

Working Together for Service as a Solution Meeting Notes

Successful Consultations

Factors that Facilitate:

Communication (x7)

Relationship development (x5)

Transparency (x3)

Direct program involvement between national direct and commission x2

Timeliness and responsiveness (x2)

Authentic; honest conversations all around (x2)

Best practices exchange (x2)

Clear responsibilities (x2)

Uniform process

Up to date contact info for state commissions

Coordinating consultation across affiliate sites

More money and awareness

AmeriCorps Members

Resources from local donors

Urban models for rural communities

Open consistency in review process between all commissions

CNCS officers to help facilitate relationship

Commission provides training or other support (i.e. swearing in members)

Share technical assistance

Better Knowledge across organizations – via representative committee/collaboration

Joint trainings/professional development

Program/project partnerships/collaborations

Legal mandate

Funding to support responsiveness

Up to date contact lists with a key person to contact

Strong network of service in state

Member events

Persistence in efforts to make contact when needed

TA for sites

Joint training opportunities

Form mission to serve communities

Nationals take initiative to notify state commissions

Nationals responding in timely fashion to questions

CNCS really listening to state feedback (not funding those with no consultation)

Varying depth of consultation based on number of members coming into state

Spirit of camaraderie across all corps

PDAT documentation

Participation state RFP and TA processes

Political support

Connection of ED Award members/programs to state
Big picture of state needs
Shared expectations
Early stage voicing commission concerns
Commission ranking of national direct applicants based on state needs
Commission perception of value of proposed national direct program based on priorities of states
Increasing opportunity for National Service in State
Invitations to training and statewide events
Use of disability funds by all national programs
Data and specifics
Strong plan that is followed
Responsiveness to state needs
Willingness to have tough conversation
Work plan coordination
Advanced planning expertise
Share info
Non-duplication of services
Give feedback
More participation in trainings and meetings
More collaboration and efficiency in meeting
Commitment to National Service
Knowing local contact person
Collaborating with other state programs especially with local services
Level playing field with for planning grant
Approval process for multi-state
Impact of commission recommendations
Awareness of local needs
Greater understanding of programs
Mutually respectful
Access to information and identified point person
Positive disposition to task
Understanding and desire to collaborate
Statement of priorities
National Direct Representation on SC (Advisory Council, etc.)
Incentives for collaboration with National Directs by providing additional dollars (training, admin, etc.) to state commissions to work with National Directs
SC strategy plans
Contact with local affiliate
Past performance of local
Objectivity of commission
Clear evaluation criteria
Expansion of members

Factors that Hinder:

Time issues (x10)
Lack of capacity of commission (x4)
Administrative Burden (x3)
Poor communication (x3)
Lack of communication (x2)
Commissions vary in response levels (x2)
Budget limitations (x2)
Duplicity of application/implementation (x2)
Incomplete state commission contact lists (x2)
Political issues (x2)
Staff limitations (x2)
Non responsive (x2)

Pre-determined agreements
Possible difficulty for new programs
State commissions not interested or knowledgeable
Larger national directs in more states have more work
Possible difficulty for new programs
Lack of legal mandate
Compliance with expectations of support
Old contact info on website
Geographic location of state commission/training
Lack on knowledge of our scope
Bias – possible?
Lack of knowledge of existing programs @ both state and national level
State commission has limited capacity for review
Timeline to potentially adjust program design/partnerships
Monitoring activities
Match requirement increase
Lack of participation in State RFP and TA process
Fewer members in rural states? How can we get them to rural states?
National vs. local needs broader needs may not meet local needs
States feel threatened
New program not sure of sites yet
No existing relationship with commission
Quid pro quo
The “entitlement” mentalities of National Direct
For small states more national directs may compete for already limited resources/programs
National Directs are not at the table
Commission involvement
Availability of national direct staff to participate in meetings, trainings
Lack of presence in state
Lack of criteria for feedback

Competing with local resources (funding and training)
Resistance to state rules
State commission not as decision makers
Concern about communication vs. control
Quasi-political/potent self serving
No knowing what programs are in state's portfolio
Understanding program model
Commissioner involvement approval/review
Lack of responsiveness
CNCS to valuing state commission recommendations
Lack of coordination
Need electronic/searchable contacts and sortable
Commission bias toward state competitive
Perceived "turf battle"
Passivity
"frenemies"
Open communication and opportunity to respond
Inherent conflict of interest
Varying degrees of collaboration from states and varying capacities
Does SC have the capacity/expertise to evaluate all ND technical expertise?
Who is the evaluator – ED, commission board, staff, etc?
National directs are issue area experts
Last minute communication
Feeling of competition
Timeline/balancing
Implications of the evaluations
Why do state commissions want to know?
Lack of clarity of the process
Communication issues
Individual programs – collaboration is a challenge
Danger of replication of reporting
Accurately capturing outcomes with potentially changing expectations and requirements
Currently not taking mutual responsibility
Undefined working relationships
Need specific goals of collaboration