**Action Planning Form**

**Draft September 2015**

Group: Building Our Community & Network Engagement Facilitators: Susan Edelman & Gail Leslie

The categories below represent areas of information that each group should produce within their groups to the greatest extent possible. It is recognized that all groups have different needs in terms of what information is needed, and also that time is limited and some information may be produced in follow up work after summit. What is important is that the information is sufficient to drive the work of the group forward post summit.

|  |
| --- |
| **Settings and Needs** |
| What does the network need? What are our shared concerns? | What are our assets as a network?What are barriers to effective collaboration? |
| * There are political and practical considerations that are driving changes in the National DB TA Network.
* In order to maximize effective collaboration we need to have a vision that captures the nature of a national community/network
* Need to understand the complexion of national and state activities that have shared value
* We need to understand what is required to either shift our behaviors in working collaboratively or better describe behaviors that we already engage in.
 | The group outlined the assets and barriers in each of these three areas:SkillsIncentivesResourcesAction PlanVision See notes for detail Identification of engagement practices in our field is important for collective understanding. There are models:* Collaborative Teamwork
* Interagency Collaboration
* Communities of Practice
* Leading by Convening

Common to all are:* shared goals
* shared agenda
* agreed upon definitions of success, meaningful to the community
* mutually beneficial relationship - likely to promote learning for all parties
* builds capacity and competency for all participants
* implications for sustainability

Time is ever present barrierCurrent grant structures are an issue because many states did not write in national collaborative activities  |
| Other questions you could consider:There is a question as to what is OSEP’s vision for our network. Are we left to define and operationalize or will their expectations surface in ways that will change our structure? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Action details** |
| **Goal(s):** |
| **Activities/outputs** | **Inputs** | **Timeline** | **Commitments/shared Leadership** | **Who will benefit** | **How can others contribute** |
| **Short Term:**Create Mentorship Model for new state project staff to help address project management and historical relationshipsCreate mechanism that allows states to have knowledge about activities of other states – This was also suggestion of NE TWGEncourage detail in NCDB site profilesCreate a visual of a network asset map. Use lists generated at session meeting Develop written vision statement for DB Collaborative TA NetworkOffer a national webinar on the information covered and generated by Summit sessionDevelop documents that help to clarify concepts for the networkCop’s – what is our approachTWGs, Work Groups, WikisWhat are theyInclude community guidelines sharing and creditingGeneral guidelines for online communities and what are good ways to use a forum postGuidelines for use of tools and community engagementNetwork Engagement Measures:Identify behaviors of engagement from across the continuum**Long Term:**Address our History –Post historical items that would inform the network of where we have been and how we got where we areInvestigate what OSEP has recognized about CoP’s. What can we use to help us better operationalizePiloting a collaborative structure with some projects to test concepts of network with states focusing on national efforts.(OSEP would allow this according to Jo Ann, it is fully possible for projects to renegotiate goals)  | Implementation model includes process for mentoring. Will be TA strategy NCDB Staff then NE TWG, then states, We need an improve your profile driveSee notes for areas and assets to be addressed and related to our shared work as second factorNotes and ideas from SummitWork plan from NE TWG Could highlight, portal, vision work, asset mapSlides from presentation identify continuumOSEP also has models identified in slide from presentationHistorical collectionHistorical perspective Models from OSEP funded projects | March 2016 and Summit 2016Fall 2015 for BetaSept – ncdbOct 9 TWGNov –st projDecember 2015Fall 2015 NE TWG Meeting to determine processJan 2016 | NCDB and statesSam M to leadNE TWG and NCDB staffNeeds to come from state db projects Sam will email state db with suggested list of ideas for entryJeff, Susan, Patrick, Eric to possibly meet in Sept 2015Craft few guiding principles that we could use with TWG. Input from TWG, input from field..webinars, blog postNCDB staff /Susan EdelmanNCDB staff with review from NE TWGNCDB staff /Susan Edelman, NE TWG | New state project staff/ networkNetworkNetwork | Identify key players and states willing to serve as mentorsNE TWG and others to review and BetaEncourage registered users to add photos and small bio’s – maybe tiered approach…start with family specialists, TWG members, state db, Data Visualization could help to understand how assets relate to national work |
| How would you prioritize the work? Scale (number of states impacted), likelihood or ease of completion (how much is it going to demand in time and resources, how ugly is it do you do the easiest or hardest first),urgency, degree of relationship to goal,  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Resources: What resources will support the activities and outputs?** |
| Collaborations (within the DB network and outside the DB network) |
| Potential partners (those who - implement practice, with authority, with influence over practitioners and families) |
| Existing efforts that could be partnered with (what can they offer, how is it connected to the work, potential shared goals, concepts, vocabulary) |
| Successful individuals with expertise who can mentor and support others in the network |
| Events that relate where partnerships, resources, and knowledge could be built |

|  |
| --- |
| Communication Plan: How will we continue to communicate and work together? (Structure, roles, technology) |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Follow up information and activities: What would you do to inform the network and enlist new collaborators? |
|  |