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Our Restorative Justice (OurRJ) works to interrupt the school-to-prison pipeline that has become endemic in US cities, particularly in communities of color. In many cases, youth become involved in the juvenile justice system as a result of a relatively minor infraction, such as being verbally disruptive in a class at school. Once a young person is court-involved, it becomes difficult for them to break free from a cycle of surveillance, missteps, and incarceration, detention, or other punishment, and youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system have a high likelihood of remaining entangled in the criminal justice system as adults.

Our Restorative Justice has been working with the Lowell Juvenile Court System since 2012 to divert youth from the juvenile justice system into a restorative process. Restorative justice, as practiced by OurRJ, is a voluntary process in which young people accused of an offense, as well as those who were harmed, members of their community, and their support network come together in a “circle” to discuss the causes of that harm, what its impact has been, and how it can be repaired. After the initial circle, OurRJ staff and the other circle members work together to hold the young person accountable and ensure that the reparative work is completed. For example, a social worker who is part of the circle might work with the young person to seek mental health counselling and to find a summer job through a local youth program. RJ thus seeks to address the root causes of behavior, equipping both young people and members of their communities with the tools necessary to avoid the same negative situations in the future.

Based on their experience working with individual young people, OurRJ believes that restorative justice is most effective when reparative work can take place in the schools, organizations, and communities they are already in, and when it can connect them to resources that help address the underlying causes of the challenges they face. Therefore, OurRJ is seeking to build a restorative justice “hub” -- or network of organizations doing related work -- that will embed their restorative justice work in the existing network of community organizations and resources in greater Lowell. Building relationships among organizations will allow OurRJ’s model to reach a larger number of youth, and will also assist youth engaged in the RJ process in accessing resources that will complement their RJ work, ideally addressing some of the root causes of the harm they have
caused and preventing future offenses.

This field project provides preliminary research for the creation of a restorative justice hub in Lowell. Our team’s objective was to consider both best practices in the field of community organization collaboration as well the local context in Lowell to offer recommendations that are specific to OurRJ’s specific circumstances and, we hope, will position a future hub for success.

Through a review of the academic literature focusing on hubs and inter-organizational collaboration, we explore different forms a hub might take, as well as best practices for forming and maintaining a hub. We have also undertaken an initial review of the organizational landscape in Lowell by researching a list of local organizations. We identified possible partners, mapped the organizations’ locations to show spatial relationships, and used this information to offer some recommendations for OurRJ as they continue to conceptualize how a restorative justice hub can enhance their work and benefit the youth and families they serve.

Our findings demonstrate that hubs can be effortful to build and maintain, and their best chance for success occurs when their membership and structure leverage pre-existing relationships and recognize the community context. Deep knowledge of both individual local organizations and their relationships with each other and the community are a necessary prerequisite to building a hub that is lasting, effective at delivering services, and has the potential to make real social change. In addition, all members of the hub must develop a shared understanding of the available community resources. We’ve identified four key lenses that will help OurRJ consider how other organizations might participate in a hub: population served, mission match, services provided, and existing network. Through our case studies and recommendations, we’ve tried to demonstrate best practices and potential pitfalls for organizations as they begin to work together.

We hope that this project brings OurRJ one step closer to creating a hub that meets their organizational needs and improves outcomes for youth in Lowell.

We use the terms **hub, network, coalition, and collaboration among organizations** in this report. All have similar meanings, with some subtle distinctions. In our literature review, we use the terms used by each author we discuss. When presenting recommendations for Our Restorative Justice, we primarily use the term hub, their preferred term. Therefore, while we are not using the terms interchangeably, we are assuming that lessons drawn from one model can be applied to the others.
Chapter 1

Community Context
Our Restorative Justice is a nonprofit organization founded in 2012 in Lowell, MA to offer an alternative for the growing number of young people who have become involved in the Middlesex County Juvenile Court after committing minor offenses, often in school.

OurRJ is the product of innovation and collaboration by local juvenile justices and legal experts, and today functions as a diversion program for youth, helping them to avoid entry into the “school-to-prison pipeline.” Restorative justice, as practiced by OurRJ, is a voluntary process in which young people accused of an offense, as well as those who were harmed and members of their community, engage in a restorative process of recognizing the harm they caused and doing work to repair that harm and prevent such harms from happening again. Its community-centered, reparative approach stands in contrast to the traditional court-based juvenile justice system, which is more offense-centered and often punitive in its response.

Once a young person has been referred, OurRJ staff and the Middlesex County Court conduct a joint intake with the young person and their parents, after which OurRJ staff does a more detailed intake at the young person’s home. Together, the youth and their families identify other people – including friends, family members, teachers, therapists, DYS workers, and others – to be part of the young person’s restorative process. If the harm involved a specific victim, that person is generally included as well. OurRJ staff then convene this group – usually four to eight people in total – in a circle, a ritualized conversation about the harm that was caused and how it can be repaired. The outcome of the circle is a reparative agreement, which lays out next steps for the young person to resolve some of the specific issues their actions caused, as well as to seek additional support to prevent future problems. After the circle, OurRJ staff continue to meet with the young person to provide support and assist the young person.
in being accountable to their reparative agreement. When the process is complete, OurRJ convenes a closing circle, and then reports the outcome to the district attorney’s office. The case is then dismissed, and because this happens pre-arraignement, the young person does not get a criminal record. Most restorative justice cases take about seven months from beginning to end.

In the five years since its founding, OurRJ has diverted over 80 youth from the juvenile justice system into its restorative justice program. Based on their experience working with these individual youth, OurRJ believes that restorative justice is most effective when it can reach youth in the schools, organizations, and communities they are already a part of, and when it can connect them to resources that help address the underlying causes of the challenges they face. Therefore, OurRJ is seeking to build a restorative justice hub – or network of organizations doing related work -- in Lowell that will embed their restorative justice work in the existing network of community organizations and resources.

Figure 1. OurRJ’s Restorative Justice Program Outline

Community Context: Our Restorative Justice
Our Restorative Justice is a diversion program for the Middlesex County Juvenile Court, which has locations in Cambridge, Waltham, and Framingham in addition to Lowell. Their programs serve youth from the portion of the county covered by the Lowell Juvenile Court, which includes the towns of Ashby, Ayer, Billerica, Boxborough, Burlington, Chelmsford, Dracut, Dunstable, Groton, Littleton, Lowell, North Reading, Pepperell, Reading, Shirley, Stoneham, Tewksbury, Townsend, Tyngsborough, Westford, Wilmington, Winchester and Woburn.

However, this report focuses on Lowell for several reasons. Lowell is a dense city with a high concentration of service providers that would lend itself well to the implementation of a hub. It is also where many of the youth who OurRJ works with live, and OurRJ has existing relationships with organizations and institutions there. Therefore, our research is focused on the Greater Lowell area.

Lowell is a city of about 110,000 residents in Middlesex County, Massachusetts, 25 miles north of Boston (US Census Bureau). It was founded in the 1820s as a planned industrial town, and was soon home to numerous textile mills and the people who worked in them. Since its founding, Lowell has attracted immigrants from all over the world, who came to work in the mills. In the 1800s and early 1900s, those immigrants came primarily from Europe, including Ireland, Poland, Sweden, Portugal, and Greece. Many of the mills moved south starting in the mid-1900s, but immigrants continued to populate Lowell, coming from Cambodia (Lowell is home to one of the largest Cambodian communities in the US) as well as Vietnam, Laos, Puerto Rico, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, India, and beyond (Farrant and Strobel 2011). At the time of the 2010 census, Lowell was about 60% white, 20% Asian, and 7% African American. About 17% of the population at that time was Latino. The median household income, at about $50,000, was lower than the state average, and the poverty rate was higher (US Census Bureau).
Lowell is also a “gateway city,” a term coined in 2007 in a report by the Brookings Institute and MassINC, and codified into law by the Massachusetts State Legislature the following year. Gateway Cities, as defined by state law, are mid-sized cities in Massachusetts, with populations between 35,000 and 250,000, that have histories of being strong manufacturing centers and “gateways” to the American Dream; there are 26 cities across Massachusetts that meet these criteria (MassINC). As manufacturing jobs left the Northeast, and eventually the US entirely, these cities struggled economically. Their designation as gateway cities is part of a strategy to revitalize their economies, taking advantage of their many assets, including walkability and easy access to transit, cultural resources, universities, and other institutions.

Lowell is a city with significant cultural resources, including mill museums run by the National Park Service, popular summer music festivals, and a thriving artist community. It is also home to large public and nonprofit institutions, such as UMass Lowell, Middlesex Community College, and Lowell General Hospital, that are anchors for the wider region as well as numerous smaller organizations providing services to the more immediate community. Although Lowell is home to the greatest concentration of nonprofits in the area, the total number is still very small compared to larger cities like Boston. In addition, Lowell has just one community foundation (the Greater Lowell Community Foundation) and two family foundations (the Theodore Edson Parker Foundation and the Abbot and Dorothy H. Stevens Foundation) that focus specifically on Lowell-area grantmaking. These small numbers necessitate collaboration between organizations in Lowell (interview with Felicia Sullivan, 4/19/17).

