

---

**COLLABORATIVE GROUPS, COLLABORATIVE CHAIRS, AND  
COMMUNITY COORDINATORS IN THE DISCOVERY INITIATIVE  
AS OF MID-2007  
Report to the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund**

---

**Prepared by S. A. Stephens, Ph.D.  
Center for Assessment and Policy Development**

**Revised March 2011**

This report was prepared as part of the Discovery Initiative evaluation for the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund. The information used in this report was collected in the summer of 2007 and initial summaries were prepared for internal distribution in September 2009. Further details on the data collection are presented in the report.

I appreciate the input and feedback of the Memorial Fund staff, the members and staff of the Discovery community collaborative groups, and the community liaisons. The analyses and conclusions in this report solely reflect the perspective of the Evaluation Team.

Sam Stephens  
Center for Assessment and Policy Development  
[www.capd.org](http://www.capd.org)

## INTRODUCTION

During its previous initiative, Children First, and since 2002 in the Discovery Initiative, the William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund has worked with Connecticut communities with the goal of improving early care and education services and educational outcomes for children from birth through age eight.<sup>1</sup> Collaboration is a core value of the Memorial Fund's approach and participating communities are expected to function through a collaborative group, either pre-existing or newly formed.

Collaboration is defined in the Discovery glossary<sup>2</sup> as: "A process whereby multiple organizations, systems and community stakeholders work together to achieve outcomes beneficial to a community that could not be achieved individually." The glossary further defined the composition and functions of the Discovery collaborative group as:

"A broadly representative body of community stakeholders that assumes responsibility, on behalf of the community at large, to improve outcomes for young children. The collaborative group functions as a catalyst or change agent by creating and sustaining the political will necessary to change social conditions including community attitudes, institutional policies, professional practice, the allocation of resources, and the ways in which the community makes decisions and establishes priorities. Participants commit to a common vision, conduct joint planning, pool institutional resources and share the risks, results and rewards."

Specific areas of responsibility for the Discovery collaborative groups are in the areas of community engagement and mobilization, parent leadership development, resource leveraging, and management of the Discovery grant and action plan.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Seven communities participated in the Children First Initiative beginning in 1995 and an additional 42 communities were invited to participate in the Discovery Initiative in 2002. In both initiatives, each participating community was expected to organize collaborative groups and by 2007 all 49 communities had formed such groups, in one case with three communities joining in a single group. In 2008 5 more communities joined the Initiative; this report does not include these communities.

<sup>2</sup> See [http://discovery.wcgmf.org/category\\_19.html](http://discovery.wcgmf.org/category_19.html).

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix A for the Community Collaborative Table Description provided to communities in May 2007 as part of the 2008-2009 Grant Application Packet.

The Discovery collaborative groups received modest annual grants from \$10,000 to \$50,000 to support their work. In most cases, a major use of these funds was to hire a local coordinator to staff the group,<sup>4</sup> although over time some groups were able to leverage local cash and/or in-kind resources from public and private sources to pay for all or part of the collaborative group's staffing.

Staff support was recognized by the Memorial Fund as a critical factor in the functioning and success of the collaborative groups; this factor is included in the Discovery Community Self-Assessment Tool that the foundation and the collaborative groups themselves use in assessing community strength.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, the leadership of the collaborative group through its chair or co-chairs was also considered a critical factor in the functioning of the Initiative. The strength of this leadership is also a factor included in the Discovery Community Self-Assessment.

During the summer of 2007 the Discovery Initiative evaluation team conducted interviews with representatives of almost all 49 community collaborative groups. A total of 45 interviews were conducted, primarily with the collaborative group's coordinator, sometimes joined by the chair and other collaborative members. The questions were open-ended, that is, specific response categories were not provided. Codes were developed for the questions after all interviews were completed; individual interview responses could receive more than one code. The interviews asked participants to describe the role and activities, as played out in that community, of the collaborative group, the collaborative chair or co-chairs, and the community coordinator. This report summarizes the responses to these open-ended questions.

