

**School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011**

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
<b>Mission</b>	▪ Population	<i>No questions</i>	A. Youth 0-Grade 12, their families, and systems	<p>A. <i>Family</i> –</p> <p><i>Campus</i>- Prenatal through 22; “System” = family and support systems</p> <p><i>Policy</i> - Children and Youth, Birth to Grade 12</p>
	▪ Need	<i>No questions</i>	B. Risk across full spectrum of child/family health and social service needs	<p>B. <i>Family</i> –</p> <p><i>Campus</i>-</p> <p><i>Policy</i> - Refer to service spectrum so its clearly beyond mental health prevention</p>
	▪ Site	<i>No questions</i>	C. Schools explicitly; home and community implicitly	<p>C. <i>Family</i> – Home and community are equal to schools. Change to <i>sites</i> (plural)</p> <p><i>Campus</i>-</p> <p><i>Policy</i> - delete explicitly and implicitly; add faith-based</p>
<b>Sponsorship</b>	▪ Key Players	<i>No questions</i>	D. Board of Supervisors and local Education leaders, other government entities	<p>D. <i>Family</i> – Bring in the community and community organizations including faith based organizations. Need to hear parent’s voices and be inclusive with planning. Need to hear the parent voices before decisions are made, so timing is essential</p>

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
				<p><i>Campus-</i> Is not just about money; Community and business leaders</p> <p><i>Policy –</i> List others (cities, F5); use Board of Education rather than local education leaders</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Convening and facilitation</li> </ul>	<i>No questions</i>	E. County Board of Supervisors approved planning and facilitation resources for SLS Plan; Key Players would approve be recruited to sponsor SLS Plan implementation.	E. <i>Campus –</i> Remove “approve”
<b>Governance/ Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What is the definition and role for each level of governance?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Who will fill the policy level role?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Which leaders will fill which roles?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Where is the accountability?</i></li> </ul>	<p>F. At <b>executive level</b> is an Operations agreement signed by Superintendent and Board of Supervisors delegated authority agreeing to SLS and parameters outlined; and to mutual agreement to provide leadership to the SLS initiative;</p> <p>G. At <b>campus level</b> is an agreement of Principal and County SLS services administration to provide oversight and leadership support to school-related services and will oversee quality and contracted service performance;</p> <p>H. At <b>service level</b>, the person in the role of service coordinator will manage referrals, consultations with school referring parties, parents, along with the process of insuring that youth are referred to services and services are well coordinated.</p> <p>I. <b>Accountability</b> will be addressed at all 3 levels of leadership within the SLS model through two contractual agreements, an</p>	<p>F – J - <i>Family</i> - Need to build in mechanisms for involving the family and community at each level and phase of planning and implementation. Can use existing parent groups (eg. Latino Parent Coalition). Can use advisory boards, taking questions to the community and reporting back, or have parent representation at meetings.</p> <p>Bring the CBOs to the table (the line staff) to discuss implementation and operationalization. This may happen at the local level as schools design their plan/infrastructure</p> <p><i>Campus –</i> What does “mutual agreement to provide leadership to the SLS initiative”</p>

