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This document provides a summary of a collective impact common agenda, one of the five principles of collective impact.

The following slides contain relatively straightforward examples, but it should be known that coming to the common agenda is rarely straightforward. The process is highly complex, requires extensive iteration and input from the community (including a broad set of stakeholders), and evolves over time.
Common Agendas Often Contain Three Components

High level goal:

Specific sub-goals:

Key levers for advancing the common agenda:

Vision: Across New York State, the juvenile justice system promotes youth success and ensures public safety

Community & Youth Outcomes

Just and fair to youth

Community safety and quality of life

Components of System Excellence

1. System Governance and Coordination

2. Effective Continuum of Diversion, Supervision, Treatment, and Confinement

Source: FSG Interviews and Analysis
Developing a Common Agenda Requires Creating Boundaries for the Initiative and Developing a Strategic Action Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creating Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “What’s in” and “What’s out”: Establishing boundaries for what issues, players, and systems to engage in the project is essential to its successful execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No Set Playbook: Determining boundaries is a situation-specific judgment call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loosely-Defined and Malleable: Boundaries change over time and subsequent analysis or activity may draw in other issues, players, or systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Apply to Geography: Discerning geographic boundaries requires same type of judgment (e.g., city, state, national or global engagement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing a Strategic Action Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Molding the “Mental Model”: The strategic action framework shapes the strategic thinking of the group, helps determine allocation of scarce resources, and guides monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility: The framework must be flexible to changes in project hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key Components:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of problem (informed by research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear goal for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio of key strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set of principles to guide group’s behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approach to evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the project boundaries and strategic action framework must be clearly defined, they also require flexibility to adjust to changing project dynamics

In Setting Boundaries for a Project, the Critical Component Is Determining Where Partners Can Have the Greatest Impact

Setting Boundaries Example: Teen Substance Abuse in Staten Island, New York*

Local Level
- Parental Neglect & Endangerment
- Alcohol
- Prescription Drugs

Parental & Youth Social Norms
- Prevention Activities
- Treatment Activities

State Level
- Access
- Mental Health
- Advocacy

Local Level
- Youth Unemployment

School Completion

Methamphetamines

*Source: Channeling Change: Making Collective Impact Work, 2012; FSG Interviews
NYJJ’s Steering Committee Agreed on High-Level Outcomes and Components of an Excellent Juvenile Justice System

**Vision:** Across New York State, the juvenile justice system promotes youth success and ensures public safety

**Community Outcomes**
- Community safety and quality of life
- Delinquent acts
- Victims have a voice in the process

**Youth Outcomes**
- Just and fair to youth
- Services to meet youth development needs
- Successful reintegration of youth

**Components of System Excellence**
1. System Governance and Coordination
2. Effective Continuum of Diversion, Supervision, Treatment, and Confinement
3. Accountability of System and Organizations Within the System
4. Shared Data and Information Driven Decisions and Policy

Source: FSG Interviews and Analysis
“The Road Map Project’s goal is to **double** the number of students in South King County and South Seattle who **are on track to graduate from college or earn a career credential by 2020**.

We are committed to nothing less than **closing the unacceptable achievement gaps for low income students and children of color, and increasing achievement for all students from cradle to college and career.**”
RE-AMP’s Goal is an 80% Reduction in Global Warming Pollution in the Midwest by 2030

This specific, ambitious, and shared goal helps motivate partners and drive greater cohesion between members.
Further Common Agenda Examples (1 of 3)

Common Agenda

• **Problem Definition:** Malaria kills 1 M+ annually, most in sub-Saharan Africa, where it leads as cause of death for children; although many had worked towards fighting malaria, coordinated action was needed

• **Solution:** The RBM Partnership launched in 1998 to provide a coordinated global response to malaria. In 2005, RBM wrote the Global Malaria Action Plan with common goals of malaria control: (1) scaling-up for impact (SUFI) of preventive and therapeutic interventions, (2) sustaining control over time

Common Agenda

• **Problem Definition:** In 2005, realization among leaders that region faced challenges in crime, workforce quality, competitiveness, and education

• **Solution:** Ambitious roadmap and solid public / private partnership necessary to make progress in economic prosperity and quality of life through four connected initiatives: (1) economic development, (2) education, (3) public safety, and (4) government efficiency
Further Common Agenda Examples (2 of 3)

Common Agenda

- **Problem Definition:** In 1990s, Chicago high rises were infamous as most dangerous places to live in within the U.S.
  - In 2000, CHA began $1.6 billion, 15-year plan to replace high rises with mixed-income developments. New residents needed skills for economic and personal growth
- **Solution:** Opportunity Chicago established urgency for helping 5,000 residents prepare for and find work in 5 years and created partnership for doing so

Common Agenda

- **Problem Definition:** In 1993, realization that Lafayette River’s infamous pollution and use as dumping ground for waste needed addressing
- **Solution:** The Elizabeth River Project, was formed to restore the river’s environmental quality through government, business and community partnerships. **Goals are:** (1) swimmable river, (2) healthy river life, and (3) citizens making a difference
Further Common Agenda Examples (3 of 3)

Common Agenda

- **Problem Definition:** In 2006, Worcester served 2,000 homeless adults, 10-20% chronically homeless. Past attempts to use Housing First model unsuccessful
- **Solution:** Five non-profits came together with funding from The Health Foundation of Central Massachusetts to end adult chronic homelessness in Worcester using collaborative Housing First model (offering permanent homes as first step, followed by community-based support)

Common Agenda

- **Problem Definition:** 8,200 young Philadelphians drop out of school annually, increasing federal spending on support services, as well crime
- **Solution:** Project U-Turn established to understand, focus public attention on and, resolve Philadelphia’s dropout crisis