



Youth Master Plan

A strategic action plan by the Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board



This page left intentionally blank.

Contents

Overview	5
Methods	5
Priorities	6
Culturally Responsive Approaches	7
Gender and Sexuality Inclusivity	7
Responsive Systems	8
Social Connection	8
Stability	9
Youth Agency	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Recommendation 1: Ensure that efforts and programs for children and young people are sustainably and adequately resourced.	11
Strategy 1.1	11
Strategy 1.2	11
Strategy 1.3	12
Recommendation 2: Support the increased participation and leadership of young people who reflect the demographic makeup of Minneapolis in our jurisdictional partners.	12
Strategy 2.1	12
Strategy 2.2	13
Strategy 2.3	13
Strategy 2.4	14
Recommendation 3: Increase advocacy for and policy knowledge of youth issues among legislative bodies representing Minneapolis.....	14
Strategy 3.1	14
Strategy 3.2	14
Recommendation 4: Use the YCB’s power, influence, and relationships to prioritize issues that are important to young people among our jurisdictional partners.	15
Strategy 4.1	15
Strategy 4.2	15
Strategy 4.3	16
Strategy 4.4	16
Recommendation 5: Become a hub for trainings, supports, and resources for our jurisdictional partners who are in contact with young people.	16
Strategy 5.1	17

Strategy 5.2	17
Strategy 5.3	17
Recommendation 6: Increase use of data in understanding the local landscape around youth to advance an equity agenda in decision making.....	18
Strategy 6.1	18
Strategy 6.2	18
Strategy 6.3	19
Recommendation 7: Reinstate our commitment to children and young people age 0-24 in Minneapolis.	19
Conclusion	20
Appendix A: Criteria for Evaluation	21
References.....	23

Overview

The recommendations section of the Youth Master Plan includes action items for the Youth Coordinating Board (YCB) and its jurisdictional partners for the next five years. The recommendations listed below will inch the YCB closer to the vision of our theory of change to mobilize children and young people, while supporting adults to share power, to shape cultures and systems. We do this so that young people can empower their education, have their safety prioritized, be connected to the natural and social world, and engage in their communities. The recommendations were developed with input from key staff from the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Public Schools, and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Youth Coordinating Board and members of the Minneapolis Youth Congress.

There are seven recommendations that are presented as packages related to one overarching goal statement. Each recommendation has a number of strategies that are short- and intermediate-term actions in service of the overall goal of the recommendation. If all strategies are successfully implemented, then we will make significant progress towards realizing each recommendation. Each strategy has associated community-level and strategy-level indicators and benchmarks we will use to measure success once implemented. Community-level indicators are an operationalized measure of the impacts we wish to see on the community- or city-level. Strategy-level indicators are more granular and allow us to measure the extent to which each strategy is effective. Benchmarks for both level of indicators tell us if our progress is on track, ahead of track, or lagging in each area. We also identify the Youth Master Plan priorities each recommendation relates to, relevant ongoing work, and resources needed to implement each strategy and recommendations.

In April 2020, the YCB Board voted to approve the continuation of exploring the proposed recommendations. In winter of 2020-21, the YCB Board will vote to adopt the final set of recommendations and identify commitments for each jurisdiction to report on periodically.

This document will discuss the methods used for developing recommendations, including stakeholder focus groups and interviews. Next is an overview of the priorities established in first installment of the Youth Master Plan: Identifying the Issues, published in 2019, which are recontextualized within the framework of the recommendations. After are the recommendations. Each recommendation has several sub-components, benchmarks for measuring progress, and resources needed to execute. Finally, there is a brief section with next steps as the recommendations are implemented and monitored over the next five years.

Methods

To develop the recommendations, we engaged in a four month long policy analysis process with key staff from the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Public Schools, and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, then further vetted and revised the recommendations with YCB staff, MYC members, and jurisdictional leadership.

The policy analysis process was conducted with the collaboration of 22 staff representing the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Public Schools, and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board across four work groups beginning in November 2019. The work groups were assigned to one to two Youth Master Plan priorities to consider when going through the recommendations process. The

first meeting was dedicated to identifying the problem in which we revisited each YMP priority statement and developed a more concrete statement of challenges we were seeking to address and define the scope of each priority. In the second meeting, each work group developed criteria for evaluating alternatives that we would eventually come up with. I synthesized the criteria for evaluation across all work groups to develop a universal set of criteria, which included considerations of context, alignment with partner jurisdictions, administrative capacity, ability to evaluate and improve, impacts, equity, and community engagement. See [Appendix A](#) for a full listing of all criteria for evaluation. The third meeting was dedicated to brainstorming alternatives. The fourth meeting was dedicated to evaluating alternatives using the criteria for evaluation that was previously established.

YCB staff further synthesized the recommendations that came out of the policy analysis process to make the set of recommendations more concise and achievable given organizational capacity. To do this, we used a grounded theory inspired approach to group up related recommendations, assessing which recommendations were most similar or seemed to be related in a way that allowed us to pull out major themes. This process allowed us to synthesize the recommendations into seven primary recommendation groups with several sub-recommendations and strategies, which became the first draft of YMP recommendations.

YCB staff then vetted the first draft of recommendations with a different set of sixteen staff members from the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Public Schools, and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board via individual meetings. At the meetings, we discussed the capacity of each jurisdiction's capacity to take on the proposed work, work each jurisdiction is already engaging with in relation to the YMP recommendations, and anticipated catalysts and barriers to implementing the proposed recommendations.

I also met with YCB staff to discuss the proposed revisions from the individual meetings described above and made a second set of revisions to the YMP recommendations, notably adding in community-level and strategy-level indicators and benchmarks to each recommendation and strategy in order to access progress and proactively begin building out accountability and reporting mechanisms.