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>County agencies and school districts are two very regulated systems. How do we ensure that regulations do not get in the way of establishing infrastructure and providing effective services?</i></li> </ul>	<p>Operational Agreement between Education and County; and a contract between the County and selected providers of services.</p> <p>J. The SLS collaborative structure will emphasize the importance of communication and teamwork at all 3 levels of leadership; these 3 levels will ensure that regulations are met while removing barriers that may impede program process or effective service delivery. During negotiations of formal Operations Agreements between school districts and the County, the parties will need to identify their important issues such as confidentiality and sharing of information, etc.</p>	<p>mean?</p> <p><i>Policy</i> - Clarify that this level is for binding contractual agreement; Need a community-level body/collaborative to form and “hold” the vision; Executive level or a steering committee should set the frame for the service delivery approach (including evidence based practices or core components)</p> <p>G. <i>Campus</i> – Same as F</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Administration</li> </ul>	<p><i>No questions</i></p>	<p>K. The Administrative team is composed of Education and County campus based leaders; County provides administrative support to service delivery component; Education supports academic functions.</p>	<p>K – <i>Family</i> - Need to balance engagement with principals’ other duties, but SLS needs to be a high priority (with district level support emphasizing the priority)</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ School</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What type of background does the coordinator have?</i></li> </ul>	<p>L. The SLS model requires a clearly defined coordinator function on each campus. The Coordinator should have oversight of service delivery and related processes; and ideally would have clinical experience sufficient to provide consultation and management of mental health or other crisis situations that occur on campus. This position would also convene stakeholders (service providers, community groups, parents, etc.), and would collaboratively design a streamlined process to provide coordinated and effective services, facilitate process implementation, and be accountable to agreed outcomes.</p>	<p>L – U – <i>Family</i> - Coordinator at site level needs to be responsible for the referrals and must know the details of all program offerings</p> <p>Quick turnaround could be accomplished by having a standardized form for teachers to fill out that links to a menu of services held by the coordinator</p> <p>Coordinator would likely be a CBO – staff</p>

**School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011**

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Is the coordinator a broker of services, a community builder, a service provider, a social worker, someone else?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Who will employ the coordinator? (e.g., the school, County MHD, CBO, a SLS coordinating group?)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Who will the coordinator report to? How do they fit in?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Does every school/collaborative get a coordinator?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>How do we provide this high level of infrastructure support to all schools that want or need it?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Will school leadership give full partnership status to a SLS</i></li> </ul>	<p>M. This is a Program Coordinator of function as described above, tasked with the responsibilities outlined above.</p> <p>N. Each district and County administration staff will determine whether the SLS Coordinator is a school, County or CBO employee.</p> <p>O. The Coordinator would report to the entity that will assume responsibility for the position pursuant to the agreement of district and county and incorporated in the Operational Agreement.</p> <p>P. Not necessarily. The function will be agreed to in Operational Agreements and may be developed over time, based on available resources.</p> <p>Q. The coordination function will be required with all SLS Services funded by the County that are provided on specific campuses and will be subject to available funds from Education and the County or other funder; the importance will be that school based services must be funded with the assumption that the coordination function be defined and implemented.</p> <p>R. Yes, that will be an explicit requirement incorporated in the Operational Agreement that outlines functions and responsibilities of both parties, including any contracted</p>	<p>having knowledge about services and the school is essential. CBO staff would also have local expertise and be cost effective</p> <p>Schools may be more directive about what services they need than they currently are</p> <p>Start SLS implementation with enthusiastic schools- but schools also have to agree to certain conditions to ensure fidelity and on the ground support. This will enhance chances of success and success will lead to more schools signing on. Roles for principals (eg. meeting with site coordinators, visiting service providers) need to be standard and spelled out</p> <p>Some case management will be necessary. Need to determine if this will be performed by coordinator or CBO to ensure that needs are getting met, that connection to services is occurring, help families with that process, and ensure that there is satisfaction with the service</p> <p>Need clarification about who will help families navigate through systems (is this the coordinator?)</p>