---

<sup>4</sup> In 2006, 95 percent of the Discovery communities paid for some of the coordinator salary from Memorial Fund grant funds; at that time, the full salary of coordinators was paid with Memorial Fund grant funds in 69 percent of the communities.

<sup>5</sup> This tool was initially developed as "Indicators of Success" in 2008 by the Memorial Fund staff and the consultants working for the Memorial Fund as community liaisons to guide the annual internal review of community progress. In 2009 this tool, called Discovery Community Self-Assessment, was introduced to the communities and used in their own annual self-assessment process. See "Constructing Collaborative Success for Network Learning: The Story of the Discovery Community Assessment Tool," A. Frusciante and C. Siberon, *Foundation Review*, Volume 2, Issue 1, 2010, pages 53-71, for a description of the development of this tool.

## **ROLE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE COLLABORATIVE GROUP AS OF MID-2007**

As noted in the Introduction, specific areas of responsibility for the Discovery collaborative groups were defined by the Memorial Fund and included community engagement and mobilization, parent leadership development, resource leveraging, and management of the Discovery grant and action plan. While written materials defining these responsibilities were not distributed until May 2007, they had been broadly discussed and supported by technical assistance throughout the Initiative.

This section describes how interview participants – primarily community coordinators, but others as well – defined the work of the collaborative group in their community in mid-2007.

### **Major Types of Collaborative Activities Mentioned During Interviews**

Six major types of collaborative group roles or activities were mentioned during the interviews:

- **Community Voice & Planning**
  - This includes responses describing the collaborative as “giving the community a unified voice on early childhood issues” and “supporting or stimulating community planning around early childhood issues.”
  
- **Work on Early Childhood Issues**
  - This included responses describing the collaborative as “being a catalyst for community activities” and “working on issues related to early childhood education or other services to children.”
  
- **Information Source**

- This included responses describing the collaborative as “being the place to go for information on early care and education issues,” “gathering and assessing community data,” and “evaluating early childhood activities and initiatives.”
  
- **Policy Action**
  - This included responses describing the collaborative as “mobilizing voters on relevant issues such as school budgets” and “providing local people with information on state-wide issues.”
  
- **Parent Engagement**
  - This included responses describing the collaborative as “fostering connections with parents” and “supporting parent leadership training.”
  
- **Connections**
  - This included responses describing the collaborative as “fostering connections with schools” and “being a place to foster connections among organizations or initiatives in the community.”

### **Percent of Collaborative Groups Reporting Each Type of Activity**

More than one type of role or activity could be reported for the collaborative group. The percent of groups reported to carry out each type of activity is shown below:

- **Community Voice & Planning** – 33 percent of collaborative groups
  
- **Work on Early Childhood Issues** – 56 percent of collaborative groups
  
- **Information Source** -- 31 percent of collaborative groups

- **Policy Action** – 9 percent of collaborative groups
- **Parent Engagement** – 36 percent of collaborative groups
- **Connections** -- 40 percent of collaborative groups

### **Clusters of Collaborative Group Activities**

The six activity types clustered into three sets of collaborative group activities, based on factor analysis.<sup>6</sup>

- Three activity types– parent engagement, connections, and community voice and planning – formed one cluster of activities that tended to occur together. This cluster represents “community engagement” activities and accounted for 28 percent of the variation among communities in the types of collaborative group activities.
- Two activity types – policy action and work on early childhood issues – formed another cluster. This cluster represents “policy and practice change” activities and accounted for 20 percent of the variation among the Discovery communities.
- One activity type – information source – was its own cluster. This cluster represents “communication” activities and accounted for 17 percent of the variation in activities among communities.

### **Association of Collaborative Group Activities and Collaborative History**

---

<sup>6</sup> Factor analysis analyzes the correlations among a set of variables to determine which variables are statistically likely to occur together. Factor analysis also determines the percent of differences among cases that are accounted for by each factor or cluster. Overall, the three clusters together accounted for 65 percent of the variation or differences among the Discovery communities in the activities reported for the collaborative group. The “community engagement” cluster accounted for 28 percent of the explained variation, the “policy and practice change” cluster accounted for 20 percent, and the “communication” cluster, 17 percent.