Like other gateway cities, Lowell has an opportunity to grow and develop to take full advantage of these assets. However, it also faces the challenge of remaining a city that is open to all, as gentrification threatens the ability of low- and middle-income people, particularly the large immigrant communities, to remain in the city. It also faces a history of unequal participation; in spite of its racial and cultural diversity, there is a common perception that this diversity is not reflected within the city’s elected leadership and municipal government. In the face of the gentrification, and accompanying rising housing costs, affecting much of Massachusetts, Lowell may look very different twenty years from now. The organizations and groups working there now have a unique opportunity to shape that future in important ways, as well as to make Lowell a model for what can be done in other similar cities in Massachusetts and beyond.
Chapter 2

Methods

Tools utilized during OurRJ’s Circle Restorative Justice Process
Our team conducted a review of relevant literature on hubs, highlighting case studies when possible. We also reviewed the organizational landscape in Lowell, researching over 70 service providers and other nonprofits and agencies in the Lowell area. Finally, we mapped these organizations to show spatial relationships.

Literature Review

Our literature review is focused on collaboration and coalition building amongst community organizations, as well as investigating the community school and health center models. We compiled this literature through the use of databases, library resources, and reading recommendations provided by our teaching staff. We identified trends in the literature, but also highlighted areas of disagreement throughout the readings, and have attempted to identify key themes, findings, and tools that will be valuable to OurRJ as they begin to build their own hub. We have also highlighted case studies of both successful and unsuccessful hubs that may be of interest to OurRJ.

Review of Local Organizations

We began with a list of 71 local nonprofits and agencies that had been identified by Our Restorative Justice staff as possible community partners. This list includes resources of potential interest to youth and families involved with OurRJ, and casts a fairly wide net, including a wide range of providers.

We worked through the list of organizations to both confirm the accuracy and currency of the information and to make a preliminary assessment of whether each organization might be a good fit for a restorative justice hub. We were guided in that work by a rubric developed by OurRJ staff and modified collaboratively by OurRJ and the field project team. A copy of the rubric can be found in Appendix A. Most of this work was done by reviewing each organization’s website, doing additional online research, and occasionally making phone calls when information was not available online.

Of the full list of organizations, we found that a small number were not currently active. Another subset provide services intended for a very specific population - such as people with HIV/AIDS; adults running in-home daycare programs; or senior citizens seeking job training - who are not OurRJ’s target population. When we removed these two categories of organizations from the list, 50
organizations remained, and the full list can be found in Appendix B. The table in Appendix B offers a condensed overview of our research; a more complete spreadsheet, including all of our research and suggestions as well as notes about the organizations we removed from the list, was sent separately to OurRJ but is not part of this report.

Based on our findings, we were able to identify four key lenses through which to evaluate the potential for these organizations to participate in a youth restorative justice hub in Lowell. These findings are presented in chapter 4.

The organizations in original list from OurRJ are organized into ten categories based on their focus area. These focus areas are:

1. Community Organizations
2. Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
3. Education, Job Training, and Child Care
4. Food
5. Housing and Homelessness
6. Immigrant and Refugees Services
7. Legal Services
8. Mental Health and Addiction
9. Physical Health
10. Youth Organizations

For the purposes of our analysis, we consolidated these into seven categories. We also re-categorized several of the organizations to better reflect their potential relationship to a restorative justice hub. The new categories are:

1. Basic Needs
2. Community
3. Education & Training
4. Funding & Support
5. Health
6. Legal
7. Youth

**Mapping of Lowell Organizations**

Following the completion of the organizational review process described above, we utilized ArcGIS to create a map that provides a visual representation of partners and community resources in greater Lowell, while also offering insights into the spatial characteristics that could influence OurRJ’s development of a restorative justice hub.

Communities across the United States are undergoing rapid changes. Geographic information systems (GIS) and online data and mapping technologies have played an important role in helping the community organizations and nonprofit organizations to identify, visualize, monitor and evaluate these changes and trends. (Esnard, 2007). GIS is widely applicable among community-based organizations, helping them to identify where their services are most needed and
where potential collaborators or assets - or competitors or other challenges - are located.

We created a map for this project, focused more closely on the city of Lowell itself. We began by geocoding the addresses of each organization (The address locator is US Census TIGER street data set, from Reference USA.), some of which include multiple physical sites. We then provided context by including neighborhood boundaries (from Zillow), city bus routes (from MassDOT), and physical features such as rivers, roads, and green space. This map, while fairly simple, provides a visual presentation of potential hub member organizations throughout Lowell.

In a small city like Lowell, nearly everything is relatively close together, and our map clearly demonstrates that most organizations are tightly clustered in the downtown area, with relatively fewer in the surrounding residential neighborhoods. The fact that many organizations are physically close to each other may make hub creation easier. The map also demonstrates which organizations share the same space, indicating that they are likely already linked programmatically as well.

**What is the “school-to-prison” pipeline?**

OurRJ often refers to the “school-to-prison pipeline” in their literature: the idea that youth, particularly low-income youth and young people of color, often transition directly from their schools into the juvenile justice system. Some of the offenses diverted to OurRJ take place in schools or school buses, such as fights between young people and their peers or teachers. Even in cases where an offense did not occur at school, schools are important communities youth help build and develop in. Schools are therefore critical collaborators in the restorative justice process.

**Methods**
Chapter 3

Literature Review

Eli Plenk, OurRJ Program Manager, speaking to community members
Our Restorative Justice requested a review of the literature on hubs: the problems they can solve, the circumstances in which they form, and best practices for creating and maintaining these networks among organizations. In this section, we review some of the academic literature that addresses these questions.

We begin with an exploration of the benefits of hubs: why create a hub in the first place? Next, we discuss some models for network structure and governance, which take into account the organizational landscape of a community as well as other local factors. Much of the literature on networks and coalitions explore the question of who has power when organizations collaborate, and whether these forms are compatible with community-led change.

Existing relationships are also key to whether networks succeed or fail, and so understanding inter-organizational and even interpersonal relationships is an essential first step toward building something new. Finally, we offer a more in-depth description of two of the oldest and most established forms of hubs in the US: community health centers and community schools.

Benefits of Inter-organizational Collaboration

The academic literature focusing on collaboration among organizations is extensive and varied. At this time in history, there is significant need for collaboration, as increasingly, initiatives that were centralized in government agencies prior to the 1980s have experienced devolution and fragmentation (Briggs 2011; Christen and Inzeo 2015). In this context, small nonprofits have found that they are not equipped to make the large-scale social change they envision alone. As a result, both nonprofits and their funders have sought out collaboration as a way to both benefit more people and better address the root causes of complex social problems.

Conteh (2013) notes that while coalitions will not entirely replace government action in most sectors, they are likely to exist alongside government agencies, blurring the boundaries between the public and the nonprofit sectors. In contrast to the top-down nature of government intervention, coalitions are by nature more collaborative, and provide a less hierarchical model for the provision of services (Conteh 2013).

Coalitions can be an appealing option when local stakeholders realize that a problem is bigger and more complex than any one organization can handle alone. Chavis (2001)
notes that coalitions have been particularly popular in public health and crime prevention initiatives, which are examples of very multifaceted issues, and certainly share a focus with OurRJ’s work.

Chavis notes that difference is both the biggest hurdle and the biggest benefit of coalitions. Unlike individual organizations, which are built around commonalities, coalitions derive their strength and value from the different perspectives that each organization brings. They can also add value by offering an opportunity for productive conflict. As coalitions work through their varied perspectives together, they can challenge the status quo in ways that individual organizations, which are comfortable in their niches, may never do.

Network Structure and Governance

While collaboration is often valuable, it is far from simple or straightforward. Briggs (2003) has developed materials for organizational decision-makers to help them decide whether and how to work together. He observes that partnership can be risky, because no one organization has total control of the process. Large or well-resourced organizations can avoid partnership entirely by growing their organizations or paying for services to increase their impact. However, small and new nonprofits often do not have these options, and must partner in order to increase their impact. Briggs cautions that partnership often requires more ongoing effort than partners initially anticipate. This is because partners must spend time upfront to reconcile different work styles and analyses of the problem they are addressing together.

Briggs describes five different levels of partnership, ranked from least to most integrated:

1. Communication (sharing information)
2. Cooperation (sharing activities)
3. Coordination (sharing resources)
4. Federation (integrating services)
5. Merger (removing all boundaries; creating one organization).

As organizations establish a partnership, they must decide which of these models best suits their purposes.

Briggs describes one collaborative initiative, a youth development alliance in Hartford, CT, that sought to address the needs of at-risk youth. Although the organizations within this alliance had broadly shared goals for the youth they served, they faced problems due to unclear governance (Briggs 2003).
Questions for Organizations Considering Partnership

Javier de Souza Briggs (2003) introduces a set of questions that organizations should consider before partnering with each other, or as a partnership begins:

Goals and Alternatives. What exactly do we want to accomplish together, and why is partnering—acting together—the most strategic choice we can make among the alternatives for getting things done? What are all the alternatives, and how do they compare?