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<p><i>coordinator?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Some schools have up to 20 programs, how do we get schools and district buy-in to shed programs that are overlapping, uncoordinated, and/or fragmented?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Are schools willing to give up the “perks” they currently get from having so many different organizations and people on campus “helping” them? Different constituencies at the school may value different partners at different levels.</i></li> </ul>	<p>functions.</p> <p>S. It is proposed that the County and other governmental entities that fund school based programs adopt policies that all schools that receive funding for direct services on campus must agree to the three levels of leadership outlined in the final SLS Plan; and agree to the roles and responsibilities and funding agreement negotiated in a SLS Operational Agreement between districts and the government entity (e.g., County, cities, schools, etc.).</p> <p>T. Ultimately it is the funders who have authority to define the conditions of funding services. In this case, the Board of Supervisors and County Superintendents would have to agree on the proposed SLS model.</p> <p>U. Our hope is that Superintendents, SLS management, and CEO's of Community Based Organizations agree that partnerships and coordination is top priority, thus making it a <b>contractual condition</b> that CBO's work together and be evaluated on the strength and effectiveness of those collaborations.</p> <p>V. It is recommended that a consolidated evaluation system be established to measure results based on the SLS "key elements" and to insure that SLS models are measuring agreed to objectives.</p>	<p>L – R - <i>Campus</i> Coordinator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there funding for coordinator? It is a CRITICAL role!</li> <li>• Is there a need or benefit to have the Coordinator role certified by the County to ensure competency and consistency?</li> <li>• Ensure core competencies for each coordinator – standardization – ongoing training</li> <li>• Explore funding and leveraging opportunities</li> <li>• Utilize interns</li> <li>• Coaching/mentoring opportunities (reflective supervision)</li> <li>• Define the role of the coordinator</li> <li>• Who supervises the coordinator?</li> <li>• Ongoing peer support</li> <li>• Ensure accountability</li> <li>• Consistency in programming is needed</li> </ul>

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
 September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are our common outcomes? (value driven, previous work done)</li> <li>• Dashboard at different levels (executive, school, providers)</li> <li>• Convene group to define measurements</li> <li>• What are the “perks”?</li> <li>• Is there flexibility for joint effort between schools and County to determine specific needs for community?</li> </ul> <p>L/N – <i>Policy</i> - Needs -- Outcomes – Services -            - Activities (Logic Model needed and shaped by coordinator or collaborative); Flexibility and tailoring welcome within the “Frame” and with accountability (e.g. addressing over-representation); Some benefits in having coordinator be county employee... or CBO</p> <p>S. <i>Campus</i> – Remove first 2 lines</p> <p><i>Policy</i> – Operational Agreement will prevent this for County programs; Asset Assessment would be helpful to have in place for each participating school</p>

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
				<p>V. <i>Campus</i> – Remove “our hope” <i>Policy</i> - Important but really hard!; Use “essential” instead of “key” elements; Use “common metrics” instead of “consolidated evaluation system”</p>
	<p>▪ Service oversight and coordination</p>	<p>▪ <i>This is a complex structure, with many layers, requiring a lot of resources. Would it be possible for schools to be grouped according to feeder patterns or within school districts?</i></p>	<p>W. Possibly. The structure is not considered complex, given that both education and service funding entities have policy, campus administration, and teaching/service delivery layers of management that would have specific roles and responsibilities for any services provided on campuses with or without SLS .</p> <p>X. Therefore, this structure should not require resources other than what may be needed to put in place an <b>adequate coordination function at the service level</b>. Effective collaborative models of decision making around needs, services and processes require agreements regarding the articulation of <b>clear service and process management role by an identified coordinator</b>.</p> <p>Y. It is recommended that districts and county leadership determine how the three levels of leadership (policy, campus, and service delivery) will be implemented on a district by district basis.</p>	<p>W. <i>Campus</i> - Possibly should mean where there are mutual and beneficial alliances and overlap, “yes”. Sharing information is a no-brainer.</p> <p>W. <i>Policy</i> – Districts are governmental entities. Any exchange of \$ or discussion about personnel needs to go through districts.</p> <p>Need to think about Charter schools – Rocketship will have 15000 students in East side.</p> <p>X. <i>Policy</i> - End last sentence at “...process management.”</p> <p>Y. <i>Campus</i> – Add school sites can come forward and apply independently with district approval. - likes feeder school mode, creates vertical</p>