Whether a community had participated in the Children First Initiative – and thus had longer experience with collaboration around early childhood issues – was not statistically associated with the types of activities that the Discovery collaborative group was reported to undertake.

However, the level of collaborative structure and functioning in 2004, represented by the cohort to which the communities were assigned, was correlated with the cluster of “community engagement” activities. These were activities of the group representing the community voice and those encouraging community planning related to early childhood. Communities that began Discovery with more experience in collaboration appeared to be more ready to engage more broadly in community engagement activities.

## Analysis

One way to look at the work of the Discovery community collaborative groups is to compare the vision for what those groups would do, based on the Memorial Fund’s description, with what appears to be their actual activities, as reported in mid-2007. The following table shows this comparison:

<b>DISCOVERY COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE DESCRIPTION<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>INTERVIEW RESPONSE CATEGORY</b>	<b>PERCENT OF COMMUNITIES IN RESPONSE CATEGORY</b>
Community engagement & mobilization	Community voice & planning	33%
	Connections within community	40%
	Information source	31%
	Work on early childhood issues	56%
	Policy action	9%
Parent leadership development	Parent engagement	36%
Resource leveraging	NA	NA
Management of grant	NA	NA

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix A.



--	--	--

As suggested by this table, managing the Discovery grant appears to have been a “given” by the interview participants, as it was not mentioned as a separate category for collaborative activities. On the other hand, finding other resources to support the collaborative group’s work, while recognized during the interviews as important for sustainability, was not yet reported as a major activity of the group. Each of the other categories in the Discovery definition of the work of community collaborative groups was addressed to some extent in the activities described during the interviews.

Community engagement and mobilization as a category of Discovery group activities is well represented by responses that refer to “creating a community voice,” “fostering connections,” and “providing information.” Respondents in 67 percent of the Discovery communities reported that one or more of these activities for their collaborative group.

“Work on early childhood issues” refers to activities of the collaborative groups specifically focused on early childhood education. Generally, these activities involved undertaking or supporting activities related to early childhood education practice such as training for providers or to parent education on early childhood education such as resource guides. These activities were reported as part of the role of collaborative group in almost 60 percent of the Discovery communities.

“Parent engagement” was mentioned as an activity of the Discovery collaborative group for one-third of the communities. Parent leadership development and parent engagement, while recognized as an important value of the Discovery Initiative, continued to be an area of struggle for most collaborative groups, as noted in the interviews.

In mid-2007 “policy action” was infrequently mentioned as part of the collaborative group’s role, and no mention was made specifically of leveraging resources. Resource leveraging requires strong relationships with committed partners that can redistribute funds and other resources in support of the collaborative’s goals. Taking action on specific policy issues is also more likely to be taken on by groups with high community visibility and credibility. The Discovery collaborative groups, most of which were newly formed beginning in 2002 and just beginning to operate in 2004, were most likely not yet prepared to take on these roles by mid-2007.



## THE ROLE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE COLLABORATIVE CHAIR AS OF MID-2007

As noted in the Introduction, the leadership exercised by the chair or co-chairs of the community collaborative group was recognized as a key factor in the group's success. The Discovery Community Self-Assessment tool<sup>8</sup> defined the highest level of "strong collaborative leadership" as including the following characteristics:<sup>9</sup>

- The chair directs the work and is committed and skilled in exercising distributive leadership – convening the executive/steering committee, delegating responsibility and facilitating collective accountability.
- The chair leads the process for setting the agenda and [for taking] responsibility for making progress in implementing strategies.
- The chair...[fosters] new leadership and [ensures] there is a system for leadership succession.
- The chair...[is] a leader in the broader community, recognized [for] making connections with diverse groups, leveraging other community assets, engaging other leaders and using their personal influence to advance the work of the collaborative.
- The chair thinks strategically and understands the local and state policy environment.