Priorities

The priorities are the buckets that our data indicators and subsequent projects and initiatives go into and significantly structure the Youth Master Plan. They were derived from stakeholder input regarding future visions, assets, and challenges youth and youth stakeholders see in Minneapolis and were analyzed and reviewed by YCB staff and our jurisdictional partners during the [first phase of the Youth Master Plan](#). Young people are likely to experience our priorities in several areas of their lives, including school, county systems, parks, recreational programming, and interacting with street-level bureaucrats, such as police and social workers. Our priorities cut across multiple domains because we realize that everything we do for youth must be a collaborative effort, and that youth must experience continuity across these areas. The priorities bring our values to life and articulate directions for change over the next five years.

In the second phase of the Youth Master Plan process, youth stakeholders who work within public jurisdictions identified problem statements for each priority. The problem statements direct the recommendations by identifying the most pressing issues under each domain. While there are countless problems that could have been identified for each, work groups prioritized problems that impacted

marginalized groups, are interjurisdictional in nature, and have yet to be adequately addressed by other systems and programs in the community. The problem statements are supported by academic research and findings in the youth development literature.



Culturally Responsive Approaches

Approaches to decision making, programming, organizations, institutions, and systems that impact youth and their families must be culturally responsive, especially in terms of racial and ethnic culture and identity. Cultural responsiveness acknowledges that race, ethnicity, age, ability, socioeconomic status, and all their intersections are foundational to one's identity and honors their meaningfulness to the individual and community. Most research shows that cultural socialization buffers against the deleterious effects of discrimination among youth of color by moderating the relationships between discrimination and self-esteem (Harris-Britt, Valrie, Kurtz-Costes, & Rowley, 2007), school self-esteem, and school bonding (Dotterer, McHale, and Crouter, 2009). Culturally responsive approaches bolster youth-centered outcomes among historically and continuously marginalized communities, families, and individuals.

Racism and classism have oppressed communities along cultural lines, and we work to eliminate discrimination in all forms. Most young people of color routinely experience some form of discrimination (Seaton, Caldwell, Sellers, & Jackson, 2008), and perceiving structural racism in any form is detrimental to one's physical and mental health (Bobo & Thompson, 2006; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Kessler et al., 1990; Lukachko et al., 2014; Seaton, 2009). Large-scale systems and institutions were built to perpetuate inequality and uphold a dominant white cultural paradigm. It is necessary for white people, in solidarity with people of color, to break down these oppressive systems.



Gender and Sexuality Inclusivity

Programs, institutions, and systems must be intentional about welcoming gender and sexuality diversity among youth by providing spaces young people feel they need to be safe and responsive environments for authentic expression. These spaces require constant reflection and critique to maintain and must be welcoming of intersecting identities, especially those of race and ethnicity.

Currently, there is dissonance between how young people and adults think about gender and sexuality, which results in programming that doesn't reflect the lived experiences of young people and furthers their marginalization. Educational settings often reinforce homophobia, heterosexism, and sexism among young children (Duke & McCarthy, 2009), exacerbating the already negative effects of discrimination. We must combat the misogyny, homophobia, and transphobia in institutions and individual experiences through proactively and intentionally integrating gender- and sexuality-inclusive practices into everything we do with young people.

Gender and sexuality inclusivity acknowledges the importance of gender and sexuality to one's identity and the oppression of people of marginalized genders and sexualities, especially trans and nonbinary people, women and femmes, and/or people at the intersection of multiple marginalized identities face. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of creating safe and welcoming spaces. Safety is not a luxury; it is something all young people need to thrive and be their authentic selves, especially young people who hold one or more marginalized identities.



Responsive Systems

Adults who work in systems must adjust their knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors to promote clear and transparent language, center relationships with young people, and collaborate across bureaucratic lines. To support systems becoming responsive, relationship-driven, and transparent, we must change the work culture among adults who work in systems to drive larger systemic change around the purpose of systems and institutions in the lives of youth and eliminating the harm they breed. Our approach mirrors Hennepin County's Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) 2.0's (2019) principles for planning and executing systems work, including “

- understand[ing] racism is at the core of racial and economic disparities,”
- “recogniz[ing] harm our systems have caused,”
- “listen[ing] as communities define their own goals,” and
- “act[ing] collectively upstream.”

Systems are made of people, and the systemic change within a five-year timeframe is to be aimed at changing cultures within systems and increasing competencies of those in systems to respond to the needs and desires of young people.



Social Connection

Young people experience positive and healthy social connections through supportive community, and relationships, including:

- **Peer-to-peer support.** Healthy peer relationships are associated with increased social emotional skills, school success, healthy lifestyles (Search Institute, 2017), broadened perspectives, life skills, self-confidence, and reduce the risk of problem behaviors (Search Institute, 2016), and moderate the negative effects of bullying and hostile family environments (Schwartz et al., 2000; Pettit et al., 2001). Peer relationships among young people are not insulated from the negative effects of racism, classism, etc., which can result in bullying, self-segregation, and subsequent reinforcement of harmful ideologies.
- **Mentorships.** Mentoring and other caring adult relationships are associated increased social emotional, (Darling, Hamilton, Toyokawa, & Matsuda, 2002; McDowell, Kim, O'Neil, & Parke, 2002), relationship (DuBois, Neville, Parra, & Pugh-Lilly, 2002; Karcher, 2005; Rhodes, Reddy, Roffman, & Grossman, 2005), and academic (Cadima, Leal, & Burchinal, 2010; Herrera et al.,

2007; Reddy, Rhodes, & Mulhall, 2003; Sánchez, Esparza, & Colón, 2008) skills, and reduced risky behaviors (Beier, Rosenfeld, Spitalny, Zanksy, & Bontempo, 2000; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2010).