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
				<p>slice – visibility – elem/middle/HS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace adequate with reflective coordination function               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Is there going to be funding available for charter schools and other educational entities?</li> <li>o Is there going to be consistency across districts?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Y. <i>Policy</i> – OK, this allows flexibility</p>
Services		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Will services be limited to evidence-based models?</i></li> </ul>	<p>Z. No, services don't have to scientific criteria for Evidenced Based recognition; however it is important that services demonstrate either performance outcome data or a design for measuring how the effectiveness of service will be demonstrated. The key is that services should be funded based on the demonstrated ability to achieve the desired results.</p>	<p>Z. <i>Campus</i> – Ensure interventions/models are measurable. Add: Promising practices</p> <p>* Discussion: EBPs required by education – who will pay for training? Schools need to be informed re: EBPs pr promising practices.</p> <p>Z. <i>Policy</i> – Preference for EBP. If not, innovative models need to be backed by strong theory (show how it works, measure results, demonstrate outcomes). Change “results” to “outcomes”.</p> <p>- LV - While we don't want to force manpower, hours, money to be spent justifying a services' existence, a major downfall of the earlier (1990's) version of SLS was that everything was anecdotal. There has to be more than stories to measure our efforts.</p>



**School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011**

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What are/could be different service elements and do schools have flexibility to utilize them?</i></li> </ul>	<p>AA. The SLS Plan should outline the range of services and interventions from prevention to intensive that should be included in the SLS Plan, and are targeted to the needs identified by the collaborative team on each campus.</p> <p>BB. It is currently envisioned that schools could opt to use one of the four SLS models, a hybrid of models, or some form of these models, as long as the requirement of “essential elements” is met. Required service elements will be determined by the Steering Committee. Essential elements could be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborative (partnership between school, parents, service providers, community, etc)</li> <li>2. Continuum of services (refer to pyramid)</li> <li>3. Infrastructure (add learning support component)</li> <li>4. Accountability (data driven, outcome measurements,</li> </ol>	<p>AA. <i>Campus</i> – LV - I viewed this (if I’m understanding the question) as the stage in the Franklin McKinley Children’s Initiative, where the SCCBOS can be hugely instrumental by getting the right team in to meet and work with the communities of interest (collaborative team) to determine the needs. This obviously includes the school folks, but it must include the families and community surrounding the school. Based upon that direction, the services are tied to the needs and the right combination of folks are lined up for that SLS site.</p> <p>AA. <i>Policy</i> – Each campus needs to do needs assessment and assets mapping</p> <p>BB. <i>Campus</i> – Change “could be” to “are”. LV - Essential elements are the key. BB. <i>Policy</i> - OK</p>

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>How will existing services be utilized and leveraged?</i></li>   <li>▪ <i>Will training pertaining to implementation be offered in order to maintain fidelity to the model?</i></li>   <li>▪ <i>Will services focus on a continuum of care beginning at</i></li> </ul>	<p>continual improvements to meet identified needs)</p> <p>CC. For services funded by the County, it is recommended that the County Departments identify those services currently funded that would fall under the administrative umbrella of the SLS Plan; and any new services that would fall under the SLS Plan. It is hoped that other government or funding jurisdictions would agree to the same.</p> <p>DD. Yes, it is envisioned that the SLS administrative function will include training or access to training for both the SLS organizational model (planning, collaborative development, parent involvement, service coordination, outcomes management); and specific intervention models and practices.</p> <p>EE. Yes, it is envisioned that the SLS Plan will have the intent of covering the scope of birth to grade 12; and that key funding</p>	<p>CC. <i>Campus</i> – Ok LV - This answer sounds like we're saying find the deck chair and move it into the right place? There may be programs already functioning that don't fit the overall plan. Oversight (Level 1) team has to be willing to challenge what there, what's available and make the decisions about what should be there. CC. <i>Policy</i> – OK</p> <p>DD. <i>Campus</i> – Ok LV - As it applies to SLS coordinators, for instance, there should be perhaps two levels of training, one all SLS coordinators get: how to make the most of what's available. Then at a district level, on-going Plan, Act, Evaluate cycle training to keep everyone light and on their toes rather than immersed and unable to see all the pieces DD. <i>Policy</i> – Add "technical assistance". Training can be provided through 30 minutes podcasts (SCCOE has technology).</p> <p>EE. <i>Campus</i> – Through age 22 – to include special education, foster care</p>