---

<sup>8</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The full description of this Indicator of Success area is provided in Appendix B.

This section describes how interview participants – primarily community coordinators, but others as well – defined the role and activities of the chair in their community collaborative group in mid-2007.

## **Major Types of Activities Conducted by the Chair**

Four major types of roles or activities for the collaborative group chair or co-chairs were mentioned during the interviews:

- **Leading Collaborative Group Meetings**
  - This includes responses describing the chair as setting meeting agendas as well as chairing meetings.
  
- **Marketing the Discovery Work in the Community**
  - This included responses describing the chair or co-chairs as “being the voice or face of the collaborative” and “building relationships in the community.”
  
- **Moving the Discovery Action Plan Forward**
  - This included responses describing the chair or co-chairs as overseeing the work of committees.
  
- **Linking the Collaborative with the Memorial Fund**
  - This included responses describing the chair or co-chairs as “sending out information on the Initiative to collaborative members” and “attending Memorial Fund meetings.”

## **Percent of Communities with Chairs Reported to Carry Out Each Type of Activity**

Collaborative chairs could be reported as responsible for more than one type of activity, as indicated below, including both work within the collaborative group and links with other groups and organizations.

- **Leading Collaborative Group Meetings** – 64 percent
- **Marketing the Discovery Work in the Community** – 52 percent
- **Moving the Discovery Action Plan Forward** – 48 percent
- **Linking the Collaborative with the Memorial Fund** – 24 percent

### **Clusters of Chair Activities**

Together, using factor analysis,<sup>10</sup> all four activity types accounted for 84 percent of the differences among communities in what the chair or co-chairs did for the collaborative group. Each type of activity was independent of the others; there were no clusters of types of chair activities.

### **Association of Chair Activities and Collaborative History and Functioning**

Chairs in communities with longer collaborative history were no more or less likely to be responsible for particular types of activities than chairs in communities that had not participated in the Children First Initiative or that had weak collaborative structure and functioning in 2004.

### **Challenges in the Chair Role**

During the interview, coordinators and others participating in the interview were asked to describe any challenges they believed their collaborative group's chair faced in

---

<sup>10</sup> See footnote 6 for a brief explanation of factor analysis.

carrying out their responsibilities. Chairs in only 9 communities were reported to encounter no challenges in their role.

The challenges faced by collaborative group chairs included:

- **Insufficient time** to carry out the responsibilities – mentioned by 34 percent of the communities in which one or more challenges were reported
- **Lack of specificity or clarity** about the chair role – mentioned by 31 percent
- **Difficulty in coordinating** the activities of the collaborative – mentioned by 28 percent
- **Problems in sustaining member participation** and engaging parents – mentioned by 22 percent

## Analysis

Again, a useful way to analyze the roles and responsibilities of the position of collaborative group chair is to compare how it was envisioned for the Initiative and what was reported as of mid-2007. The table below illustrates this comparison:

<b>DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>INTERVIEW RESPONSE</b>	<b>PERCENT OF COMMUNITIES</b>
Sets agenda & monitors work plan	Leads meetings	64%
Uses distributive leadership	Moves action plan through committees	48%
Fosters new leadership	NA	NA
Uses connections into	Markets Discovery in the	52%

community	community	
Strategizes on policy issues	NA	NA
NA	Links with the Memorial Fund	24%

The role of the chair in directing the work of the collaborative group – both in meetings and through committees – was well-recognized in many communities, as reported in mid-2007. The same is true of the chair’s role in making the collaborative group and its work visible in the community. These types of activities were described for between 48 and 64 percent of the communities.

However, as of mid-2007, two key aspects of the role of collaborative chair were not mentioned in any of the Discovery communities. These were fostering new leadership from within the collaborative and helping the group address local and state policy issues. This may reflect the early development of the groups at that point. Leadership succession may not yet have become a pressing issue and, as mentioned in the previous section, the group itself may not have been ready to take on policy action.

