Round Table Summary, Governor’s Children’s Cabinet Network

Date: June 30, 2010

What is the single most important thing that could facilitate/foster more effective interagency collaboration at the state level to really support youth development?

- Share data, perhaps through a centralized system or agency.
- Improve data quality with a focus on shared, broad outcomes.
- Enhance communication among states, and between states and the federal government.
- Share best practices across states.
- Provide better information about how research relates to practice at the federal level.
- Develop a federal youth council – they can provide financial accountability, and mobilize youth to vote and to become engaged in issues and legislation.
- Engage youth who are consumers of services/programming, including youth who face special challenges.
- Make strategic planning more directed, so people move from ideas to action (action is the hard part).
- Focus accountability on effective implementation of plans, not outcomes.
- Enable and encourage the use of existing coordinating bodies to meet federal mandates, rather than creating new state entities to do so.
- Align policies (and funding) with research/what we know about positive youth development.
- Support data-sharing across state agencies to better serve children, youth, and families (e.g., clarification about HIPAA, FERPA).
- Provide more flexible funding streams (often funds have too narrow a focus).
- There is a need for more leeway for innovative policy concepts to meet the unique needs of states. Not all best practices look the same; focus should be on achieving broad outcomes, rather than service delivery based on specific programs.
- Increase federal support for implementation and evaluation of federal programs.
- Capacity-building is needed to support an infrastructure that connects and aligns youth policy efforts from the federal to the state and local levels.
- Streamline redundant youth-related data requests. States often duplicate efforts when they have to provide similar data to different federal agencies.
- Design goals based on child and youth outcomes, rather than specific to an individual program or service delivery.
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Children’s Cabinet Webinar
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The focus of the discussion part of the webinar was on reviewing the summary information from three questions that were drawn from the summaries of the Public Input Sessions. The Children’s Cabinet representatives were provided with a selection of responses and the purpose was to explore their thoughts and comments on them.

What thoughts and/or comments do you have on the selected responses from the Public Input Sessions?

- It is important to ensure that federal partnership in the management of funding does not create competition at the state level.
- Collaborations are especially challenging when new administrations come in and try to “brand” their own approaches and priorities.
- Recommendations from stakeholders to incentivize agencies to serve the most at-risk populations could have an unintended consequence of taking the focus off of universal prevention (which also benefits youth at risk).
- There needs to be cross-system collaboration within federal, state, and local levels as well as vertical alignment of federal, state, and local systems.
- Collaboration should be presented as something that does not require the creation of more bureaucracy (e.g., positive terms such as “seamless integration” can be a good way to present the idea of collaboration).
- Shared accountability indicators and metrics across agencies and/or levels (federal, state, local) can reduce the data collection burden on agencies.
- Stakeholders seem to use the terms “flexible funding” and “block grant” to mean the same thing, but they are not. Sometimes agencies have difficulty getting clarity on what “flexibility” means in terms of funding.
- Federal youth-related requests for proposals should be aligned so that states can more efficiently and effectively serve youth.
- Allow for more flexible funding streams (meaning the blending and braiding of funds), so that states can make the most of the existing resources available for youth across agencies. Likewise, create more flexible eligibility requirements so that young people can receive a comprehensive set of services rather than a siloed set of disconnected services from various agencies.
- Increase stakeholder engagement to improve policy for young people; it’s especially important to engage youth who are impacted by the policies.
- Provide more funding opportunities for innovative youth policy efforts.
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