

Getting to 'Y'

Replication Process



If you are reading this flyer, you are likely considering the fit of Vermont's [Getting to 'Y' \(GTY\)](#) for your community, region or state. Unlike many program "packages" with non-negotiable components, UP believes *it is essential* to adapt the GTY design to ensure its alignment with the unique characteristics of a replication site, while maintaining the research-based program components.

Together, we will probe the alignment of the replication context with the three frameworks that undergird GTY: Youth-Adult Partnership, Positive Youth Development, and Youth Participatory Action Research (see [Garnett, 2019](#)).

Our attention will then turn to a more basic infrastructure and resource assessment. This assessment may drive program adaptations,

for example renaming the initiative, introducing the youth-adult partnership concept as a lead-in, or choosing a different asset model that aligns with prior local, regional or state efforts.

UP for Learning will partner in the model redesign which evolves from this assessment, providing guidance for these two fundamental questions:

- What components of GTY are key to its research-based positive impact and therefore essential to replication efforts?
- What aspects of the model can and should be customized to align with your unique demographics, cultural norms, and resources that surfaced during the assessment process?



Unleashing the Power of Partnership for Learning

continued next page >

◀ continued from previous page

Assessment Questions

Local context* assessment questions will include (but not be limited to):

YOUTH-ADULT PARTNERSHIP

- Has precedent been set for youth as change agents and partners with adults in change? If so, what was the outcome? What lessons were learned? How would you assess a readiness to allow for authentic youth-adult partnership in this culture? Examples?

POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

- Consider a continuum of change paradigms. At one end is a deficit model, where the focus is on addressing weaknesses in a system and fixing them. At the other end is a positive youth development or strengths-based proactive model based on an assessment of strengths as a springboard for actions. Where would you place your context on this continuum? Examples?
- If you have employed an asset or strengths-based approach in the past in any change effort, did you reference any one particular model such as the Search Institute 40 Assets framework, or Bentro's Circle of Courage? Are there cultural considerations about what strengths-based approach would best serve you?

YOUTH PARTICIPATORY ACTION RESEARCH

- Have young people been involved in data analysis of any kind to inform school or community change? What was the process like? The outcome (for both youth and adults)? How has the YRBS data been analyzed and utilized in the past?

INFRASTRUCTURE ADVOCACY AND RESOURCES

- Do you anticipate the educational leader(s) support of GTY? School board members? What might mobilize advocates or proactively address anticipated concerns or barriers to implementation?
- Is there an educator or nurse (at each site) that is pedagogically aligned with this initiative and able/willing to be a leader/advocate/partner? What is the history of compensating individuals taking on similar additional responsibilities? What would be required to ensure GTY success in this regard?
- Is there a time available that ensures regular (weekly/bi-weekly) meetings throughout the year for the GTY team of a diverse, representative group of youth?
- Have there been previous attempts to recruit a diverse and representative group of youth to work together on change? If so, what were the keys to the success of this recruitment process? If not, how might GTY recruitment achieve this important goal?

- Is YRBS data made available on a timely basis? On the school/community level?
- Are there potential community partners who can be recruited to help?

* Team composition and questions will be adapted for regional and state level replication consideration.

Approach 1

APPROVED CATCHMENT AREA: Statewide

TIMELINE: Anticipated 3 years with required annual review of contract and continuation opportunity after the 3 year agreement period ends

PERSONNEL: PT GTY Coordinator through state department (State is responsible for hiring and employing)

LICENSED MATERIALS:

- GTY State Manual in print
- GTY State Manual electronic copy
- Most Recent State YRBS Report
- FAQ's and Calendar
- Pre and Post GTY Surveys

TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

- Training for new hire
- Annual GTY Training of Trainers
- Monthly Network Meetings

TOTAL PROGRAM COST: \$35,000/year. Year 4 and beyond would include licensing materials, membership and GTY network at estimated \$5000 with the option to request additional consulting services.

Approach 2

WHAT IS THE SAME AS APPROACH 1:

- Catchment area, Timeline, Licensed Materials, Training and Technical Assistance

WHAT IS DIFFERENT:

- **Personnel:** PT GTY Coordinator hired and supervised by UP for Learning
- **Total Program Cost:** \$65,000/year. After Year 3, state partners would need to determine whether the GTY Coordinator position could be hired through a state partner agency/organization, or continue to contract with UP to support a state level GTY Coordinator. If GTY Coordinator is hired through a state agency, Year 4 and beyond would include licensing materials, membership and GTY network at estimated \$5000 with the option to request additional consulting services.

Empowering youth and adults to reimagine & transform education together