One role for collaborative group chairs in one-quarter of the Discovery communities was to maintain ties with the Memorial Fund. This was not included in the Discovery Community Self-Assessment Tool description of strong collaborative leadership, but was reported, at least in some communities, as a necessary and important role in any group supported by an outside funder.

## THE ROLE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE COORDINATOR AS OF MID-2007

As noted in the Introduction, the skills of the community coordinator were also recognized as a key factor in the success of Discovery collaborative groups. The Discovery Community Self-Assessment Tool definition for the highest level for “strong and skilled facilitator (staff support)” include the following characteristics:<sup>11</sup>

- The staff provides leadership and facilitates the work of the collaborative group by helping the group think strategically and focus on the “big picture,” identifying and raising issues that need to be considered, and seeking solutions to challenges or barriers.
  
- The staff maintains a functional relationship with the collaborative sponsor,<sup>12</sup> chairs, members of the collaborative, parents, providers, and policymakers.
  
- The staff functions as a neutral facilitator.
  
- The staff demonstrates commitment to the values of parent engagement and collaboration.

---

<sup>11</sup> The full description of this Indicator of Success area is provided in Appendix C.

<sup>12</sup> Collaborative sponsors (originally called “collaborative agents”) were the community organizations that acted as the fiscal agent for the Discovery community grants; they were also expected to play an active role in and support the work of the collaborative group. See [http://discovery.wcgmf.org/resources/sps\\_resource\\_1159.pdf](http://discovery.wcgmf.org/resources/sps_resource_1159.pdf) for the evaluation report on the role of collaborative sponsors (agents) in the Discovery Initiative.



This section describes how interview participants – primarily community coordinators, but others as well – defined the role and activities of the coordinator in their community collaborative group in mid-2007.

## **Major Types of Coordinator Activities**

Six major types of coordinator roles or activities were mentioned during the interviews:

- **Managing Collaborative Meetings**
  - This includes responses describing the coordinator as “handling logistics for meetings,” “planning and managing events and retreats,” and “staffing meetings by taking notes and facilitating discussions.”
  
- **Facilitating Communication among Collaborative Members**
  - This included responses describing the coordinator as “distributing information to members” and “acting as the ‘glue’ for the group – keeping us together and on track.”
  
- **Carrying Out Outreach and Publicity**
  - This included responses describing the coordinator as “attending community meetings as the representative of the collaborative,” “handling publicity,” and “working to engage community members and parents.”
  
- **Implementing Discovery Strategies**
  - This included responses describing the coordinator as “participating in regional activities,” “carrying out action plan activities,” and “coordinating action plan activities.”
  
- **Participating in Initiative Capacity-Building Supports**

- This included responses describing the coordinator as “attending Memorial Fund meetings and capacity-building events,” “encouraging member participation in Discovery/Memorial Fund activities,” and “connecting with the Memorial Fund including the community liaison.”
- **Handling Administrative Duties**
  - This included responses describing the coordinator as “processing paperwork and completing reports,” “writing grants,” “drafting by-laws, job descriptions, brochures, and other materials,” and “designing and conducting surveys and research.”

### **Percent of Coordinators Reported to Carry Out Each Type of Activity**

Coordinators could be reported as responsible for more than one type of activity. The percent of coordinators for each type of activity is shown below, ranging from 42 percent handling administrative duties for the collaborative group to 64 percent managing the logistics for collaborative meetings.

- **Managing Collaborative Meetings** – 64 percent
- **Facilitating Communication among Collaborative Members** – 60 percent
- **Carrying Out Outreach and Publicity** – 51 percent
- **Implementing Discovery Strategies** – 62 percent
- **Participating in Initiative Capacity-Building Supports** – 40 percent
- **Handling Administrative Duties** – 42 percent

### **Clusters of Coordinator Activities**

Together, using factor analysis,<sup>13</sup> all six activity types accounted for 68 percent of the differences among communities in what the coordinator did for the collaborative group.

