technical assistance mini-grants to a select number of local communities or local collaboratives to address a specific after school issue or need in their community (such as funding, transportation, data collection). CAN could provide technical assistance throughout the implementation process.
- ❑ Contract with regional consultants to provide collaboration facilitation to select technical assistance grantees during the initial phase of work with selected local communities.
- ❑ The models, strategies, best practices, and lessons generated from these pilot communities could be used to inform other communities struggling with similar issues.

Securing Sustainable Funding

- ❑ Create a clearinghouse of available funding opportunities on CAN's website
- ❑ Send out regular e-mail blasts to subscribers with updates on funding opportunities
- ❑ Continue to engage and work closely with county officials (human service directors and county commissioners) to explore areas of partnership aimed at supporting strategies to enhance resources for after school programs

Outreach and Education

- ❑ Offer regional trainings on selected topics, such as outreach and messaging
- ❑ Offer messaging "toolkits" via the website

Making the Case for After School Programming through Data

- ❑ Offer data “toolkits” on identifying, collecting, analyzing, and messaging
- ❑ Utilize the various data currently being collected including the CAN luncheon report and The Colorado Trust’s statewide assessment as an advocacy tool to engage school districts and city and county officials

Conclusion

Informing and being informed by local communities is an essential ingredient to the success of the Colorado AfterSchool Network. In this vein, the “Community Connection Luncheons” were an important first step in identifying critical issues that affect local communities and to inform statewide stakeholders about CAN. As CAN begins to craft regional strategies, local stakeholder input and buy-in will continue to be a critical element in developing and implementing appropriate action plans. This report is designed to mark an initial path in which CAN begins to document and connect the variety of regional issues that make up Colorado’s out-of-school time landscape. It is our hope that this report will continue to further the local and state-level conversations around the importance of after school programs for all youth.

Appendix A

The following table identifies the types of organizations that attended the five “Community Connection Luncheons”.

Organization Type	Number of Participants (N=105)
Community based after school programs	19
National organizations (4-H, Boys & Girls Club, YMCA, Junior Achievement, Girl Scouts, Big Brothers/Big Sisters)	18
Community based organizations	13
School based after school programs	12
Childcare	8
City/County departments (Recreation Centers, Police Dept.)	6
Not specified	6
School leadership	5
City/Council Officials	4
Libraries	4
Private Schools	3
Juvenile justice	3
Other	3
Media	1

HELP US LEARN MORE ABOUT YOUR PROGRAM AND COMMUNITY

Our number one goal is to create a statewide movement to support after school programming in Colorado. We envision a time in which public officials, school boards, businesses and parents in every county know the value and impacts of after school. We are working to build strong public support so that as a state we are able to provide the resources for every child to participate in after school programming. To do this we need you! Please take a minute to fill out this survey and tell us a little bit about your program and your community. This information will help us craft regional strategies and services to better meet your needs.

Please tell us a little bit about your program....

Program Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic	<input type="checkbox"/> Arts and/or Enrichment
	<input type="checkbox"/> Community-Based	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
	<input type="checkbox"/> School-Based	<input type="checkbox"/> Social/Cultural
	<input type="checkbox"/> Youth Leadership/Character Building	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

Ages Served	<input type="checkbox"/> K-3rd	<input type="checkbox"/> 3rd-5th	<input type="checkbox"/> 6th-8th
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8th-12th	<input type="checkbox"/> K-12th	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

After School Membership Affiliations	<input type="checkbox"/> CAQSAP	<input type="checkbox"/> CACE	<input type="checkbox"/> Boys and Girls Clubs
	<input type="checkbox"/> YMCA	<input type="checkbox"/> 4-H	<input type="checkbox"/> 21st Century Learning Centers

Appendix B

Please tell us a little bit about local issues, needs, and priorities....

Types of Resources that would be most beneficial to your program and/or community?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Research and Best Practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluation Tools
<input type="checkbox"/>	Program Activity Ideas	<input type="checkbox"/>	Networking Opportunities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Funding Updates	<input type="checkbox"/>	Media/Public Awareness Tools
<input type="checkbox"/>	Training _____ (list topics)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____		

What policy priorities are most important to your program and/or community?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Licensing/Quality Standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	State Funding
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coordinated After school systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Data on after school
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Funding	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____

Are there specific policy makers, local officials or other champions that you recommend we contact?

Are there other pressing issues or needs related to after school in your community that you would like us to address?