- **Intergenerational relationships.**
- **Familial relationships, which includes those young people consider to be family.** Effective parenting and parental warmth are mediating factors of instability (Sandstrom & Huerta, 2013), and promote protective cognitive factors (Cavanagh & Huston, 2006; Gershoff, Raver, Aber, & Lennon, 2007; Hair et al., 2005; Sarsour et al., 2010; Whittaker 2011). We anticipate that these same benefits extend to any person in a role of authority within a household.
- **Community relationships that promote neighborhood cohesion and social capital.** Social capital is associated with better self-rated health (Browning & Cagney, 2002) and better access to health-enhancing resources like medical care, healthy food options, and places to exercise (Matsaganis & Wilkin, 2015), and lower rates of violence and crime (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997) and mediates income inequality and mortality rates (Gilbert, Quinn, Goodman, Butler, & Wallace, 2013). Promoting neighborhood cohesion and social capital is a form of healing and building resilience among marginalized communities who have experienced systemic oppression and disinvestment.



Stability

Systems and institutions support children and youth living in safe, stable environments in which their basic needs are met so they grow and thrive in directions that are personally fulfilling and enrich their communities. There is ample research and evidence suggesting that young people whose needs are not met experience negative consequences in several different domains (Aaronson, 2000; Adam and Chase-Lansdale, 2002; Alaimo, Olson, & Frongillo, 2001; Beyer, Wallis & Hamberger, 2013; Conley, 2001; Cramer, O'Brien, Cooper, & Luengo-Prado, 2009; Cutts et al., 2011; Duncan, Ziol-Guest, & Kalil, 2010; Farah et al., 2006; Fowler, Tompsett, Craciszewski, Jacques-Tiura, & Baltes, 2009; Guerra, Huesmann, & Spindler, 2003; Haurin et al., 2002; Henly and Lyons, 2000; Kalil & Wightman, 2011; Margolin, Vickerman, Oliver, & Gordis, 2010; Riina and Brooks-Gunn, 2016; Rumbold et al, 2012; Sandstrom and Chaudry, 2012; Scott, London, & Hurst, 2005; Stevens, Huff, & Schaller, 2011; University of Minnesota, 2015).

Meeting one's needs is not merely about survival, it also ensures opportunity for growth and advancement personally, socially, economically, and politically. As it currently stands, many systems create barriers to accessing resources, such as income limits for welfare, excessive paperwork, and financial disinvestment in communities of color (Sandstrom and Huerta, 2013). We advocate for systems and institutions that are nimble enough to ensure a child's needs are met through supporting adults, children, and service providers. We also champion systems reform through collaboration, use of data, planning, improvement, and coordination.

Young people are active agents in shaping their futures through the support of adults that recognizes and values youth ownership and leadership within their communities and families. Supportive adults are paramount to youth voice, and adults have historically tokenized young people and their voices roles

while claiming youth voice. This tokenization has broken trust between youth and adults, which we must make every effort to repair.

Young people will contribute in the ways they are best able and adults working in partnership with youth must make youth engagement accessible to all young people. Young people must be at the table or, more preferably, leading the charge on policy making, civic engagement, and allocation of funds and resources. Young people must also own their spaces, organizations, and opportunities. Fulfilling the obligations of youth voice allows young people the right to self-define, be part of a system that makes change, and recognizes the multitude of ways in which people can contribute to building a future.

Recommendation 1: Ensure that efforts and programs for children and young people are sustainably and adequately resourced.

The public must invest in youth development, youth workers, and young people themselves on an ongoing basis to see the greatest impacts of positive youth development. To do this, we will build out relationships between the YCB and the local business community, community organizations, and public bodies at various levels of governance. These funds are to be used to fill resources gaps in the community, especially those relating to racial and gender disparities, and local governments due to dwindling state and federal investments and must be distributed equitably among programs that serve young people. There are expected to be challenges in raising funds for this since local jurisdictions are often constrained by both state and federal requirements as well as their own essential services that must be funded, however investing in racial justice and public health and safety, newfound goals of local governments in 2020, requires investments in young people and those who support them.

Strategy 1.1: Support ongoing campaigns and coalitions seeking to increase benefits, pay, and prestige of the youth worker and early childhood workforces via active staff participation and adding to our policy advocacy platform. We will also continue to participate in community coalitions to advocate for increased resources to the youth worker and early childhood fields at the state level. We must also push our partners to include and uplift youth voices within this advocacy space to scaffold former youth program participants into youth workers. Our goals are to increase both recruitment and retention into the youth work field through advocating for better working conditions, including increased pay, more stable working hours, increased benefits like health insurance and childcare. We will lend staff time and in-kind resources for each viable strategy to achieve this.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Average youth worker pay in Minneapolis per the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Benchmark is an equivalent of \$20 per hour, or \$40,000 annually for full-time work.
- *Strategy-Level Indicators:* A qualitative assessment of the sufficiency and effectiveness of policy platform items among YCB staff who are responsible for policy advocacy work; Number of coalition meetings attended and/or amount of in-kind resources pitched. Benchmarks are a qualitatively determined effective and sufficient policy platform and 4 meetings or 100 staff hours, respectively.