- Four activity types – administrative duties, meeting management, communication facilitation, and outreach and publicity – formed one cluster of activities that accounted for 30 percent of the differences in coordinator activities across communities.
- One activity type – participating in capacity-building – accounted for an additional 21 percent of community differences in coordinator responsibilities.
- One activity type – implementing the local Discovery action plan – was the third cluster that accounted for an additional 17 percent of the differences among communities.

### **Association of Coordinator Activities and Collaborative History and Functioning**

Coordinators in communities with longer collaborative history were unlikely to be directly involved in community outreach and publicity. However, these community factors – whether a community had participated in the Children First Initiative and its level of collaborative structure and functioning in 2004 – were not associated with any of the other five types of coordinator activities. This suggests that, while others on more established collaborative group, particularly the chair, may take responsibility for engaging the community, certain responsibilities remain with the coordinator.

### **Challenges in the Coordinator Role**

During the interview, coordinators were asked to describe any challenges they faced in carrying out their responsibilities. Only 6 coordinators mentioned no challenges; the other 39 who participated in an interview mentioned a range of challenges that fell into the following categories:

---

<sup>13</sup> Factor analysis analyzes the correlations among a set of variables to determine which variables are statistically likely to occur together. Factor analysis also determines the percent of differences among cases that are accounted for by each factor or cluster.

- **Insufficient Resources** , including too few hours allotted to the coordinator position, needing more staff to carry out the work, and lack of funding from other sources beyond the Memorial Fund – this was reported as a challenge by 47 percent of the coordinators interviewed
- **Lack of Clarity or Focus**, including a lack of direction or unclear role for the coordinator position and the need to develop by-laws and job descriptions, as well as “too much talk and not enough work” in the collaborative group – reported as a challenge by 29 percent of coordinators
- **Low Participation in the Collaborative Group**, including problems with engaging parents and sustaining collaborative group participation among members – reported as a challenge by 29 percent of coordinators
- **Weak Community Interest**, including difficulties in making the Discovery collaborative group visible in the community and obtaining community buy-in for its work – mentioned as a challenge by 22 percent of coordinators
- **Unfamiliarity with Coordinator Position**, usually a new coordinator who reported needing to get up to speed on the Initiative and the local collaborative group’s work – a challenge for 16 percent of coordinators interviewed
- **Community Crisis**, usually due to a change in community leadership – a challenge for 13 percent of coordinators

Of the 39 coordinators who described challenges in carrying out their responsibilities, 41 percent (16 coordinators) reported only one type of challenge and an equal number reported two types of challenges. Only 7 coordinators reported 3 or 4 challenges, and none mentioned all six.

## Analysis

As in the earlier sections, comparing what the Discovery Initiative describes as characteristics and activities of strong staff support with what was reported in mid-2007 as the roles and responsibilities of coordinators highlights some similarities and differences. This comparison is illustrated on the next page. Certain aspects of the Discovery definition of the roles and responsibilities of the coordinator were not explicitly named by the coordinators themselves during the 2007 interviews. Some of this may be due to differences in terminology; for example, taking responsibility for implementing the group’s action plan (which was given as one of their responsibilities by 62 percent of the coordinators) might mean “providing leadership and facilitating the work of Discovery.”

Certain activities clearly fell within the role of the community coordinator, in both the Discovery description and in the interview reports. Coordinators in more than 60 percent of communities were expected to support the meetings of the collaborative group and handle communication among group members.

In the majority of communities (between 50 and 60 percent), the coordinator was reported to be responsible for implementing the collaborative group’s action plan and for conducting community outreach and publicity. It is not surprising, then, that a major challenge faced by almost half of the coordinators was the lack of time and resources to carry out their duties.<sup>14</sup>

In many (40 percent) communities, coordinators were responsible for carrying out administrative duties associated with the group’s work and the Memorial Fund grant. In approximately the same proportion of communities, coordinators had the responsibility for attending meetings and technical assistance sessions held by the Memorial Fund.