Timing. Why is partnering the best option now? What is happening in our environment to make this a promising or urgent time to partner in this way?

Clarity on purposes. How much is our prospective effort about productivity gains (improved tangible results in a product or service) as opposed to gains in the legitimacy and political support we need to act effectively on this problem(s) or opportunity?

Rewards. What are the specific tangible benefits we expect from committing to this “strategic” alliance or partnership, and why? (Think about better outputs or enhanced impact of our work and what will produce these: new financial resources, expertise, facilities, other?) What intangible benefits (networks, legitimacy, reputation, learning) do we expect, and why?

Risks. What key risks can we identify? Think about risks to reputation, the likely costs of managing the alliance relative to concrete gains, and how you will handle the “people side” of partnering (are there informed, capable, motivated people who can build the alliance?).

Success. How will we know if we are making progress? Think about indicators of improved knowledge about the problems and each other’s roles and capacities relevant to tackling the problem; key actions that indicate the alliance partners are acting to institutionalize that knowledge, such as in changes to their practices; indicators of new and improved outputs that depend directly on such actions being jointly delivered and coordinated; and indicators of improved outcomes in the underlying condition “in the world” that the alliance is intended to affect for the better. Do we have a “logic” model for why our actions should make a difference? Are outside factors identified? How will we handle them?

Capacity. Do we each have the capacities needed to engage in this alliance—at least to begin well? Think about capacities for assessing your own organization and your prospective partners; for conducting joint fact finding and group planning activities; for facilitating discussion and troubleshooting conflict when perspectives diverge; for measuring the kinds of progress indicators (see above) that will allow us to make informed choices; for sharing information on clients that we try to serve jointly.

How partnered should we be? What’s the history of our relations with one another? What kinds of exchanges (information or other) have we had to date, and how shared is our vision of what purposes we each serve in the community? What degree of “integration” do we feel ready for now? What risks and potential rewards correspond to that level or another level of integration? What supports, internal or external, could help us mitigate the risks and see more of the rewards? When should we re-evaluate the degree question and on what basis?

Follow-through. What will it take to make the chosen degree of integration work? What are the needed steps and resources? The success measures? Who is responsible for what?
Underscoring the importance of governance to these efforts, Provan and Kenis (2008) describe three different types, and the strengths and pitfalls of each:

1. In shared governance, there is no single leader; all participating organizations are equally responsible for the functioning of the network.

2. The lead organization model positions one organization - often the convener of the network -- as the primary convener and the one to move the network forward.

3. A network administrative organization establishes a new entity that exists solely to run the network.

Provan and Kenis note that each of these models works well in some situations, depending on four factors: trust, network size, goal consensus, and nature of the task(s). They describe each of these, and match different sets of factors to the appropriate governance model, as shown in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Forms</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Goal Consensus</th>
<th>Need for Network-Level Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared governance</td>
<td>High density</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead organization</td>
<td>Low density, highly centralized</td>
<td>Moderate number</td>
<td>Moderately low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network administrative organization</td>
<td>Moderate density; NAO monitored by members</td>
<td>Moderate to many</td>
<td>Moderately high</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, Provan and Kenis highlight additional tensions to consider when deciding on a network governance structure: inclusivity versus efficiency; building legitimacy within the network versus externally; and flexibility versus stability. The different governance models fall at different points on the continuum between each of these sets of tensions.

### Key Finding:

A hub’s structure and governance must be well-matched with its purpose and the capacity of its members.

Beyond these general guidelines for thinking about inter-organizational collaboration, scholars have developed various more prescriptive models for how collaboration should occur. One that has risen in popularity in the past decade is collective impact (CI), a concept developed in the late 2000s by Kania and Kramer (2011). Collective impact is defined by five key elements:

1. A common agenda
2. Shared measurement
3. Mutually reinforcing activities
4. Continuous communication
5. Backbone support.

Kania and Kramer also identified three preconditions for collective impact: influential champion(s) of the collaboration; adequate financial resources; and a broadly-felt sense of urgency about the problem (Christens and Inzeo 2015).

### Coalitions and Community Power

Waltzer, Weaver, and McGuire’s piece is the introduction to a 2016 issue of the journal Community Development (issue 47, number 2), that is dedicated to an exploration of the CI model. LeChasseur’s article, featured in this same issue, offered some insight into the limitations of CI to address issues of power and structural inequality. She notes that when organizations work together, by definition, the agendas of organizational leaders tend to take precedence over the needs of community members. Because the “participants” in CI are organizations, each with its own goals and turf, they collectively have an interest in maintaining the status quo, rather than challenging existing structures of power and privilege. As a result, in the case of social issues that require a recognition of and shift in power -- which, the author points out, is essentially all social issues -- coalitions are often unable to address the root causes of the problems they are attempting to combat. To the extent that solving social problems entails reevaluating unjust systems, she finds the traditional Collective Impact model poorly suited to the task.

Christens and Inzeo (2015) also offer more guarded support for the Collective Impact
model, and contrast it with the less trendy, but more time-tested model of community organizing. While their analysis of the current need for collaboration matches that of the other authors, they note that models such as CI continue to work around the problem of cuts in government services, rather than addressing that deficit head-on by holding the government accountable for better services.

They observe that CI differs from community organizing (CO) in three overlapping ways:

1. In CI, initiatives are led by organizational leaders, and while they may prioritize community engagement, it is not essential. CO, in contrast, sees grassroots engagement as its foundation.

2. CO has a goal of explicitly shifting the balance of power. CI rarely even talks about power directly, and operates within existing structures.

3. CO often provokes or exposes conflict to bring about change. CI, because it functions within existing power structures, does not seek out conflict.

That said, CO and CI may each be appropriate in different circumstances. If what is needed is better service coordination, CI may be appropriate. If a solution will require concessions from powerful groups or a reorganization of power structures, CO may be required (Christens and Inzeo 2015). This comparison is summarized on the following page:
Key Finding:

Building a hub can increase capacity, but it can also reinforce the very power structures many of its member organizations are working to change.

Table 2. A Comparison of Collective Impact and Community Organizing (based on analysis by Christens and Inzeo, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collective Impact</th>
<th>Community Organizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall approach</strong></td>
<td>Works around a lack of government services by bringing private and nonprofit projects together</td>
<td>Advocates for better government services and more public funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and direction</strong></td>
<td>Comes from organizational leaders (for example, executive directors)</td>
<td>Comes from the grassroots (residents, constituents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to power</strong></td>
<td>Operates within existing power structures</td>
<td>Goal is to shift the balance of power more to the grassroots/residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to conflict</strong></td>
<td>Avoids conflict to maintain existing structures</td>
<td>Provokes or exposes conflict to bring about change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it can accomplish</strong></td>
<td>Better service coordination</td>
<td>Concessions from powerful groups or a reorganization of the power structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1999, the Annie E. Casey Foundation launched an ambitious initiative to transform children’s lives by transforming their neighborhoods, based on the belief that strong communities nurture strong families. “Making Connections” was ultimately implemented in 10 city neighborhoods around the country in order to put that theory into practice. Neighborhoods identified different strategies to implement, including connecting residents with employment opportunities, opening free tax preparation centers to help residents access the Earned Income Tax Credit, providing financial services to help residents avoid predatory lenders, and ensuring that licensed child care and health care for young children were widely available. The program also supported local policies that could ultimately strengthen initiatives like these. Community residents served as ambassadors for these programs in order to increase participation.

Through its programs, Making Connections was able to demonstrate the value of a “two-generation strategy” that provides supports for both parents and their children in improving outcomes for young people. Ultimately, however, although these programs resulted in many success stories for both new initiatives and individuals, they were not successful in creating the population-level change they were seeking. Initially, Making Connections posited that neighborhood-level change would directly impact families. However, over the course of the initiative they discovered several challenges to the model of place-based community change:

1. Cities and organizations are often not able to implement programs at a neighborhood scale; they are structured such that their service areas are larger, and not necessarily overlapping with other organizations. This made providing neighborhood-level, coordinated services very difficult to achieve.

2. There is a great deal of movement in and out of neighborhoods and local institutions, such as schools, by low-income people. Families with children tended to change their housing situation even more often than the average. Therefore these neighborhoods were in a constant state of flux, with residents coming in and out.

In addition, they found that when organizations worked together, each organization tended to see itself as the “gatekeeper” to its clients or constituents, but were not prepared to foster meaningful grassroots leadership. This kind of deep organizational culture shift was outside of the scope of this initiative, but would have been instrumental to creating the kind of change the initiative aspired to.

In a similar vein, they noted that while holistic neighborhood-level interventions have been tried since the settlement house movement in the early 1900s, the goal of reducing poverty throughout the neighborhood remains too big and too broad. They recommend identifying more concrete, achievable goals for future projects. (Annie E. Casey Foundation 2013)
The Role of Context and Existing Relationships

The literature is clear that networks do not emerge in a vacuum: they develop within the context of communities, relationships, and networks that already exist. A study by Kegler, Rigler, and Honeycutt (2010) explores the impact of community context on the formation and functioning of coalitions. The authors note that much of the literature on coalitions has not focused on issues of context, but their research found that context has a significant impact on whether coalitions are successful. They define five “contextual domains” that may influence coalition formation and functioning:

History of collaboration. Have the organizations (or individuals within the organizations) worked together before?