Strategy 1.2: Build out public/private partnerships to increase the capacity to pool resources equitably for the benefit of children and young people in Minneapolis. These resources can be used for public programs, mini-grants to fund youth-led initiatives, local grantmaking, etc. To achieve this, we will build out infrastructure (i.e. goals, theory of change, planning documents) to quickly mobilize when local leadership is in support of initiative. We will also continue to build and strengthen partnerships with the private sector and build a sustained campaign among the private/business sector, youth workers, young people, and the public sector to ease the burden of attaining resources and support among potential funders.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Total amount of funds allocated towards children's, youth, and afterschool programs by public bodies as stated in the YCB's children's budget. Benchmark is a total of \$500,000 across all jurisdictions in afterschool and youth development funding.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* The YCB will conduct a qualitative assessment of the efficacy of this strategy, including new partnerships and progress towards adequate resource development. Benchmarks are feeling adequately prepared to launch a Youth Fund initiative if the YCB was asked to participate in creating a Youth Fund tomorrow.



Strategy 1.3: Pivot Outreach work to a more systems-based role, including training other street outreach teams and building capacity within the community and organizations to adopt the YCB's piloted outreach model, to share knowledge and expertise with newly minted street outreach operations aimed at young people and violence prevention.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of juvenile or juvenile-involved crimes reported in serviced areas. Benchmark is a 30% decrease in juvenile crime from previous the previous.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Number of adults trained in the YCB's outreach model and number of partner organizations engaged in training and/or capacity-building services. Benchmark is 20 adults trained across two street outreach teams.



Recommendation 2: Support the increased participation and leadership of young people who reflect the demographic makeup of Minneapolis in our jurisdictional partners.

Increase the participation and leadership of young people who are demographically representative of young people in Minneapolis on boards, commissions, and project- or initiative-based bodies across our four jurisdictional partners. Young people should have a voice on issues that affect them and they care about, and the strategies outlined below will bring us closer to this. The YCB will take on the responsibility to build capacity for local jurisdictions to support young people in positions of leadership and convening partners who can make collaborative and holistic plans for action in the realm of youth participation and engagement.

Strategy 2.1 Launch a Youth on Boards and Committees initiative, wherein local governing bodies reserve a set amount of spots on boards, commissions, and City Council committees for youth delegates and YCB supports young people in these positions. For committee participation, youth representatives will be vital to contributing to the deliberation and discussion of each item before it goes to the full

Council for a vote. YCB staff will build capacity before engaging youth delegates in these positions and will also be involved in training around supporting youth delegates throughout their terms.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of young people serving on boards and commissions across all jurisdictions. Benchmark is an average of 3 young people serving per board or commission.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Number of key decision makers, including elected officials, who support a Youth on Boards initiative and all relevant legislation and rule changes and a qualitative assessment of the YCB's internal capacity to support and/or lead on a Youth on Boards initiative. Benchmarks are a majority of decision makes supporting the initiative and rating capacity as sufficient.



Strategy 2.2 Increase access to trainings and technical support to enable jurisdictions to share power with young people who are BIPOC, LGBTQ+, and/or low-income. Trainings and technical support is to be ongoing, responsive, and focused on working with staff to eliminate barriers to young people participating in leadership, decision making, and engagement opportunities. YCB staff will give priority to spaces within our partner jurisdictions who welcome us for rolling out this strategy.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of afterschool programs offering high quality programming. Benchmark is 100% of YCB partner organizations and jurisdictions offering high quality youth development programming.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Number of trainings delivered to afterschool providers and youth workers. Benchmark is seven organizations engaged in Continuous Program Improvement cycle.



Strategy 2.3 Continue to increase efficacy of the Minneapolis Youth Congress to create open and transparent channels of communication and influence between local decision makers and other youth led organizations including Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) Citywide Student Government. MYC will meet at least four times a year with YCB, local government jurisdictions represented on YCB, or MPS Citywide Student Government or other youth led organizations. YCB staff will build out systems to prepare MYC for meetings, track action steps and developments, maintain accountability systems for joint MYC and YCB board initiatives, and support connections between MYC and other organizations.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of YCB board meetings held in conjunction with MYC per year. Benchmark is four meetings.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Qualitative assessment of efficacy of MYC-YCB board meetings to be conducted via survey. Benchmark is a positive efficacy rating of four or more using a traditional five-point scale.



Strategy 2.4 Consult, monitor, and report on racial equity teams across all four jurisdictions to develop a strategy around departments incorporating systemic consideration of children and young people and how the department's work may uniquely affect them. Children must be considered as a valuable constituency across all departments and lines of work of each jurisdiction and must be considered within an equity framework. The YCB will leverage our collaborative structure and partnership with MYC to advance this work.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number or percentage of departmental plans across each jurisdiction that specifically consider young people and the department's impact on young people in Minneapolis. Benchmark is 75% of all departmental plans consider young people.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Number of convenings and qualitative assessment of partnerships and efficacy of considering young people in departmental planning processes. Benchmarks are four convenings per year and a positive assessment of capacity and quality of partnerships.



Recommendation 3: Increase advocacy for and policy knowledge of youth issues among legislative bodies representing Minneapolis.

Increase advocacy and policy knowledge by tracking and monitoring state, federal, and local policy developments as it relates to afterschool, early childhood, and other children and youth policy issues and convene relevant partners in an effort to direct advocacy, action, and mobilization efforts. The YCB will rely on preexisting knowledge and expertise of our partners to inform and advance our work, including child and youth policy analysis, information gathering, and existing coalitions.

Strategy 3.1 YCB engages in an organizational planning process to build a policy role as needed or incorporate with existing legislative agendas or positions within jurisdictional partners, including position priorities, responsibilities, and possible funding sources.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Amount of allocated funding towards a policy position at the YCB and a qualitative assessment of organizational capacity to accommodate this role. Benchmarks are \$150,000 raised to be allotted to salary, benefits, and materials for the role and a positive, on track assessment of organizational capacity.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* FTE created for advocacy and/or policy positions created in-house. Benchmark is 1 FTE available for policy and advocacy work.