<b>DISCOVERY DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>INTERVIEW RESPONSE</b>	<b>PERCENT OF COMMUNITIES</b>
Provides leadership &	NA	NA

<sup>14</sup> Three-quarters of community coordinators in 2007 held part-time positions. In 2006, on average, coordinators worked 17 hours per week, with wide variation across communities – from as few as 2 hours per week to 47 hours per week. Approximately one-quarter (22 percent) of the Discovery communities in 2006 had coordinators who worked less than 10 hours per week; 44 percent of the coordinators worked from 10 to 19 hours per week; 22 percent from 20 to 29 hours per week; and 12 percent worked 30 hours per week or more.

facilitates work of the collaborative		
Support relationship with collaborative agent, chair, members, parents	Facilitate communication	60%
Act as neutral facilitator	Manage meetings	64%
Demonstrate commitment to values of parent engagement & collaboration	NA	NA
	Conduct outreach & publicity	51%
	Implement action plan	62%
	Participate in Memorial Fund meetings & technical assistance	40%
	Carry out administrative duties	42%

At the time of the interviews (mid-2007), no mention was made of the coordinator's leadership role in helping the community collaborative group think and plan strategically about the broader scope of early childhood education issues. There was a shift in Discovery from action planning around specific objectives to community-wide planning and decision-making in Fall 2007. After that point, this role for the coordinator may have become more evident.

## **SUMMARY**

At the time the information presented in this paper was gathered – during the summer of 2007 – the Discovery Initiative was almost at the end of its expected four-year implementation period. The Memorial Fund’s decision to extend the Initiative into 2008 and 2009 was a recognition both of the progress that had been made in establishing collaborative groups to mobilize communities for work on early childhood education issues and of the fact that, for most, this point was still early in their development. That “immaturity” is reflected in the comparisons between what was intended and what was reported in the roles and responsibilities of the Discovery community collaborative group, the chair, and the coordinator. In many communities by mid-2007, the foundations for effective action had been laid but the potential of community collaboration had not yet been broadly realized.

During 2008 and 2009, the Initiative focused on providing community collaborative groups, their leadership, and their staff with training and resources in areas that were intended to support them in taking on the next level of work. These areas included facilitative leadership to strengthen collaborative member engagement and action, community decision making to reach beyond the collaborative group to develop broadly supported early childhood community plans, and results-based accountability to commit to actions to improve early childhood outcomes. In summarizing the Discovery Initiative through 2009, the evaluation will look for evidence that the community collaborative groups have moved forward in acting as catalysts for community analysis, planning, and action on behalf of young children.

**APPENDIX A:**  
**COLLABORATIVE COMMUNITY TABLE**  
**As defined on the Discovery web site**  
**([discovery.wcgmf.org/sps\\_resource\\_750.pdf](http://discovery.wcgmf.org/sps_resource_750.pdf))**  
**for the 2002-2009 period**

A new or pre-existing or reconstituted group of individuals and institutions vested by the community with the responsibility to articulate and realize a shared vision for young children (birth to eight) and their families. The *Collaborative* is responsible for the governance, design and implementation of the local Discovery plan. The *Collaborative* is accountable to the community and the Memorial Fund for the direction of the Discovery Grant Program.<sup>15</sup>

**Responsibility Area Description**

**INCLUSIVE:** Those most affected by the work to be undertaken are provided opportunities for meaningful participation. Special emphasis on inclusion of parents, grassroots groups, early care providers, business and community residents including senior citizens.

**COMMITMENT TO CHANGE:** Accepts responsibility to implement a comprehensive and collaborative community planning and/or problem solving effort to improve educational and life outcomes for children.

**LEVERAGE RESOURCES:** Secures commitments, to increase and redeploy resources in a manner consistent with the social, educational and developmental needs of children.

**LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT:** Provide opportunities for the development of community and parent leadership as advocates for improving education.

**ENGAGEMENT** Responsible for the mobilization, organizing and engagement of parents and community in the process of improving educational and life outcomes for all children. Maintains an informed community conversation about the status of children and strategies for their continual enhancement.