**School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011**

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<p><i>birth through school age?</i>  <i>*Definition of schools needs to be 0-12<sup>th</sup> grade (needs to be inclusive of children ages 0-5). How will the services being offered through the FIRST 5 Family Resource Centers and the KidConnections Provider network be integrated?</i></p> <p>▪ <i>How will data be used to assess and prioritize the service needs of schools?</i></p>	<p>partners will be invited and encouraged to “integrate” their lines of service into the SLP Plan. This will be accomplished through agreements memorialized in policy and Operational Agreements.</p> <p>FF. Our students deserve top quality effective services, thus agreements amongst traditional partners must insure clarity of service expectations, specific service requirements, roles, and performance outcome measures.</p> <p>GG. It is envisioned that key data from both education and the health and human service domains will be an important aspect of the SLS Plan. Therefore, policy agreements between those entities that have data should be included in the SLS Plan. One of the key elements of SLS is that data will be used to inform effective policy and practice. Schools or districts interested in participating in SLS will be required to utilize data in order to determine and prioritize the service needs of their schools.</p>	<p>EE – <i>Policy</i> – OK</p> <p>FF. <i>Campus</i> – LV - The question seems to be, “How will we know if we are hitting the targets we believe cause us to bring these resources and structures here?” Reduction in youth of color being arrested, incarcerated; increase in successful participation of youth in school; neighborhoods experience decrease in crime, especially violent crime, by youth?  FF. <i>Policy</i> - Take out “traditional”</p> <p>GG. <i>Campus</i> - Reverse GG/FF (combine); who will maintain dashboards; is it possible to enter data into one system? (web-based) manageable, costs, resources  LV - Don’t forget police, gang, probation.  GG. <i>Policy</i> – add “formal” to “policy agreements”</p>

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>How will you prioritize which schools get what services?</i></li> </ul>	<p>HH. While our vision is for all children in the County to have access to the education and support services that will help them succeed, It is envisioned that the SLS Plan will prioritize those schools with data indicators that demonstrate need for public funded health and human services, some examples of which are: underperforming test scores, poverty level of surrounding neighborhoods, dropout rates, crimes citations, expulsions, suspensions and truancy rates; and health needs.</p>	<p>HH. <i>Campus</i> – Ok – SES, IEP compliance, CA healthy kids survey and add on components LV - No explicit note regarding children of color? Communities of color?</p>
<p><b>Funding</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Source</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What resources will be made available to schools to make it work?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Will resources be made available for conducting engagement?</i></li>   <li>▪ <i>Will school districts be required to invest fiscal resources in</i></li> </ul>	<p>II. Funding comes from multiple sources (County General Fund, grants, MHSA, Medi-Cal, cities, private sector)</p> <p>JJ. County agency heads will meet and discuss resources and funding that can be directed to SLS. This will form the initial funding pool for SLS.</p> <p>We propose 3 tiers of funding/investment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planning grant (to discuss and plan for “essential elements”)</li> <li>2. Technical assistance (to start up implementation, includes funding for infrastructure)</li> <li>3. Support for services</li> </ol> <p><b>KK. Yes, to the extent possible. This is one of the Tenets of SLS.</b></p> <p>LL. Schools and districts would be asked to match funding or in-</p>	<p>II. <i>Family</i> - School district financial investment – this could be an in kind contribution What is the payment for services? II. <i>Policy</i> – Add “SLS services” funding... <i>Campus</i> - ok</p> <p>JJ. <i>Campus</i> – County and school administrators will meet JJ. <i>Policy</i> – Replace “County” by “Funding”. Comment: It would be nice to have a Foundation, such as Bella Vista</p> <p>KK. <i>Campus</i> – ok LV - This should be an “in-kind” agreement</p>