Strategy 3.2 YCB hosts an annual retreat/convening to identify policy priorities for the legislative session in conjunction with MYC, YCB Board, jurisdictional IGR staff, and community-based policy experts. YCB uses information gathered by community groups and others to identify priorities, track policy developments, and identify areas for action and/or support.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number or percentage of legislative priorities from the YCB's platform introduced in a particular state legislative session. Benchmark are 50% of platform items are introduced in a session.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Number of partners engaged in drafting the YCB's policy platform and survey feedback from participants rating efficacy of convening. Benchmarks are five partner organizations engaged and a satisfaction score of four or more on a traditional five point scale.



Recommendation 4: Use the YCB's power, influence, and relationships to prioritize issues that are important to young people among our jurisdictional partners.

Continue to support our jurisdictions work on issues that are important to young people, such as mental health, restorative justice, and environmental sustainability. Build out more systems to institutionalize bringing youth voice into each jurisdiction's work via the Minneapolis Youth Congress while retaining flexibility to respond to needs and desires for youth input.

Strategy 4.1 Build an infrastructure that allows MYC staff and members to systematically consider and connect with topic areas of interest each term. Work with MYC staff and coordinators to build, test, and evaluate this system before final implementation. Incorporate this infrastructure in implementing Strategies 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of partner organizations connected with MYC. Benchmark is three organizational connections per year.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Qualitative assessment of infrastructure progress and an inventory of resources developed and still needed. Benchmark is a positive assessment of infrastructure and capacity and ready access to 80% of resourced needed to pull off MYC consultation and partnership systems.



Strategy 4.2 Increase opportunities for youth voice on jurisdictional convenings on youth mental health in the Hennepin County, City of Minneapolis, and Minneapolis Public Schools in order to prioritize youth perspectives on mental health and bring mental health-focused programs to a larger audience of young people. Each jurisdictional program must prioritize the mental health of young people, increase access to medically correct, culturally responsive information and resources on mental health for young people across the city, and normalize talking about a wide range of mental health topics.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* To be determined in partnership with MYC members participating.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* To be determined in partnership with MYC members participating.



Strategy 4.3 Increase opportunities for youth voice on jurisdictional conventions on restorative justice and juvenile corrections in Hennepin County and the YCB’s existing partnership with the Legal Rights Center. YCB staff will facilitate connections between restorative justice work and MYC to disrupt the school-to-prison pipeline and increase prevalence and accessibility of youth restorative justice alternatives to punishment and incarceration.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* To be determined in partnership with MYC members participating.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* To be determined in partnership with MYC members participating.



Strategy 4.4 Support youth-led initiatives to promote environmental sustainability and facilitate connections between Community Education’s Green Team and MYC to build energy and outreach strategies to change guidelines and practices that reduce waste by increasing recycling and composting options and reducing net carbon emissions by prioritizing energy efficient buildings and transportation options. Ensure that environmental sustainability is approached from a racial and economic justice lens, prioritizing the accessibility of environmental practices in marginalized communities. YCB staff will explore more opportunities for environmental justice and sustainability within each jurisdiction and prioritize carving out space for youth involvement at appropriate tables.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* To be determined in partnership with MYC members participating.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* To be determined in partnership with MYC members participating.



Recommendation 5: Become a hub for trainings, supports, and resources for our jurisdictional partners who are in contact with young people.

Serve as a hub for training, supports, and resources for our jurisdictional partners, which includes staff trainings for non-youth workers and service providers. Trainings models will be tailored to the audience (e.g. early childhood providers, youth workers, non-youth workers with high youth contact), informed by best practices, and cover topics important to young people, such as LGBTQ inclusivity, cultural responsiveness, youth-police relations, and technical skills (e.g. payroll paying young people without bank accounts) with the goal of long-term social and cultural change within systems.

Build out infrastructure for interjurisdictional trainings related to youth work and early childhood best practices and continuous improvement cycles to build quality and consistency among youth and early

childhood programs. Includes translating youth development quality into tools for drop-in and community engagement strategies and implementing youth trainings for onboarding, professional development, etc. across jurisdictions. Trainings are to be done in a cohort model to build relationships and share knowledge among practitioners on emerging issues in the field while disrupting hierarchies of learning and experts.

Strategy 5.1 YCB becomes accredited for CEUs for social workers, teachers, parks staff, etc. associated with trainings to increase incentives for partners to attend, give more legitimacy to YCB's training work, and become a revenue stream by charging a small fee for CEU-eligible trainings.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of CEUs offered and/or awarded to attendees. Benchmark is to be determined as workplan is built out.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Funds raised by CEU fees and number of trainings delivered. Benchmark for funds to be determined as workplan is built out and at least three CEU-eligible trainings delivered per year.



Strategy 5.2 Build out training track for youth work veterans to provide a place to critically reflect, connect with peer youth workers, engage in emotional self-care, in order to increase field-based retention.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Retention of youth workers, early childhood workers, and other youth service providers, calculated using Bureau of Labor Statistics years of tenure for Minneapolis. Benchmark is 0.5 year increase in tenure for youth and education workers over five years.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Qualitative assessment of participant experiences and satisfaction with trainings. Benchmark is positive experiences by attendees and perceived efficacy of trainings among attendees.



Strategy 5.3 Non-youth worker trainings are to use the Authentic Connections model that is re-vetted by young people and common across jurisdictions.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of Authentic Connections trainings delivered per year. Benchmark is three trainings delivered per year.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Qualitative assessment of participant experiences and satisfaction with trainings. Benchmark is positive experiences by attendees and perceived efficacy of trainings among attendees.