Community history and politics. Are there distinct groups that have a history of either productive collaboration or tension? How will past events in the community more broadly impact the new coalition?

Community norms and values. What are some widely-held values, norms, and beliefs?

Community demographics and economic conditions. Who are the people in the community, in terms of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, employment, religion, country of origin, or other salient factors?

Geography. How does the community’s urban/rural status, or location within a larger county or metro area, impact what happens there?

A significant finding is that existing relationships are important in coalitions. In places where some coalitions already exist, new coalitions tend to take on the structures and roles of the old ones. Interpersonal relationships matter as well. Kegler et al (2010) observed that when coalitions wanted to expand their membership, they were most successful when they brought in people who had pre-existing connections to current coalition members. For example, in one case they studied, coalition members were asked to bring someone they knew to the next meeting.

They also found that just as strong relationships can lay the groundwork for strong coalitions, distrust and rivalry can make coalitions very difficult to build. In some cases, “old timers” in a place are resistant to new ways of doing things; if these “old timers” are established organizations, it may be difficult...
to obtain their participation and buy-in for a collaborative effort. Likewise, a lack of trust or communication across neighborhoods, ethnic groups, or other internal divisions can stymie a coalition’s progress. The authors suggest seeking explicit representation from each group -- perhaps by nominating representatives from neighborhoods or ethnic groups or other locally meaningful categories -- in order to broaden the appeal of a coalition and, ultimately, its success.

One method of researching and modeling relationships is the technique of network analysis. Provan et al (2005) note that one common reason why networks sometimes fail is that each organization often has difficulty understanding the network as a whole, and instead views it, understandably, from the vantage point of their own organization and its goals and priorities. Network analysis can help organizations see how they fit into an existing landscape, in which they are just one player. Uniquely, the unit of analysis is not the organizations themselves, but the relationships between them.

A valuable network analysis must start with high-quality data. The executive directors of organizations, or other people with deep knowledge of each organization and its relationships, can provide this data through a survey, which should identify where relationships exist, what kind of relationship they are, as well as their strength (Provan et al 2005; see Appendix C for an example of such a survey). This data is then run through a computer program such as Gephi, which creates a visualization of the linkages between organizations.

**Key Finding:**

Existing relationships among organizations are a significant predictor of a hub’s success. Network analysis is one method of identifying and evaluating those relationships.

**Case Studies in Collaboration:**

**Community Health Centers and Community Schools**

As we have mentioned above, some of the earliest and most established inter-organizational networks have been in the fields on public health and youth development, and some of the most common forms of collaboration in these areas are community health centers and community schools. Boston is the home of the nation’s first community
health center and, at the time of publishing, has more community health centers than any other city in the US.

As of 2005, community health centers throughout the state serve one in ten MA residents, representing 43% of the state’s Medicaid and uninsured or underinsured residents. “Boston: The Way Democracy Ought to Work” explores the advent of this public health social service in Boston, from its beginning as an extension of major university medical centers to the autonomous community centers of today (Lefkowitz 2007).

Understanding Boston’s health centers from a historical context provides useful insight into the moral and procedural issues that arise in establishing hubs. At their core, the health centers of Boston are exercises in community governance. However, health centers throughout the city were initially competitive with one another. As the impact of community health centers grew and grant funding became more plentiful, tension arose between funding recipients. There was a belief that the poorest neighborhoods in the city with the “highest number of minorities” and “generous, holistic job creation models” were disproportionately funded in comparison to “homegrown projects in white, working-class areas.” As explained by the authors, “racism was used for a proxy for frustration” with the limitations of grant funding (Lefkowitz 2007). Understanding historical tensions between non-profit and community organizations within a city will be essential for OurRJ as they attempt to recruit organizations for their proposed restorative justice hub model.

Gradually, the city’s disparate centers began working as a unit. “Cross fertilization” of best practices, grant funding, and holistic community health care interventions was essential for the growth and success of the city’s centers. It is important to note the uniqueness of each health center. As stated by the authors, “If you’ve seen one center, that’s all you’ve seen. Like our neighborhoods, each organization will be proudest of what makes them different” (Lefkowitz 2007). Despite the individuality of each health center, there are certain phenomena that are common amongst the city’s centers. In terms of physical infrastructure, the city’s health centers are often located in gentrifying areas. New residents, and those less likely to use the health center’s services, often claim that community health centers contribute to “too many social services,” as opposed to resources to be utilized by “all neighborhood” residents.

Similarly, there is a lack of representation on health center boards of directors, reflective of newer residents of a neighborhood. The article gave an example of a Boston community
health center board where “25% of the board is minority when it ought to be 60 or 70”. This “big brother, little brother” dynamic and lack of representation of community demographics in community health center leadership is pervasive (Lefkowitz 2007).

As evidenced by this example from community health centers, “cross fertilization” is an important tool in community organizational development. The Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child Model (WSCC) is an exemplary tool that calls for greater collaboration across the school, community, and health care sectors “to meet the needs and support the full potential of each child” (Burbank and Hunter 2012). This article explores case studies in Arkansas, Colorado, Kentucky, and Maine where the WSCC model has been successfully implemented. It highlights the importance of “health outcomes to educational outcomes, and the importance of educational attainments to health” (Burbank and Hunter 2012).

Amongst the case studies, there were three key programmatic areas:

1. Leveraging resources
2. Utilizing resources efficiently
3. Improving health and education outcomes.

The article gives the example of shared use agreements as an implantation of these programmatic areas. In one case study, shared use agreements between local schools and community organizations lead to improved community access to facilities to be used for physical activity. Similarly, school-based health centers have been shown to decrease inappropriate emergency room use, increase the usage of primary care providers, and reduce hospitalizations amongst regular youth patients (Burbank and Hunter 2012).

Models such as these demonstrate that it is possible to prioritize student health within the education system as it allows for better consideration of the needs of the whole child. WSCC also exhibits the importance of strategic leadership at the state and local level, including support from policymakers, superintendents, local school boards, and community organizations to foster healthier school environments that address the needs of the whole child.

An additional example of the linkage between school and health partners comes in the form of the Community Advocate Model (CAM). Through a series of facilitated focus groups, CAM advocates aim to establish “reciprocal relationships” between the parents of historically underserved populations, youth, and educators. The specific goals of CAM are:
• Identifying ways to benefit from the knowledge immigrant parents bring to school communities

• Sharing information on how parents can successfully work with school staff

• Assisting parents in becoming more involved in their child’s education

• Preparing K-12 advocates who will spread their knowledge to other parents (Chiang, Meagher, and Slade 2015).

This article investigated the implementation of CAM through a series of workshops ranging from relationship building between families and schools to understanding the development needs of teenage children. Initially, these sessions were taught by individuals unaffiliated with the schools. However, researchers and practitioners interviewed for this study soon began to realize the “funds of knowledge” that students and parents bring to these workshops. Legitimizing backgrounds and life experiences fosters the meaningful connection between community, schools, home, and family.

Feedback from CAM workshop participants (with a particular focus on immigrant parents) included increased discussion about communicating with teachers, issues about gang involvement, and the American higher education system. Amongst workshop participants, there was a noted misunderstanding about the value of college or post-high school education. The authors stated, “Families are often unaware that the payback from education is not as substantial and immediate as expected” (Chiang, Meagher, and Slade 2015). This case study proved an excellent example of legitimate and meaningful involvement of immigrant families and experiences in the education system.

Key Finding:

Initially, disparate city organizations will find a multitude of reasons not to collaborate. However, reconceptualizing community resources is key in increasing ways for individuals to participate. Facilities within schools and offices are vital along with individual’s unique experiences and should be leveraged as community resources.
The Community School Model

Community schools are public primary and secondary institutions that offer a wide range of services to students and their families including:

- Primary health and dental care
- Mental health services
- Nutrition education
- Mentoring
- Adult education
- Job training & career counseling

Inherent in this model is addressing the many levels of support that a child needs in entering school while remaining keenly aware of increasing achievement accountability from the US Federal Government. The idea was pioneered in the early 20th century by John Dewey, finding inspiration from his time working at Jane Addam’s Hull House in Chicago. At the core of this philosophy was the notion that schools should be the “hub of the community”.

The Coalition For Community Schools is an “alliance of national, state and local organizations in education K-16, youth development, community planning and development, family support, health and human services, government and philanthropy as well as national, state and local community school networks”. The rationales below explain the basic premise and tenants of the community school model:

Rationale One. College, Career, and Citizenship

It is the goal of K-12 schools to prepare students to be successful in life after graduation and into their careers. In order to achieve this, it is typical that community schools partner with institutions of higher education to prepare older students for college. In addition, there is an emphasis on community service to develop students into active citizens of their community.