What other regional or local networks should we be connecting with in your area?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Consolidated Child Care Pilots	<input type="checkbox"/>	Its About Kids Network
<input type="checkbox"/>	Build a Generation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Regional Council of Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safe and Drug Free Communities Collaborations	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____

Appendix C

The following table identifies all of the relevant themes identified across the five “Community Connection Luncheons”.

Theme	Number of Responses (N=141)
Professional Development – of staff and volunteers	10
Collaboration	47
w/schools	5
w/providers	4
w/parents	3
in relation to duplication of services	2
w/other/miscellaneous	33
Resources – website, funding information	10
Outreach	17
Data – Id gaps, analysis of needs, Evaluation	14
Transportation	4
Funding	15
from Donors	1
from Businesses	1
from Taxes	1
Communication	6
Media	2
Research/Best Practices	6
Other	10

Definition of themes

Professional Development: Defined as the need for local training – especially in the rural areas, training and technical assistance, in-services for staff, professional development needed to work with students, parent educators, and professionals on types of students we work with, training need to include cultural competency, and training on working with volunteers.

Collaboration: Defined as the need for increased collaboration in order to create information sharing, networking, and coalescing individuals/groups to work on specific issues. Connecting with schools, school staff and leadership, families/parents, youth, libraries, the juvenile justice system, larger state and/or Federal programs, private programs such as Boys and Girls Clubs, existing networks and coalitions were the entities acknowledged possible collaborators. [*Targeted collaborators were classified in a collaboration subcategory, if more than one group was cited or no specific group was cited the response was categorized under general collaboration.]

Appendix C

Resources: Participants cited resources needed as website content including program and funding and grant information, and maps detailing where providers are located.

Outreach: Defined as connecting with different target audiences (e.g. “develop community awareness of all programs”, “connect with business people”, “invite legislators to our programs to see what’s happening”, “educate schools on value of after school and info sharing with parents”). Outreach also included having a unified message regarding after school or framing after school as part of a “Pathways to Positive Development” Initiative.

Data: Defined as having the ability to provide data to show the benefits of after school evaluation tools to measure their programs data, as well as providers need for data about pregnancy rates, crime rates, barriers to youth participation and a general needs assessment of who is/isn’t being served, demographics, etc.

Transportation: Identified as a need or barrier to program participation. Participants also discussed ways their community could collaborate to fulfill this need.

Funding: Identified as a topic of need or concern; targeting individual donors, local businesses, national corporations, faith-based organizations, foundations, and taxes as a means of increasing funding. Funding was also discussed in the context of creating sustainability that did not rely solely on grants, and as a means of setting up local hubs in order to increase collaboration.

Communication: Defined as improving communication between programs, the CAN Advisory Council and community leaders, communicating with parents through the schools, and information sharing

Media: Defined as working with the media as a means of increasing visibility, building public will and increasing funds

Research/Best Practices: Defined as information about existing successful programs, sharing models of what works, and access to research

Other: Consisted of the issue of distance between communities and programs, the trend in home schooling, assistance regarding increasing the volunteer base, and the need for a grant writer to improve maintain quality programming

Appendix D - Survey Responses

	Alamosa	Ft. Collins	Pueblo	Durango	Grand Junction	TOTAL	%
# of surveys turned in	7	11	14	9	10	51	
Program Type/Region							
Academic	2	3	6	3	7	21	41%
Community-Based	3	6	7	2	4	22	43%
School-based	3	3	6	4	4	20	39%
Youth Leadership/Character							
Building	2	2	9	4	7	24	47%
Arts and/or Enrichment	0	4	5	4	5	18	35%
Recreation	0	4	7	2	4	17	33%
Social/Cultural	0	2	7	2	2	13	25%
Other	2	3	5	2	2	14	27%

Alamosa: Early Childhood Council, no AS program yet - will be community-based, youth-in-conflict mediation, parent teen mediation training

Ft. Collins: Technology, job skills, consolidated childcare, resource and referral, training/t.a., community coalition that coordinates America's Promise Initiative

Pueblo: partner w/other orgs, mentoring (3xs), abstinence education

Durango: Low-income housing neighborhood networks, private childcare 6 weeks - 13 years.

Grand Junction: Family Support Programs 0-21, Children's Extensive Support Waiver - provides services and supports to special needs children

Ages Served	Alamosa	Ft. Collins	Pueblo	Durango	Grand Junction	TOTAL	%
K-3rd	2	4	4	3	4	17	33%
3rd-5th	3	4	5	3	4	19	37%
6th-8th	5	2	6	2	1	16	31%
8th-12th	5	1	3	1	1	11	22%
K-12th	2	2	5	4	3	16	31%
Other	4	4	2	3	3	16	31%

Alamosa: 0-8, Head Start, pre-K thru 21, over 18yrs.