Recommendation 6: Increase use of data in understanding the local landscape around youth to advance an equity agenda in decision making.

Increase the use of data in decision-making, including qualitative information from younger children. The YCB Board will direct YCB staff on what data to collect, YCB will gather and present the data, and the Board will interpret the data and make decisions based off it. We must ensure that data practices are intentional and efficient to limit research fatigue and reduplication of data sets.

Use data leveraged from partners and collected by the YCB to measure and support young people in Minneapolis to create an equity-rich environment. This may include increasing the ability to disaggregate data by race, ethnicity, gender, and age to ensure that programs, interventions, and opportunities are serving the most vulnerable young people in our community and we and our partners are adequately addressing gaps in the community.

All strategies below operate in cyclical relationship. Once we develop useful data indicators, we then collect recent data, and next use our data to inform decisions relating to young people. When this cycle is complete, we must begin the process again to ensure our decisions are based on the most useful, relevant, and recent data we have on young people in Minneapolis.

Strategy 6.1 Sustain and deepen the data collected in the Youth Master Plan Status of Youth report that monitors community-level outcomes and assesses progress towards organizational mission, goals, and Youth Master Plan progress. Advocate among partners for collection of data gaps and enlightening disaggregation of existing data. To achieve this, we will leverage existing data from jurisdictional partners and other youth organizations in Minneapolis and continue to advocate for creating a public data commons and establishing data sharing agreements between the Youth Coordinating Board and public bodies. Doing this will allow YCB staff and our partners to better assess the wellbeing of young people, and limit the need to reduplicate data that is collected by programs or community organizations.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of Status of Youth report indicators updated annually. Benchmark is nineteen indicators are updated each year.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Number of webpage views for each of six data dashboards on the YCB's website as a proxy for utility by partners. Benchmark is an average of seven views per week.



Strategy 6.2 Develop infrastructure for a recurring model to collect qualitative and quantitative data from children, young people, and families to assess the state of young people and children in Minneapolis, assess the YCB's progress, share out meaningful data with our partners, and formalize the knowledge held within the YCB. This could take the form of a youth and family survey that will allow us to have a better understanding of quantitative data points by getting at the stories and experiences underneath them and by collecting data not captured in traditional quantitative points, such as Friend,

Family, and Neighbor childcare. Saint Paul and the Brooklyn Bridge Alliance for Youth are examples of youth surveying. Share out the results of the survey with jurisdictional partners so they can incorporate youth voice without doing additional outreach and preparation. In the next couple of years, the YCB will focus on developing resources to design a data collection system, including funding for staff lead/coordinator, youth partners to collect and interpret data, and necessary software and data storage.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of dataset creations and/or updates per year. Benchmark is one annual update of data.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Qualitative assessment of capacity to do primary data collection and an assessment of quality and rigor of data collection. Benchmark is positive assessments of capacity for and quality of data collection in partnership with young people.



Strategy 6.3 Continue to build out infrastructure to aggregate, count, and analyze youth-serving programs across Minneapolis using an equity lens to provide our staff, partners, and community members with information.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of average weekly views of the What's Up 612! Program Finder map and number of programs listed in WU612! database. Benchmark is 150 average views per week and 20 programs in database.
- *Strategy-Level Indicator:* Qualitative assessment of capacity to collect program information and publish map. Benchmark is an on track assessment of collecting and publishing information.



Recommendation 7: Reinstate our commitment to children and young people age 0-24 in Minneapolis.

Uphold the YCB's age range of 0-24. This can be done through a resolution accompanying the final YMP presentation to the board restating the YCB's mission and vision.

- *Community-Level Indicator:* Number of board actions taken to affirm the YCB's commitment to young people. Benchmark is one board action in total.



Conclusion

The Youth Master Plan will allow the YCB to organize and prioritize which initiatives and projects we advance in the next five years. The Youth Master Plan was informed by the YCB's priorities, organizational values, and youth and stakeholder input. We engaged youth and youth stakeholders to develop our recommendations, which will allow us to continue to service our mission of championing the health, safety, education and development of Minneapolis' children and young people through collective action and policy alignment.

The recommendations in the Youth Master Plan action items that young people and youth stakeholders in Minneapolis see as essential to addressing to ensure the wellbeing and healthy development of young people. Each of the recommendations are building blocks which, if achieved, will get us closer to realizing our priorities and organizational aspirations. Over the next five years, until the Youth Master Plan is revisited and updated, we will work on implementing the recommendations above, building systems of measurement and accountability to ensure we are making adequate progress, and will continue to update our status of youth report and children's budgets for each jurisdiction annually to ensure we're making decisions based on the best data and information available.

Appendix A: Criteria for Evaluation

Criteria Category	Sub-Criterion	Operational Definition	Priority
Context	Environmental scan	Who else is doing this? What information does this tell us?	Low
	Consideration of risk	What are the risks involved in the policy's trajectory?	
Alignment	Jurisdictional alignment	Does it propel the work that our jurisdictional partners are already doing? Is there likely to be cooperation among our partners? What are anticipated obstacles from other jurisdictions?	High
	Unifying	Will it unify or divide political factions, neighborhoods, jurisdictions? Will it grow an organization and their partnership networks?	Low
Administrative Capacity	Funding	How much funding will it take? What are the ROIs? Is funding aligned with mission and values?	
	Staffing	What staffing is required? Does staff reflect/support community? How is staff supported? Are we able to get buy-in from staff or potential staff?	Medium
	Adequateness of resources	Other materials? Non-tangible resources? Are there existing resources to leverage? How easily are we able to get resources?	Medium
	Adaptability	Can it be used in multiple levels and settings? How effectively? What does a feedback loop look like in planning stages?	
	Costs of sustainability	What are costs and benefits of sustaining it? What resources (time, \$, political will) are necessary to sustaining it?	
Evaluation and Improvement	Translating values into tangibles	Are material outputs and processes reflected in mission/vision? Do outputs align with policy intentions?	
	Sustainability	In what ways is this sustainable (environmental, social, political, fiscally)? Can this be sustained?	
Impacts	Unintended outcomes	What are possible unintended/collateral outcomes? How will we evaluate possible unintended outcomes?	