**GOVERNANCE:** Responsible for the overall governance, organization and implementation of the Discovery Grant. Establish policies and procedures for the conduct of business for the Discovery process. Selects the collaborative agent.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The grant program was renamed “Birth to 8 Community Planning” in 2010.

<sup>16</sup> The term “collaborative agent” was later changed to “collaborative sponsor.”



Reviews and approves all work plans, budgets, contracts and hiring related to the implementation of the Discovery Grant. Governing body in partnership with the Collaborative Agent is accountable to the Community and Memorial Fund for the Discovery grant.

**APPENDIX B:  
LEVELS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF “STRONG COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP (CHAIR)”  
FROM DISCOVERY COMMUNITY SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL**

1	2	3	4
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The collaborative has no chair or a staffer serves as chair</li> <li>2. The collaborative has no process or criteria for the selection of chair</li> <li>3. Chair is not involve in setting the agenda or sets agenda singlehandedly</li> <li>4. There is high turnover in chairs and seat often is not filled for months at a time</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The collaborative has a chair other than staff, but staff is mostly responsible for directing the work</li> <li>2. The collaborative has a process and criteria for the selection of chair, but choice is more about availability than experience and skills</li> <li>3. Chair is minimally involve in setting the agenda and there is little involvement outside of regular collaborative meeting</li> <li>4. There is usually a chair, but turnover slows down the work</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The collaborative has a chair who is responsible for directing the work</li> <li>2. The collaborative adheres to a process and criteria for selection of chair</li> <li>3. Chair leads the process for setting the agenda and checks in with other committee chairs and staff between meetings</li> <li>4. There is always a chair and most chairs serve full term and build relationships</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The chair directs the work and is committed and skilled in exercising distributive leadership – convening the executive/steering committee, delegating responsibility, and facilitating collective accountability</li> <li>2. The chair exceeds selection criteria in that he or she is a leader in the broader community, recognized making connections with diverse groups, leveraging other community assets, engaging other leaders, and using personal influence to advance the work of the collaborative</li> <li>3. Chair leads the process for setting the agenda and leads responsibility for making progress in implementing strategies</li> <li>4. The chair serves full term and builds strong working relationships with other members, as well as fostering new leadership and ensuring there is a system for leadership succession</li> <li>5. The chair thinks strategically and understands the local and state policy environment</li> </ol>

**APPENDIX C:  
LEVELS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF “STRONG AND SKILLED FACILITATOR (COORDINATOR)”  
FROM DISCOVERY COMMUNITY SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The staff works up to 10 hours a week</li> <li>2. There is no job description, or the staff’s job description does not align with the role and functions of a community collaborative</li> <li>3. The staff is only directed by the collaborative sponsor only and gets no direction from the collaborative</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The staff works up to 15 hours/week</li> <li>2. The staff’s job description aligns with the role and functions of a collaborative, but staff is primarily focused on administrative or program activities</li> <li>3. The staff is primarily directed by the collaborative sponsor and may get some direction from the collaborative</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The staff works up to 20 hours/week</li> <li>2. The staff’s job description aligns with the role and functions of a collaborative, and staff is primarily focused on facilitating the work of the collaborative</li> <li>3. The staff is primarily directed by the collaborative leadership and committees</li> <li>4. The staff exercises some level of leadership</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The staff works 20 hours or more per week</li> <li>2. The staff’s job description aligns with the role and function of a community collaborative, and staff provides leadership and facilitates the work of the collaborative helping the collaborative to think strategic and focus on the “big picture” – identifying and raising issues that need to be considered and seeking solutions to challenges or barriers</li> <li>3. The staff is directed by the collaborative and maintains a functional relationship with collaborative sponsor, chairs, members of the collaborative, parents, and other providers and policy makers</li> <li>4. The staff functions as a neutral facilitator</li> <li>5. The staff demonstrates commitment to the value of parent engagement and collaboration</li> </ol>