**School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011**

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<p><i>order to encourage fidelity and buy-in?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What is the total funding amount for school-linked services and how will it be prioritized?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>What is the sustainability plan?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>This is a very ambitious plan, where are the resources to implement it?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Will technical assistance be</i></li> </ul>	<p>kind to the extent possible.</p> <p>MM. Currently only PEI Project 2 funding is available to commit to SLS. The funding plans already completed through local MHSA process and is ready for implementation. Next step would be for County Departments to identify any programs/funding which fit with SLS Plan.</p> <p>NN. To be determined</p> <p>OO. Within current resources of the districts and public funding agencies.</p> <p>PP. Yes, to the extent resources are available. This needs to be</p>	<p>and be flexible. LL. <i>Policy</i>. It is important to define “in-kind”. Schools could offer facilities, etc LL. <i>Campus</i> – ok LV - In this climate, it means cutting from someplace else. How do we sell that?</p> <p>MM. <i>Campus</i> – ok MM. <i>Policy</i> – change “County departments” to “Funding entities”.</p> <p>NN. <i>Campus</i> – ok LV Some analysis showing how this model is efficient and working needs to be built-in. NN. <i>Policy</i>- Steering Committee will raise funds. After first year, Steering Committee stays in place at no additional cost. Steering Committee explores innovative approaches to funding such as braided funding.</p> <p>OO. <i>Campus</i> – ok LV – Good luck</p> <p>PP. <i>Campus</i> – ok</p>

**School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011**

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<i>provided to schools to help them develop a plan, form a collaborative and apply for this "school of excellence" model?</i>	discussed among County Departments and determined.	LV - This is actually pretty important. Districts will develop by-in based upon participation in the "into" phase. That will make the difference in terms of their willingness to redirect funds. If we don't find ways for Districts and sites to do this preliminary work, I think we won't get many willing to rearrange their resources to come to the table as a partner.
	▪ Restrictions	<i>No questions</i>	QQ. Variable by funding source	QQ. <i>Campus</i> – ok QQ. <i>Policy</i> – We will comply with restrictions as determined by funding agencies.
	▪ Procurement	▪ <i>Single point of procurement has the potential for transforming how we help children and families – not only at the schools, but throughout the County. How would the single point of procurement work?</i>	RR. Once agency heads (MHD, SSA, Probation, DADS, Public Health, VMC, First Five, etc) agree to those services that are a fit for the SLS Plan, they would need to agree upon the consolidated administrative structure for SLS. We proposed that this occur before the next meeting and incorporated into the draft SLS Plan.	RR. <i>Campus</i> - Add SCCOE and Education; check grammar LV - I don't know how this could work, but if we can figure this out, a major stumbling block falls away. RR. <i>Policy</i> . Take out last sentence. Replace with : "Our goal is to have these discussion results incorporated into the SLS Plan.
<b>Planning</b>	▪ Model	<i>No questions</i>	SS. The SLS model was developed by County-wide collaborative planning team chaired by County and Education leadership with invited membership from schools, districts, law enforcement, CBOs, consumers, etc., to detail SLS framework	SS. <i>Campus</i> – ok SS. <i>Policy</i> – Add Families and Communities
<b>Roles</b>	▪ Education	<i>No questions</i>	TT. Specific invited Education leaders were involved on strategic planning committee	TT. <i>Campus</i> – ok
	▪ School	▪ <i>How do we get schools to</i>	UU. Primarily through opportunity for on campus services,	UU. <i>Campus</i> – suggestion for readiness