	Outcomes	What outputs are we looking for? How will outputs impact community-level outcomes? Do these align with jurisdictions? How does this serve the public good? Does it improve people's lives? How does it impact staff? What is impact on community? What is impact on system? Are impacts youth-focused?	High
	Strategic Points	Does it get at more than one thing at the same time? (ripple effects)	
Equity	Youth-centered	Are young people at center of decisions?	
	Equity	Does it alter power relationships? Does it promote safe relationships? Are there equitable standards between groups?	
	White supremacy culture	To what extent are policy designers self-reflective and evaluative when considering white supremacy culture?	High
	Prioritization of most marginalized folks	Are we prioritizing the most marginalized folks/communities? Are communities proportionately impacted (intentionally or unintentionally)?	High
Community Engagement	Exciting	Does this policy generate excitement? Among whom?	

References

- Aaronson, D. (2000). A note on the benefits of homeownership. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 47(3), 356-369.
- Adam, E. K., & Chase-Lansdale, L. (2002). Home sweet home(s): Parental separations, residential moves, and adjustment problems in low-income adolescent girls. *Developmental Psychology*, 38(5), 792-805.
- Alaimo, K., Olson, C.M., & Frongillo Jr., E.A. (2001). Food insufficiency and American school-aged children's cognitive, academic, and psychosocial development. *Pediatrics*, 108(1), 44-53.
- Beier, S.R., Rosenfeld, W.D., Spitalny, K.C., Zansky, S.M., & Bontempo, A.N. (2000). The potential role of an adult mentor in influencing high risk behaviors in adolescents. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 154, 327-331.
- Beyer K., Wallis A.B., & Hamberger L.K. (2013). Neighborhood environment and intimate partner violence a systematic review. *Trauma Violence Abuse*, 16(1), 16-47.
- Bobo L, Thompson V. (2006). Unfair by design: the war on drugs, race, and the legitimacy of the criminal justice system. *Soc. Res.* 73(2), 445-72.
- Browning, C., & Cagney, K. A. (2002). Neighborhood structural disadvantage, collective efficacy, and self-rated physical health in an urban setting. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 43(4), 383-399.
- Cadima, J., Leal, T., & Burchinal, M. (2010). The quality of teacher-student interactions: Associations with first graders' academic and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology*, 48, 457-482.
- Cavanagh, Shannon E., & Aletha C. Huston. (2006). Family instability and children's early problem behavior. *Social Forces* 85(1), 551-81.
- Cramer, Reid, Rourke O'Brien, Daniel Cooper, & Maria Luengo-Prado. (2009). A Penny saved is mobility earned: Advancing economic mobility through savings. Washington, DC: Economic Mobility Project, Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Conley, D. (2001). Capital for college: Parental assets and postsecondary schooling. *Sociology of Education*, 59-72.
- Cutts, D. B, Meyers, A. F., Black, M. M. Casey, P. H., Chilton, M., Cook, J. T., Geppert, J., Ettinger de Cuba, S., Heeren, T., Coleman, S., Rose-Jacobs, R., & Frank, D. A. (2011). US housing insecurity and the health of very young children. *American Journal of Public Health*, 101(8), 1508-1514.
- Darling, N., Hamilton, S., Toyokawa, T., & Matsuda, S. (2002). Naturally occurring mentoring in Japan and the United States: Roles and correlates. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30, 245-270.
- Dotterer, A. M., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2009). Sociocultural Factors and School Engagement Among African American Youth: The Roles of Racial Discrimination, Racial Socialization, and Ethnic Identity. *Applied Developmental Science*, 13(2), 61-73.
- DuBois, D. L., Neville, H. A., Parra, G. R., & Pugh-Lilly, A. O. (2002). Testing a new model of mentoring. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 93, 21-57.

Duke, T. S., & McCarthy, K. W. (2009). Homophobia, Sexism, and Early Childhood Education: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 30(4), 385–403.

Duncan, Greg J., Kathleen M. Ziol-Guest, & Ariel Kalil. (2010). Early childhood poverty and adult attainment, behavior, and health. *Child Development* 81(1), 306–25.

Farah, M. J., Shera, D. M., Savage, J. H., Betancourt, L., Giannetta, J.M., Brodsky, N. L., Malmud, E. K., & Hurt, H.. (2006). Childhood poverty: Specific associations with neurocognitive development." *Brain Research* 1110(1): 166–74.

Feagin J.R., & Sikes M.P. (1994). *Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Fowler P.J., Tompsett C.J., Braciszewski J.M., Jacques-Tiura A.J., Baltes B.B. (2009). Community violence: A meta-analysis on the effect of exposure and mental health outcomes of children and adolescents. *Dev Psychopathology*, 21(01), 227-59.

Gershoff, E.T., Cybele, C.R., Aber, J.L., and Lennon, M.C. (2007). Income is not enough: Incorporating material hardship into models of income associations with parenting and child development. *Child Development* 78(1), 70–95.