Rationale Two. Health and Social Support

Limited access to health care, mental illness, chronic health problems, relationships with family, and poverty are factors that significantly determine a student’s ability to come to school ready to learn. Yet, these outside factors are not accounted for when measuring a student’s success in school. Community schools offer a variety of health services to students, families, and community members including primary care physicians, dentists, and mental health experts.
Rationale Three. Expanded Learning Opportunities

Community schools are able to offer additional learning experiences before, during, and after the school day (and also during the summer) as a way to extend a student’s school year. More time in school allows students to access additional academic tutoring — but also allows time for enrichment in the form of music lessons, nutrition classes, and other programming intended to meet the student’s unique needs and interests.

Rationale Four. Engaging Instruction

Partnerships with local businesses, non-profits, and higher education institutions offer students learning opportunities that complement their regular academic curriculum.

Rationale Five. Early Childhood Development

With the recent demands placed on schools to meet certain testing metrics, more attention is being focused on students’ experience even before entering kindergarten. Many community schools also feature early childhood programs to better ensure that students come to kindergarten ready to learn. High-quality early educational experiences have a strong positive impact on a child’s life.

Rationale Six. Community Engagement

Community schools are built on the strength of the school as well on the strength of the surrounding community. Leaders of community schools are dedicated to working in partnership with local organizations to understand the needs of the community and to develop a shared collective mission. Sharing a vision means sharing accountability for the success of the community’s youth and students.

Rationale Seven. Family Engagement

Family engagement is key to the academic success of youth. Community schools are exploring innovative ways to increase parental involvement through relationship building and a variety of support programs. Many schools offer GED classes, food pantries, and enhanced opportunities to participate in school decision-making. Community schools are also a social and cultural hub in many areas and offer religious, art, and health events to members of the surrounding neighborhood.

Rationale Eight. Youth Development

The “typical” school day at a community school differs in structure from the “typical” school day at a traditional school. Flexibility within the school day and extending school hours...
allows for enrichment and youth development. Community partners are able to participate at the school, designing an array of innovative and engaging educational opportunities for students. The goal is for students to explore their interests and grow into highly creative adults.

Rationale Nine. Strategic Alignment

The structure of community schools supports collaboration and engagement amongst many types of stakeholders. Leadership teams at community school are developing to feature not only school administrators, but also parents and community partners — all of whom are interested in creating a shared vision for the school.

Harms or offenses? Our Restorative Justice uses the term “harm” to describe the actions youth have taken to cause harm to other individuals or their community. This terminology focuses on the impact of the action: what has been done to hurt the community, and perhaps to the young person themself? A more commonly used term, in the juvenile justice system and society as a whole, is “offense”. Although it may be more familiar to many readers, the term offense highlights the rule-breaking or illegal nature of an action, emphasizing state norms rather than community norms. In addition, “offense” refers to a particular incident, whereas “harm” is more inclusive, focusing on multiple individuals and community actors (schools, courts, police, etc). Due to our focus on restorative justice, in this report, we use the term harm rather than offense when possible.
Chapter 4
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Findings

As described above, our literature review yielded several key findings about community hubs:

A hub’s structure and governance must be well-matched with its purpose and the capacity of its members.

Building a hub can increase capacity, but it can also reinforce the very power structures many of its member organizations are working to change.

Existing relationships among organizations are a significant predictor of a hub’s success. Network analysis is one method for identifying and evaluating those relationships.

Initially, disparate city organizations will find a multitude of reasons not to collaborate. However, reconceptualizing community resources is key in increasing ways for individuals to participate. Facilities within schools and offices are vital along with individual’s unique experiences and should be leveraged as community resources.

Our review of the organizational landscape in Lowell augmented these more academic findings, and situated them within the local context.

Analysis of the Organizational Landscape

As described in the Methods section above, we reviewed a list of 50 possible community partners in the Lowell area.

These organizations offer a wide menu of possible partnerships and hub structures to explore. Here, we offer four different lenses that OurRJ can use when considering whether and how each organization might participate in a hub:

1. Target population match
2. Mission match/organizational philosophy
3. Services provided
4. Existing network

Below, we describe organizations from the list that exemplify each category. However, OurRJ will likely identify additional organizations that belong in each category. We hope that both the suggested organizations and the lenses themselves will be helpful as OurRJ considers which organizations may contribute most fruitfully as part of a hub.

Target Population Match

All of the organizations on our final list are there because they serve either youth or their families in some way. However, some of these organizations offer programs that target a nearly-identical population to OurRJ’s: court-
involved youth, or youth facing difficult life circumstances of other kinds. The organizations in this category include:

Table 3. Target Population Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridging the Gap (Salvation Army)</td>
<td>Court-involved and at-risk youth aged 12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthbuild (part of Community Teamwork Inc)</td>
<td>Young people aged 16-24 who have dropped out of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTEC</td>
<td>“Disconnected” young people, particularly those who are gang-involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three of these organizations focus on youth development for young people who are system-involved. While a number of other organizations on the list offer programs specifically for young people and teens, they are not necessarily geared at those who are experiencing the same set of challenges.

Based on target population alone, we recommend that OurRJ be in contact with these organizations to discuss how their programming can complement each other’s. A youth restorative justice hub in Lowell would almost certainly be relevant to these three programs and the youth they serve.
2. Mission Match/Organizational Philosophy

Our Restorative Justice articulates its mission this way:

The mission of OurRJ is to provide marginalized youth and young adults with an alternative approach to justice that disrupts the school-to-prison pipeline. OurRJ utilizes a restorative justice model to empower youth to resolve harm and conflict within their own communities. It is a model that surrounds the young person with both high levels of support and high accountability to their community and to those harmed. By addressing the root cause of harm, the OurRJ approach keeps youth in school, strengthens families and builds robust communities.

Here, we identify other Lowell-based organizations that share OurRJ’s commitment to strengthening communities and to deep investment in individual development, either for youth or adults:

Table 4. Mission Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mission*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for a Better Acre</td>
<td>Economic development, real estate development, and resident empowerment in the Acre neighborhood of Lowell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association</td>
<td>Provides resources of all kinds to the Cambodian community, and helps local service providers communicate with and meet the needs of the Cambodian population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Health &amp; Recovery</td>
<td>Provides services and research for people experiences substance abuse and mental health issues that are trauma-informed, family centered, and strengths-based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Alliance for Families and Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Addresses immediate needs and long-term challenge through resident empowerment. Part of the statewide Community Connections initiative, which “promotes a planning framework that is prevention focused, strengths-based, resident-driven, and builds upon the diversity of families and communities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Community Health Center (especially the Teen BLOCK program)</td>
<td>“Supports the healthy development of young people, and empowers them to become leaders in the community.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All quotations in this section come from the mission statements on each organization’s website.
Mission is a more subjective category than some of the others listed here, and it can be difficult to assess an organization’s philosophy from their website alone. However, it seems clear that each of the five organizations listed here approach their work in much the same way as OurRJ does: they acknowledge that individuals are embedded in families and communities, and that individuals flourish when their families and communities are strong. Organizations with a shared worldview may find it easier to work together, as their methods are likely to be uncontroversial amongst themselves and they will tend to define success similarly. We anticipate that OurRJ would find these organizations to be like-minded partners.

3. Services Provided

A third lens through which to evaluate Lowell-based organizations is the services that each provides. We assume that all of the services included in the full list, from food pantries to domestic violence shelter, are relevant to some OurRJ youth and their families. However, the organizations below offer services that seem particularly well-suited to OurRJ’s target population:

Table 5. Services Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Relevant Services Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbor Counseling Services</td>
<td>Counseling groups specifically for youth and young men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for Public Counsel Services, Youth Advocacy Project</td>
<td>Legal representation for young people with a youth development focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Health and Recovery</td>
<td>Range of mental health and substance abuse services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Community Health Center, especially Teen BLOCK program</td>
<td>Health-related programs for teens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Public Schools Family Resource Centers</td>
<td>Helps parents and families navigate the Lowell Public School system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Can Help</td>
<td>Emergency assistance for families involved in the juvenile court system. Can provide assistance with utility bills, rent, emergency supplies and so on that can keep youth with their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise Above</td>
<td>Funds for youth in the foster care system for everything from music lessons to sports team expenses to class trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTEC</td>
<td>Leadership and training opportunities for young people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These organizations offer a wide range of services, from emergency financial assistance to mental health support to engagement with children and families who are court-involved, but all are highly relevant to OurRJ’s target population of children and families. If one goal of a hub is to strengthen relationships between organizations that work with similar populations, OurRJ should include organizations like these in a future hub; particularly those that they anticipate referring to and working with often.

4. Existing Network

This final category, organizations that are already part of a robust hub themselves, serves two purposes. First, these organizations will be particularly valuable partners, since they bring these relationships along with them. And second, they can serve as a model as OurRJ initiates a new hub of their own. The following are particularly well-networked organizations on our list: each of these organizations works solely or primarily through a hub, and offers a model for OurRJ to consider as it develops a hub of its own.