Ft. Collins: 6-18 yrs., 7-9th grade, 0-12 yrs., preschool - 12

Pueblo: 1-12th, 6-17 year old

Durango: 4-6th, 1-2th (2xs)

Grand Junction: 0-21 years, 0-18, 1st-5th

After School Membership	Alamosa	Ft. Collins	Pueblo	Durango	Grand Junction	TOTAL	%
Affiliations							
CAQSAP	0	1	0	1	0	2	4%
YMCA	0	0	3	0	0	3	6%
CACE	0	0	0	1	0	1	2%
4-H	0	1	2	0	4	7	14%
Boys & Girls Clubs	2	3	2	1	0	8	16%

	Alamosa	Ft. Collins	Pueblo	Durango	Grand Junction	TOTAL	%
After School Membership							
Affiliations							
21st CCLC	2	2	7	0	5	16	31%
Other	1 (NAEYC)	2 (NAEYC, NACCRA)	1 (Urban League)	0	0	4%	8%
Types of Resources							
Research/Best Practices	2	4	6	4	3	19	37%
Program Activity Ideas	2	3	5	5	5	20	39%
Funding Updates	6	7	13	6	10	42	82%
Evaluation Tools	3	4	7	5	6	25	49%
Networking Opportunities	2	5	8	1	5	21	41%
Media/Public Awareness	2	4	6	2	5	19	37%
Training	2	2	3	5	5	17	33%
*Topics identified	SAPST	funding, 3rd-8th grade specific		maintaining staff, tutoring (3xs), improvement of skills, volunteers			
Other	1	2	2	0	2	7	14%
Alamosa: employment							
Ft. Collins: transportation, community/business awareness							
Pueblo: funding, state licensing issues,							
Durango: N/A							
Grand Junction: inclusive programs countywide, current list of grant writers							
Policy Priorities							
Licensing/Quality Standards	1	2	2	1	1	7	14%
State Funding	6	7	7	4	5	29	57%
Coordinated AS Systems	4	3	10	4	5	26	51%
Data	2	0	8	4	2	16	31%
Local Funding	5	7	8	5	7	32	63%
Other	0	0	0	0	1	1	2%
Grand Junction: programs that have staff trained to care for and activities with special needs children							
Regional Networks to connect with							
Consolidated Child Care Pilots	N/A	3	3	2	0	8	16%
Build a Generation	N/A	1	3	1	2	7	14%
Safe & Drug Free Communities	N/A	2	4	2	4	12	24%

	Alamosa	Ft. Collins	Pueblo	Durango	Grand Junction	TOTAL	%
Regional Networks to connect with							
It's About Kids	N/A	0	3	3	1	7	14%
Regional Council of Government	N/A	0	1	2	0	3	6%
Other	N/A	1	0	1	1	3	6%
Alamosa: N/A							
Ft. Collins: business networks							
Pueblo: N/A							
Durango: School Districts							
Grand Junction: Special needs children/mesa developmental services							
Open-ended questions							
Champions of AS							
Alamosa:	4-H CU Extension in Del Norte, Julie Mordecai - B&G Club of SLV, City government - esp. city council						
Ft. Collins:	School District Admin., like to develop local AS & explore the linkage to CAN - would like to do a coordinated outreach effort, Angie Paccione, Pat Stryker						
Pueblo:	Abel Tapia, Buffie McFadden, Lola Spradley, Dorothy Butcher, Sen. Ken Kester, Huerfano County Commissioners Scott King, Roger Cain, Ores DeHerrera						
Durango:	city officials, district schools, So.Ute Tribe						
Grand Junction:	Judy Jespon - Safe & Drug Free Schools, Fromer Rep. Gayle Berry, West Grand School District, Fraser Valley Rec. Dept.						
Pressing issues/needs in community							
Alamosa:	High adult illiteracy - Spanish and English, Extremes of standards of living, small populations spend over large geographic areas, transportation, We hope to tie-in w/bully prevention efforts not only w/our 5 target sites for our CO trust initiative, but other sites as well						
Ft. Collins:	Transportation, status						
Pueblo:							
Durango:	transportation(2xs) - to activities and programs, Best way to hold meetings that end in action rather than more meetings						
Grand Junction:	funding schools across the county including special needs population - especially for older children ages 10-20 years, parent, Family involvement, transportation						