Gilbert, K. L., Quinn, S. C., Goodman, R. M., Butler, J., & Wallace, J. (2013). A meta-analysis of social capital and health: a case for needed research. *Journal of health psychology*, 18(11), 1385-1399.

Guerra N.G., Huesmann L.R., Spindler A. (2003). Community violence exposure, social cognition, and aggression among urban elementary school children. *Child Dev.* 74(5), 1561-76.

Hair, E. C., Moore, K. A., Garrett, S. B., Kinukawa, A., Laura, H., & Michelson, E. (2005). The parent-adolescent relationship scale. *Adolescent & Family Health*, 4(1), 12–25.

Harris-Britt, A., Valrie, C. R., Kurtz-Costes, B., & Rowley, S. J. (2007). Perceived racial discrimination and self-esteem in African American youth: Racial socialization as a protective factor. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 17(4), 669–682.

Haurin, D. R., Parcel, T. L., & Haurin, R. J. (2002). Does homeownership affect child outcomes?. *Real Estate Economics*, 30(4), 635-666.

Henly, J.R. & Lyons, S. (2000). The negotiation of child care and employment demands among low-income parents. *Journal of Social Issues* 56, 683–706.

Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., Feldman, A. F., McMaken, J. (with Jucovy, L. Z.). (2007). *Making a difference in schools: The Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring impact study*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Hurd, N., & Zimmerman, M. (2010). Natural mentors, mental health, and risk behaviors: A longitudinal analysis of African American adolescents transitioning into adulthood. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46, 36–48.

Kalil, A., & Wightman, P. (2011). Parental job loss and children's educational attainment in black and white middle-class families. *Social Science Quarterly*, 92(1), 57–78.

- Karcher, M. J. (2005). The effects of developmental mentoring and high school mentors' attendance on their younger mentees' self-esteem, social skills, and connectedness. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42, 65–77.
- Kessler R.C., Mickelson K.D., Williams D.R. (1990). The prevalence, distribution, and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *J. Health Soc. Behav.* 40(3), 208–30.
- Lukachko, A., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., & Keyes, K. M. (2014). Structural racism and myocardial infarction in the United States. *Social Science & Medicine*, 103, 42-50.
- Margolin G., Vickerman K. A., Oliver P. H., Gordis E. B. (2010). Violence exposure in multiple interpersonal domains: Cumulative and differential effects. *J Adolesc Health*, 47(2), 198-205.
- Matsaganis, M. D., & Wilkin, H. A. (2015). Communicative social capital and collective efficacy as determinants of access to health-enhancing resources in residential communities. *Journal of Health Communication*, 20(4), 377-386.
- McDowell, D. J., Kim, M., O'Neil, R., & Parke, R. D. (2002). Children's emotional regulation and social competence in middle childhood: The role of maternal and paternal interactive style. *Marriage & Family Review*, 34, 345–364.
- Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Criss, M. M. (2001). Antecedents and behavior-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child development*, 72(2), 583-598.
- Reddy, R., Rhodes, J. E., & Mulhall, P. (2003). The influence of teacher support on student adjustment in the middle school years: A latent growth curve study. *Development and Psychopathology*, 15, 119–138.
- Rhodes, J. E. (2005). A model of youth mentoring. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 30–43). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Riina, E. M., Lippert, A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2016). Residential Instability, Family Support, and Parent-Child Relationships Among Ethnically Diverse Urban Families. *Journal of marriage and the family*, 78(4), 855–870.
- Rumbold, A. R., Giles, L. C., Whitrow, M. J., Steele, E. J., Davies, C. E., Davies, M. J., & Moore, V. M. (2012). The effects of house moves during early childhood on child mental health at age 9. *BioMed Central Public Health* 12, 583-594.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918-924.
- Sandstrom, H., & Chaudry, A. (2012). "You have to choose your childcare to fit your work": Childcare decision-making among low-income working families. *Journal of Children and Poverty*, 1(2), 89–119.
- Sandstrom, H. & Huerta, S. (2013). The negative effects of instability on child development: A research synthesis." *Low-Income Working Families: Urban Institute*, 3, 1-57.
- Sarsour, K., Sheridan, M., Jutte, D., Nuru-Jeter, A., Hinshaw, S., and Boyce, W. T. (2010). Family socioeconomic status and child executive functions: The roles of language, home environment and single parenthood. *Journal of International Neuropsychological Society* 17, 120–32.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & The Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (2000). Friendship as a moderating factor in the pathway between early harsh home environment and later victimization in the peer group. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 646–662.

Scott, E. K., London, A.S., and Hurst, A. (2005). Instability in patchworks of child care when moving from welfare to work.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(2): 370–86.

Seaton, E. K. (2009). The influence of cognitive development and perceived racial discrimination on the psychological well-being of African American youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(6), 694–703.

Seaton, E. K., Caldwell, C. H., Sellers, R. M., & Jackson, J. S. (2008). The prevalence of perceived discrimination among African American and Caribbean Black youth. *Developmental psychology*, 44(5), 1288–1297.

Search Institute. (2017). The power of peer relationships: A study of peer programs in the United States.” 1-10.

Stevens, A. H. & Schaller, J. (2011). Short-run effects of parental job loss on children’s academic achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 30(2), 289–99.

University of Minnesota. (2015). Violent victimization among adolescent youth in Minneapolis. MinnLink, 22 (Winter), 1-6.

Whittaker, J. E. V., Harden, B. J., See, H. M., Meisch, A. D. & Westbrook, T. R. (2011). Family risks and protective factors: Pathways to early head start toddlers’ social-emotional functioning. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26, 74–86.