Table 6. Existing Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Hub or Network Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association</td>
<td>Because their mission is to connect Cambodian residents with services and opportunities, they maintain connections with a wide range of service providers throughout Lowell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catie’s Closet</td>
<td>Partners with Lowell schools (as well as schools in other areas) to provide free clothing. Their entire delivery mechanism and referral system is school-based, taking advantage of existing relationships youth have in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lowell Health Alliance</td>
<td>GLHA is a hub (their term is a “Community Health Network Area”) of dozens of organizations working together to improve health in Lowell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Alliance of Portuguese Speakers</td>
<td>Similar to CMAA (above), but for Portuguese-speaking populations, particularly from Brazil and Cape Verde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Lowell Center for Community Research and Engagement</td>
<td>Offers support to numerous local organizations, many of which are on our list, and could potentially help make connections through programs or funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthbuild/Community Teamwork Inc</td>
<td>They both identify youth to participate in their programs and offer training and placement to those youth through organizational partnerships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a part of this project, we were asked to map potential partners for OurRJ’s proposed restorative justice hub. Below is a map of the Greater Lowell area that features these potential partners. The greatest density of potential partners are located in Downtown Lowell.

Figure 3. Map of Lowell Organizations
The following is a directory for the Lowell Organization Map pictured on the previous page. Organizations are listed by category and in alphabetical order.

Youth
63. Boys and Girls Club of Greater Lowell
22. Bridging the Gap (the Salvation Army)
34. Girls Incorporated of Greater Lowell
45. United Teen Equality Center (UTEC)
81. Rise Above

Community
56. Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association
9. Massachusetts Alliance of Portuguese Speakers (MAPS)
75. Mill City Grows
58. Coalition for a Better Acre
46. Greater Lowell YMCA
75. Lowell Alliance for Families and Neighborhoods
52. Pollard Memorial Library
27. Youthbuild/Community Teamwork Inc.

Legal
37. Committee for Public Counsel Services
79. Northeast Legal Aid

Education and Training
8. Career Center of Lowell
Frederick Assad Abisi Adult Education Center locations:
53. Frederick Assad Abisi Adult Education Center (main location)
17. CTI/Head Start
27. Youthbuild/CTI

31. Lowell Transitional Living Center
42. Out of School Youth Program at Middlesex Community College
45. UTEC
54. STEM Academy at Rogers School
56. Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association
57. Lowell High School
29. CTI/Youthbuild
25. Lowell Public Schools Family Resource Center
42. Middlesex Community College (Lowell Campus)
62. Middlesex Community College (Bedford Campus)

Funding/Support
4. Greater Lowell Community Foundation
72. UMass Lowell Center for Community Research and Engagement

Health
2. Arbor Counseling Services
44. Bridgwell
70. Center for Family Development of Lowell
1. Greater Lowell Health Alliance
75. Institute for Health and Recovery
28. Lowell Community Health Center
59. Lowell House, Inc
50. Lowell Treatment Center Community Services
41. MA Department of Children and Families
76. Mental Health Association of Greater Lowell
20. Metta Health Center
37. NFI Family Resource Center
66. Alternative House
77. Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence
78. The Center for Hope and Healing

Basic Needs
14. Habitat for Humanity of Greater Lowell
71. House of Hope
3. Living Waters Center of Hope
47. Lowell Housing Authority
31. Lowell Transitional Living Center
19. Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance, Lowell Office
68. Merrimack House Family Shelter
65. Merrimack Valley Catholic Charities
64. Merrimack Valley Housing Partnership
18. Open Pantry of Greater Lowell
55. WIC (Women, including Pregnant Women, Infants, and Children) Program
13. The Wish Project
80. One Can Help

Catie's Closet locations:
10. Robinson Middle School
11. Butler Middle School
16. Lowell High School Career Academy
21. J.G. Pyne Arts Magnet School
23. James Sullivan Middle School
24. James S Daley Middle School
26. Dracut High School
32. McHugh Alternative Middle School
35. Laura Lee Therapeutic Day School
36. Greater Lowell Technical High School
48. Dr. An Wang Middle School
51. McDonough Freshman Academy
54. STEM Academy at the Edith Nourse Rogers School
57. Lowell High School Career Academy
60. Kathryn P. Stoklosa Middle School
61. LeBlanc Therapeutic Day School
69. Bartlett Community Partnership School

Food Pantries (Merrimack Valley Food Bank distribution locations):
3. Living Waters
5. Christ Jubilee
6. Lowell House Inc -- Recovery House
7. Community Christian Fellowship
12. Hope Dove
15. Dwelling House of Hope
30. Christ Church United
31. Lowell Transitional Living House
33. UMass Lowell Student Pantry

34. Girls Inc
38. Council on Aging
39. St. Vincent De Paul – Immaculate Conception
40. Megan’s House
42. Middlesex Community College
43. UTEC
49. Central Food Ministry
56. Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association
58. CBA-Youth Educational Success Program
65. Merrimack Valley Catholic Charities
71. House of Hope
73. Life Connection Center
74. Pathfinder
75. Lowell Alliance for Families
67. Merrimack Valley Food Bank, Inc. (dropoff center)

Findings
Map Findings

Each number on the map represents an organization rather than a location, because some locations are home to more than one organization or program. For example, UTEC, represented by number 45 on the map, is also home to one of the Frederick Assad Abisi Adult Education Center’s programs. These overlaps help to show some existing collaborative relationships within the organizational landscape. In addition, many organizations have more than one physical location. For example, Catie’s Closet is based at most of the schools in Lowell, and has seventeen locations on this map.

The map also demonstrates that the majority of organizations are clustered in downtown Lowell, rather than being spread among various neighborhoods. This geographic proximity may be helpful in facilitating collaboration among different groups, as well as with OurRJ. It also means that most organizations are easily accessible by LRTA bus routes, which may improve access for the youth served by OurRJ. Exceptions to these generalizations can also be seen on the map; these organizations may be more challenging partners.

Concluding thoughts

Our literature review showed that it is crucial to be thorough and intentional as organizations begin the process of collaborating through a hub, and to recognize existing relationships and community resources. Our organizational review was a first step in understanding those relationships and resources in Lowell. We were able to identify organizations that share a target population and mission with OurRJ, as well as others that provide complementary services and are already well-networked in the community. Finally, mapping the location of these organizations helped draw out some additional relationships, such as that some organizations share the same physical space, and highlighted the fact that most community organizations are located close to each other in downtown Lowell.
Chapter 5
Recommendations
Based on the findings from our literature review, we can offer several suggested next steps for OurRJ as they work to build a restorative justice hub in Lowell.

As OurRJ works to build a network, it will be important to consider how it will be organized and governed, taking into account both the desired purpose of the network as well as the capacity of OurRJ and other organizations to provide leadership. Clarifying the purpose of a youth restorative justice hub is therefore an important initial step. OurRJ could initially do this step on their own, particularly if they imagine establishing a hub with a lead organization governance model, with OurRJ at the center. Alternately, if OurRJ anticipates building a hub with a more shared governance model, the step of network analysis should precede conversations about the hub’s purpose and priorities, so that all hub participants can engage in this process.

OurRJ is a small, new organization in Lowell with limited resources. Given that reality, our recommendation is that OurRJ pursue a shared governance model for the hub. While OurRJ is the local expert on youth restorative justice practices, other Lowell nonprofits and agencies have more existing inter-organizational connections, a higher level of recognition and trust in local communities, and an understanding of local power dynamics informed by decades of work in Lowell. We therefore recommend that OurRJ begin the hub-building process by becoming more familiar with the most likely partner organizations.

The previous section offers four key lenses for evaluating each organization’s potential as a hub member: target population, mission, services provided, and existing network. In the previous section, we also identify several organizations in each category that appear particularly well-suited to being part of a hub. We recommend that OurRJ take our process one step further by refining the list of organizations in each category, removing any that they do not expect to work closely with, and adding key organizations we may have missed.

Once OurRJ has finalized an initial list of possible hub members, they should reach out to each one for an in-depth conversation which may include:

1. Some or all of Javier DeSouza Briggs’ questions, found in our literature review on page 15.

Recommendations
2. Some or all of the Network Analysis Survey, described in our literature review and included in full in Appendix C. The survey would need to be modified from the sample to apply to building a youth restorative justice hub in Lowell, and could be administered as a followup to an initial conversation.

OurRJ should structure its hub-building work to ensure that this initiative complements OurRJ’s primary mission to strengthen communities and end the systemic criminalization of young people. Throughout their inter-organizational conversations, OurRJ should keep in mind how a new hub can either perpetuate or interrupt the existing power structures in Lowell. There is an inherent tension between seeking out effective, influential partners to get the work done and seeking to empower those who may not currently have the means or connections to change the system to better serve youth and families. As OurRJ meets with local organizations and considers possible hub members, they can help maintain this balance by:

1. Explicitly seeking to partner with organizations that have a strong grassroots base, and are led by people from the communities they serve.

2. Soliciting input directly from court-involved youth and their families, to learn how they envision a hub serving them. This may require an element of education, as community members may not be familiar with how organizations are structured and function.

Throughout the hub-building process, it will be crucial to look at the relationships that already exist among organizations, and how those dynamics could be either replicated or disrupted. As OurRJ meets with other organizations and gathers information about their organizational relationships, a picture of Lowell’s organizational network will emerge. As we described in the literature review, pre-existing relationships among organizations is the strongest predictor of a hub’s success. Therefore, we strongly encourage OurRJ and its partners to leverage these existing relationships as they conceptualize and build a new network.