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
		<i>apply? What's the "hook" to help administrators buy in and take the opportunity?</i>	improved academic outcomes, technical assistance, collaborative development, and inclusion in grant funding.	assessment for schools/include parents to assess readiness to embrace SLS; hook – application straight forward and user friendly LV - Schools have to understand that if they look at all their programs through this first frame (implementing a SLS program), everything could be restructured to emanate from, through and to this program. I guess what I mean are school folks had to look at this not as one more program on campus, but the frame within all school programs now exist. That's a huge paradigm shift. If Andrew Hill is now a site that provides prevention and intervention services for students and families, all decisions work from there—what classes is the student in, what resources does he have access to, which adults does he see and why. When a school views it this way, the whole comes together and we have a chance of making that difference. As long as SLS is viewed as the room down the hall, I believe the program fails UU. <i>Policy</i> – Hook : single application process, opportunity to enhance services to students and families, increase access to services in a resource-depleted environment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CBO &amp; County provider</li> </ul>	<i>No questions</i>	VV. Key provider stakeholders involved in strategic and local collaborative planning; Contracted or committed County	VV. <i>Campus</i> – ok LV - how to not micro-manage continues to

School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Family &amp; Community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>How will parents, students, community be involved in driving the effort and advocate for change?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>How will parents be included in the process?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>How do we engage the business community?</i></li> </ul>	<p>departments provide direct services with oversight by County</p> <p>WW. The community will be involved at each level (policy, administration, coordination) and each phase of implementation. This will be an explicit responsibility for each level of leadership.</p> <p>XX. From breakout session discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Back to school nights could be utilized to connect with parents.</li> <li>○ Home visits are successful</li> <li>○ Use community center for meetings</li> <li>○ Include Parent engagement as part of all Principals' formal evaluation</li> <li>○ Community outreach coordinator or liaison often needed and successful</li> <li>○ Include volunteers and interns effectively</li> </ul> <p>YY. The Steering committee will engage the business community at the County level. Each collaborative determines how to involve the business community at the local level.</p>	<p>be a concern</p> <p>WW. <i>Campus</i> – ok WW. <i>Policy</i>- We propose a seat for parent and a seat for student in the Steering Committee.</p> <p>XX. <i>Family</i> - Most important to the family - <b>Streamlined, single point of entry for access to services with a quick response time</b> <i>Campus</i>- PTA, school sites, ELAC, parent leadership group, staff development movement for professional learning communities. Teachers – need to have their buy in; school wellness teams, district wellness teams XX. <i>Policy</i> – design on parent engagement strategies. Besides face-to face, use website, electronic distribution, etc ,. SLS will evaluate parent engagement and communication strategies</p> <p><b>YY. Family</b> - Diversity present in community needs to be represented by service providers and in the collaborative</p> <p>What does success look like? Should have a clear idea going into SLS what success would look like after a year. Measures might include</p>



School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
				<p>factors such as - # days to service linkage, quality of experience, school attendance/performance</p> <p><i>Campus</i> – Schools/districts will leverage current partnerships  <i>SVEF</i> – how do we partner?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change management implementation model needed; engage teachers from the beginning.</li> </ul> <p><i>LV</i> - This may need to be an explicit area we address with some funding: someone who works the business community, sells the program, keeps finding people to buy in to the vision.</p> <p><i>YY. Policy</i> – We propose a seat at the Steering Committee for an engaged business leader to devise strategies to sell to and engage the business community.</p> <p>Other discussions about Steering Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- there should be standing seats for funding agencies and appointed seats (e.g. for parent and student).</li> <li>- Look at different models for multi-agency administration structure (Joint Powers authority, Destination Home, Oversight Committee, , First Five</li> </ul>

**School Linked Services Emerging Plan  
September 20, 2011**

Plan Section	Feature	Questions posed by breakout groups	Proposed Response	9/20 & 10/11 Meeting Input
				ordinance, etc) - Set up a policy platform for change, a platform which needs to be recognized and sustained