

COMMUNITY SYSTEM ASSESSMENT

INDICATORS		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> Strongly Disagree ← → Strongly Agree </div>										Priority	
Vision and Mission	The community system (CS) is guided by a written, future-oriented vision statement that has been developed and adopted by its members.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A
		2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A
	<i>Notes: The following vision was developed: "An empowered community working together to reduce substance abuse for the health and safety of its residents." While members believe that this vision fits the work of the Community System, they believe it will need to be slightly revised as the System begins to more broadly mobilize community members for whom decreases in ATOD use may not be a priority or even a goal at this time.</i>												
	The CS has a written mission statement, developed and adopted by its membership, that succinctly describes its purpose, general method of achieving its purpose, and values (if applicable).	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A
		2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N/A
	<i>Notes: The following mission statement was developed after the first community systems assessment: "Preventing substance abuse and associated consequences in the county through innovative strategies and community partnerships."</i>												
CS members believe they are collectively capable of achieving broad outcomes that will significantly enhance community well-being.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ABC	
	2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ABC	
<i>Notes: Attending members were unable to easily come to a single score on this indicator, and so they assigned a range from 7 to 10. While those in attendance did believe that the community was collectively capable of achieving broad desired outcomes, they also felt that the broader community may not yet feel as confident about their ability to collectively create positive change.</i>													
Conceptual Clarity	CS members share a common definition of prevention that guides all participating agencies and organizations.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A
		2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	?*
	<i>Notes: Attending members felt very positively about the degree to which they had come to consensus for a common definition of prevention to guide their work across sectors (e.g., human and social services, law enforcement, education, public and behavioral health, etc.). A number of members had received extensive training in the use of environmental approaches (i.e., policy, community mobilization and reducing availability and access to alcohol, tobacco and other drugs) to achieve positive community change, and the day preceding the systems assessment many members had participated in an additional day-long training in the use of public policy approaches. *While acknowledging that they have come a long way in the past year, some members felt that some additional work on a common understanding for environmental prevention might still be needed.</i>												
	CS members have established common definitions for key concepts and terminology that are used in CS work.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A
		2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ABC
	<i>Notes: Members gave this an 8.5 score</i>												
The CS can articulate how its work fits within the larger community and complements—yet is distinguishable from—other community initiatives.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	B	
	2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A	
<i>Notes: Members felt this will be increasingly important as coalition work begins to be move more broadly into the community. Attendees noted that not everyone is aware of the coalition, and some suggested that a pamphlet and "elevator speech" be developed to provide common succinct talking points for members to use to generate awareness and transform coalition efforts into a true community system approach. A related topic of discussion was the large number of groups and coalitions in the county working on different social, economic and public health problems, without much intentional and targeted coordination and communication at this time.</i>													
Inclusion	CS membership reflects the demographics of the community served and includes stakeholders served or impacted by CS actions and decisions.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	B
		2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ABC
	<i>Notes: Particular groups identified included the following: youth, county residents, clergy and schools.</i>												
	CS membership includes all agencies and organizations responsible for achieving goals, objectives and desired outcomes that are related to—and enhanced by—CS successes.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	B
		2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ABC
	<i>Notes: The coalition is attached to an overarching Community Collaborative, which is comprised of public and private members that work together to coordinate health and human services across systems to "develop and share resources, identify and communicate the community needs, connect services systems and partnerships, and enhance effectiveness/efficiency of service delivery to children and families, to achieve measurable results."</i>												
The CS has successful strategies for recruiting and retaining representation from all demographic groups—including hard-to-reach populations—for planning and decision making.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A	
	2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A	
<i>Notes: Members gave this a 4.5 score.</i>													
Political Will	The CS and its members, collectively and individually, have the political will to undertake the actions needed to create positive community change.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	B
		2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N/A
	<i>Notes: Changes in the county over the past year have included positive changes in elected positions, as well as increased investment and expansion of higher education in the downtown area.</i>												
	The CS has secured the support of key stakeholders, opinion leaders and key champions.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	B
		2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ABC
	<i>Notes: Members scored the general community at a level of four for this indicator. Members scored the professional community at a level of nine, but noted that additional work needed to continue to be done among the sectors of education and law enforcement. There has been significant and substantive law enforcement participation in many areas, but there remain some areas for development. K-12 education has not been as involved in coalition, and higher education contribution to the community has primarily been economic in terms of increased service sector jobs. To this point higher education has not leveraged its academic and intellectual resources to join in community problem solving.</i>												
The CS has analyzed the community's level of readiness for change, and has successfully developed and implemented a plan to advance community readiness for change.	2008	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	B	
	2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ABC	
<i>Notes: While members feel they have a good plan for advancing readiness for change, they kept this indicator at an "ABC" priority level in acknowledgement that communities are dynamic and ever changing, and readiness needs to be on the "radar screen" at all times.</i>													