Network analysis could be one way to approach this process. While we’ve offered some preliminary suggestions of highly-networked organizations in the previous section, we encourage OurRJ to use a version of the network analysis survey (Appendix C) to obtain more in-depth information about each organization’s relationships than we were able to gather in this project. Soliciting this
information directly from each organization’s executive director, or another high-level staff person, will ensure that the data paint an accurate picture of relationships and alliances in Greater Lowell. OurRJ can use this information in written form, or can use a social network analysis tool such as the Gephi program to explore the connections in a more visual way.

Relationships matter not only among other potential hub members, but also between those organizations and Our Restorative Justice. While this project does not focus on how to build trusting relationships, it is clear from the literature that those relationships are essential. As OurRJ embarks on the process of building a hub, it should consider how to partner in smaller ways to demonstrate its trustworthiness and value in the community. Offering restorative justice trainings and engaging staff from other agencies in restorative justice circles are opportunities for OurRJ to add value for other organizations and to build relationships in the community.

We began this report, and this research process, by learning about Our Restorative Justice’s deep commitment to situating their restorative work within each young person’s existing community and network. OurRJ’s model is based on the belief that relationships matter: both existing ones, at school and in families and neighborhoods, and the relationships that can be forged between young people, peers and adults who care about them, and a wider network of organizations and institutions that can provide them with services and support. Helping a young person become even more deeply rooted and supported in their community is a crucial step toward restorative justice.

It is fitting, then, that successful hubs also require strong relationships and trust. Just as OurRJ works to connect youth with supporters and partners, they should also spend time developing mutually-supportive, trusting partnerships with other organizations in Lowell. And just as each restorative justice circle yields a thoughtful, actionable reparative agreement that involves reaching out to others, OurRJ should develop a plan for building a hub that is action-oriented and that focuses on learning from and collaborating with other organizations in achieving that goal. Building and strengthening relationships, always at the core of OurRJ’s mission, will be central to this new project of building a restorative justice hub as well.
References
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Appendices
This evaluation tool and notes for use were developed by Meghan Higgins and Eli Plenk at Our Restorative Justice. They were modified by the UEP team after a conversation with our partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission/Focus</th>
<th>Organization Characteristics</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Amenable to RJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is the organization's primary constituency?</td>
<td>Any concern that the</td>
<td>Does the organization have institutional affiliations? Which?</td>
<td>Does the organization regularly work with groups of young people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Youth under 17? Families? Other?)</td>
<td>organization’s mission and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approach might be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incompatible with OurRJ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What services does the organization provide?</td>
<td>Is the organization active</td>
<td>Is the organization community-based or scaled (either at state or national</td>
<td>Are youth involved with the organization on a sustained basis (multiple months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and stable?</td>
<td>level)?</td>
<td>or more)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the organization led by</td>
<td>Does the organization have a youth development or therapeutic approach to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people in the community (at</td>
<td>their work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the staff or board level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and does the leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seem qualified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does this seem like a particularly strong mission match with RJ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional notes for operationalizing the questions above:

**Mission/Focus**
- Include the age range of youth with which the organization works.
- List services the organization provides (OurRJ can make determination about what is most relevant or needed).

**Quality**
- Red flags in terms of mission match might include: Does the organization explicitly evangelize as part of services? Are they using the criminal justice system as a default approach for dealing with youth behavior rather than a last resort? Do their materials indicate something other than a social justice analysis, ie that people should “pull themselves up by their bootstraps”?
- An “active and stable” organization should show activity on their website, calendar, etc.
- Check to see if staff and board are affiliated with other community organizations, or if they are from Lowell. Also note if leaders have relevant background or training in their field.

**Context**
- Examples of affiliations: Umass Lowell, Middlesex Community College, Lowell General Hospital, Lowell Public Schools, state or city government
- By scaled, we mean that organization is one site of a multi-site organization, like YouthBuild, Girls Inc., etc.

