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Plan, Act, Evaluate
Connecticut Early Childhood Alliance

Build Network & Local Capacity
YMCA’s

Gain Common View of Advocacy
East Bay BHC Hub

Multi-group ACT! Uses
Advocacy Capacity Tool Sections

I. Advocacy Goals, Plans & Strategies

II. Conducting Advocacy

III. Advocacy Avenues

IV. Organizational Operations to Sustain Advocacy
The organization has decided not to build capacity in a particular measure because it primarily gets that capacity from other individuals or groups. ACT!
Partnering Ranked #2 of 18
## Summary of ACT Indicator Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Partners</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Structure</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence Decisions</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Management</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messaging</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Advocacy</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans, Strategies, &amp; Adaptability</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Ops</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Analysis</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballot Measures</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Capacity: 2.35
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT Advocacy Partners and Coalitions</th>
<th>Average Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization <strong>participates</strong> in coalitions that share one or more of its goals and provide value to the organization.</td>
<td><strong>3.32</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization actively <strong>seeks support for its priorities</strong> from its coalition partners.</td>
<td><strong>3.04</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization <strong>exchanges information with its partners</strong>, as appropriate.</td>
<td><strong>3.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequency “Rely On Partners” Selected
What can I do?
What should I do?
Selected Areas to Strengthen

**Top 3:**
- Detailed Planning
- Fund-raising
- Messaging and Media Relations

**Bottom 3:**
- Electoral
- Litigation
- Ballot Measures

Selected Areas to Strengthen
Groups Choose to Specialize
• Overwhelm with Coalition Choices

• Need for Common Advocacy Understanding

• ACT Possible Improvements:
  ❖ Clearly identify multi-group users
  ❖ Dig deeper on partnering
  ❖ Do shorter version

Observations
• Groups Rank Partnering Capacity Very High

• Participating/Sharing Info Higher than Getting Support

• Groups Choose to “Specialize”

• Low Media Relations Capacity/Partnering

Conclusions
Bolder Advocacy Tools

**Advocacy Capacity Tool (ACT)**

www.bolderadvocacy.org/act

**International Advocacy Capacity Tool (IACT)**

www.bolderadvocacy.org/iact

**PowerCheck for community organizing**

www.bolderadvocacy/powercheck

**Resources for Evaluating Community Organizing (RECO)**

www.bolderadvocacy/reco