**Amenable to Incorporating RJ**
- For “particularly strong mission match” consider approaches that seem particularly aligned with RJ, such as an emphasis on community-based solutions to problems.
## Appendix B. Full results from organizational research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization name</th>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Primary constituency</th>
<th>Services provided</th>
<th>Institutional affiliations</th>
<th>Groups of young people (youth involved on a sustained basis? Youth leaders in the organization?)</th>
<th>Other notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carter's Closet</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Kids in need of clothing and other necessities. Many of the schools served are in or around Lowell.</td>
<td>In-school “closets” stocked with clothing and other necessities. Kids are referred by guidance counselors, nurses, and others. Goal is to reduce absenteeism and keep kids in school.</td>
<td>37 schools in MA and NH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity of Greater Lowell</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>People and families are homeless or in poverty housing.</td>
<td>Build and repair homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Hope</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Homeless individuals</td>
<td>Permanent Housing, Workforce Training, Emergency Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Waters Center of Hope</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Homeless individuals</td>
<td>A variety of services (from a barber to food aid to ESOL classes) not normally available to homeless individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Housing Authority</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Anyone living in or seeking to live in public housing or affordable housing in Lowell.</td>
<td>Various types of affordable housing, supports, and information. The Family Self-Sufficiency program connects families with various services to become self-sufficient. The “Learning Zone” is an after-school program for kids in grades 5-8 in two locations in Lowell (both public housing projects). There is also a college scholarship for public housing residents, through the Lowell Housing Youth Activities Program, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, two after-schools for grades 5-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Transitional Living Center, Lowell office</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Homeless individuals. Some programs (such as meals) are open to non-homeless people as well.</td>
<td>Many of their programs, including the Meals program, are open to the wider community. Emergency food and shelter, case management, intensive care for the chronically homeless.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Department of Transitional Assistance, Lowell office</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>People needing emergency assistance</td>
<td>Help people access SNAP benefits, as well as some other emergency funds for seniors, pregnant women, and people who’ve experienced domestic violence. Educational, financial, emotional, parenting, and housing services. Can house up to 14 families.</td>
<td>State of MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack House Family Shelter</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Homeless and low income people</td>
<td>Merrimack programs include: Basic Needs, Counseling, Family Support Services, Food Pantry, Grandparents as Parents, Parent Support Services, emergency shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack Valley Catholic Charities</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Anyone in need of services (any faith) in greater Lowell (local locations in Haverhill and Lowell)</td>
<td>Merrimack programs include: Basic Needs, Counseling, Family Support Services, Food Pantry, Grandparents as Parents, Parent Support Services, emergency shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>List on their “partner” page, including housing orgs such as CHAPA and the Mass Housing Partnership, as well as Middlesex CC, City of Lowell, various groups that house their classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack Valley Housing Partnership</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Homebuyers and potential homeowners, new homeowners</td>
<td>First-time homebuyer classes, first-time landlord classes (for those buying multifamilies), lead-abatement assistance, down payment assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Still in Lowell (Catholic Charities in Boston have been programs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Can Help</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Families involved in the juvenile court system in MA</td>
<td>Emergency assistance with basic needs such as: utility bills, cleaning supplies, school supplies, bus passes, emergency food. Support for families with no financial cushion, who may be at risk of having children placed in state custody.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Pantry of Greater Lowell</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>People in need of food. Self-described “emergency” food bank, serving as a last resort for people in need of food.</td>
<td>Food pantry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wish Project</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Homeless families, the elderly, mentally and physically ill, infants, babies, and individuals in the Merrimack Valley</td>
<td>CFTI Emergency Shelter, Community Teamwork, Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC Program</td>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>Women who are pregnant or have children under 5</td>
<td>Translation, interpretation, ESOL classes, citizenship classes, homebuyer classes, Khmer languages classes, after school and summer programs for kids, assistance for families with children with developmental disabilities, leadership program for youth (starting in HS) and young adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assad Abisi Adult Education, Merrimack Valley Housing Partnership, Massachusetts Department of Developmental Services, Cross Cultural Health Care Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association of Greater Lowell</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Cambodian people of all ages (including programs for kids, youth, and families)</td>
<td>Translation, interpretation, ESOL classes, citizenship classes, homebuyer classes, Khmer languages classes, after school and summer programs for kids, assistance for families with children with developmental disabilities, leadership program for youth (starting in HS) and young adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (after school Cambodian program, summer program for kids w/ limited resources, leadership program for high school kids</td>
<td>Important resource for Cambodian families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization name</td>
<td>Focus area</td>
<td>Primary constituency</td>
<td>Services provided</td>
<td>Institutional affiliations</td>
<td>Groups of young people (youth involved on a sustained basis? Youth leaders in the organization?)</td>
<td>Other notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Alliance of Portuguese Speakers</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Portuguese-speaking populations (including Brazilian and Cape Verdean) throughout MA</td>
<td>Transition and interpretation, citizenship classes, elder services, HIV/AIDS, domestic violence services, language classes, family stabilization</td>
<td>DYS (for family stabilization), MA Dept of Public Health, Massachusetts Office for Refugees &amp; Immigrants, etc. Many funders for specific issue areas of their various programs; sec program pages for details.</td>
<td>No youth-specific programming</td>
<td>Important resource for Portuguese-speaking families. Works to engage people within their community; complements OurNut's mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill City Grows</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Gardeners, people in need of food produce, schools/kids in schools</td>
<td>Community gardens, produce from community farms (to Mobilize Market and farmer's market), school gardens, educational programs for adults and kids</td>
<td>UMass Lowell, Lowell Public Schools and City of Lowell, three different AcmeCorps programs</td>
<td>Yes -- summer youth program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for a Better Acre</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>lower-income residents of struggling neighborhoods</td>
<td>Economic development, real estate development, and resident empowerment</td>
<td>City of Lowell Community Development, AHSC Affordable Housing &amp; Services Collaborative, Inc, Lowell Alliance for Families and Neighborhoods, Lowell Community Health Center, Lowell Housing Authority, Lowell Regional Transit Authority, Lowell Spinners</td>
<td>Yes, sustained activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lowell YMCA</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Children and families in Greater Lowell</td>
<td>Swimming, dance, childcare, Youth Sports, and Theater Camps.</td>
<td>Lowell General Hospital, Align Credit Union, MSK Pool Service,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Alliance for Families and Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Lowell families and neighborhoods, especially low-income families</td>
<td>Grassroots leadership training, community garden, financial literacy mentoring, diaper bank</td>
<td>Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association of Lowell, Coalition for a Better Acre, Community Development Center in Lowell, Community Teamwork in Lowell and the City of Lowell</td>
<td>Yes, sustained activities</td>
<td>Some youth enrichment programs (a &quot;Full STEAM ahead&quot;), mostly for younger kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard Memorial Library</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>all Lowell residents</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>Local Banking &amp; Finance Community, Area hospitals and health care facilities, Faith Community, Local businesses, Area universities, colleges, vocational schools and public schools</td>
<td>Sustained involved in programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthbuild/ Community Teamwork Inc</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Young adults between the ages of 16 and 24 who have dropped out of school</td>
<td>Education, Career Development, Case management and counseling, Graduate Services, Construction, Culinary Program, Leadership Development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustained involved in programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Center of Lowell</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>General career center, but Young Adult Department serves youth 14-24 in greater Lowell. Age requirements vary by program</td>
<td>Lots of career services for youth, including a summer program, in-school and out-of-school programs, YouthWorks (year-round and summer subsidized jobs for youth), Shriver Job Corps</td>
<td>City of Lowell, MA One-Stop Career Centers network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Assaad Abai Adult Education Center (LPI)</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>Adults in greater Lowell (must be at least 16 and have officially withdrawn from school for HS, not for ESL)</td>
<td>High school equivalency (HSET), ESL classes. In addition to courses at their own location, they also offer classes as partner organizations in greater Lowell including UTED, YouthBuild, etc. All classes are free.</td>
<td>Part of Lowell Public Schools; and relationships with various &quot;satellite locations&quot; where their classes are offered.</td>
<td>Yes (aged 16+), so includes lots of non-youth too.</td>
<td>Resource for parents needing assistance navigating the school system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Public Schools Family Resource Center</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>Parents of public school students</td>
<td>Help connect families to Lowell Public Schools, and assist with enrollment. Offers contact people who speak a range of languages, as well as materials/resources in those languages. Also promotes desegregations within the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlsex Community College</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>Students pursuing an associate's degree; others taking college courses for various reasons</td>
<td>College coursework (along with support in next steps beyond community college), Campuses in Lowell and Bedford.</td>
<td>Local high schools seem most relevant. HS students can take courses there.</td>
<td>Yes (but mostly over 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lowell Community Foundation</td>
<td>Funding/Support</td>
<td>Private and corporate donors</td>
<td>Local lender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Lowell Center for Community Research and Engagement</td>
<td>Funding/Support</td>
<td>UMass students; local organizations and residents</td>
<td>Community-Based Initiatives Facilitation, Community Research and Program Evaluation through community-university partnerships</td>
<td>Lowell Community Health Center (LCHC), the Coalition for a Better Acre (CBA), Community Teamwork Inc. (CTI), the Lowell Housing Authority (LHA), and Merrimack Valley Housing Partnership (MVHP).</td>
<td>Because they support many local organizations, could be a good partner in forming and maintaining a hub.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization name</td>
<td>Focus area</td>
<td>Primary constituency</td>
<td>Services provided</td>
<td>Institutional affiliations</td>
<td>Groups of young people (youth involved on a sustained basis? Youth leaders in the organization?)</td>
<td>Other notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative House</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Victims of domestic violence and their children</td>
<td>shelter, support, options, counseling and legal advocacy for all victims of domestic violence and their children. Also offers domestic violence education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbor Counseling Services</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Individual, couple, family and groups from Lowell area; languages spoken include Greek, Khmer, Russian, Spanish and Ukrainian</td>
<td>ADDA/OHDD, Child and Adolescent Therapy, Dual Diagnosis, Substance Abuse, Multicultural issues, PDD/Asperger's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>specific youth and young men's therapy groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Immigrants and refugees from East Asian, South, and Southeast Asian; Most clients are women, and are between the ages of 21 and 45</td>
<td>housing, food assistance, multilingual services, legal advocacy, English language lessons, healthcare, mental health, public benefits, employment, and immigration advocacy, counseling, and referrals</td>
<td>United Way of MA Bay and Merrimack Valley</td>
<td>Programming for youth survivors of sexual assault - programs mostly focused on needs of adult family members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Comprehensive behavioral health treatment; continuity of care to individuals with psychiatric and developmental disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Family Development of Lowell</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>children, Adolescents, Adults and Elders</td>
<td>Same as Story Brook Counseling Center? Same website <a href="http://www.cosicounseling.com/lowell.html">http://www.cosicounseling.com/lowell.html</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Their programs focus on the intersector of substance abuse treatment and criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lowell Health Alliance</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>healthcare providers, business leaders, educators, civic and community leaders</td>
<td>Substance Use and Prevention, Mental Health, Maternal/Child Health, Healthy Eating and Living, and Cultural Competency</td>
<td>Organization dependent on collaborative relationships between these organizations – <a href="http://www.greaterlowellhealthalliance.org/who-we-are/partner-organizations/">http://www.greaterlowellhealthalliance.org/who-we-are/partner-organizations/</a></td>
<td>Youth could be involved with programs related to task forces</td>
<td>Youth programming focuses on the intersection of substance abuse treatment and criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Health and Recovery</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>individuals, youth, and families affected by alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use, violence/trauma, mental health challenges and other health issues</td>
<td>Access to housing and recovery; HIV prevention and education; outpatient behavioral health; tobacco education and treatment; criminal justice re-entry programs; family and mother engagement programs; fetal alcohol syndrome treatment; substance abuse therapy and treatment; trauma services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Community Health Center</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>All ages -- regardless of financial status</td>
<td>adult, pediatric, and family medicine; school-based health centers; teen leadership programs; family planning; HIV services; women's health; addiction services; pharmacy</td>
<td>Teen BLOCK Youth programs – leadership, substance abuse, cambodian youth, counseling, sexual education, dance crew</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth programming focuses on the intersector of substance abuse treatment and criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell House, Inc</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>individuals seeking treatment for addiction, their family and friends</td>
<td>residential sober living for men, women, and young men; outpatient addiction treatment facilities; adolescent diversion program; case management; DIII aftercare programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Treatment Center Community Services</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>inpatient treatment for children and adolescents, partial hospitalization programs for adolescents and adults, and a Family Stabilization Team</td>
<td>Arbour Health System - &quot;Largest Private Behavioral Health System in MA&quot;</td>
<td>various groups in adolescent partial hospitalization program. Not long-term.</td>
<td>Work with youth transitioning from institutions to regular life could translate to ODRU's work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Department of Children and Families</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>infants, youth, adolescents, families, and guardians</td>
<td>Adolescent Services, Adoption/Parenting, Domestic Violence Prevention and Mediation, Foster Care, Housing Stabilization, Family Support &amp; Stabilization, Out of Home Placements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A key player in the field of juvenile justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Association of Greater Lowell</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Individuals seeking treatment for mental health and addiction of all ages</td>
<td>counseling services (phd, family issues; substance abuse, etc), medication management, school based services for youth</td>
<td>Division of MA State Gov't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metta Health Center</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Lowell's Southeast Asian and other refugee populations.</td>
<td>Primary medical care for all ages using a family medicine model, chronic disease management, nutrition counseling, mental health services, traditional healing advice, acupuncture, massage therapy, social services, mediation, health education and referrals.</td>
<td>Lowell Community Health Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI Family Resource Center</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>adults, youth, teens, infants, ESL, youth with special educational needs, homeless populations, LGBTQ folks, youth in the juvenile justice system</td>
<td>career, civic engagement, Early Childhood, Education, Family Support, Financial, Housing, Medical, Mental Health</td>
<td>UMass Medical School, DFC, MA Dept of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>various support, education, and language groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization name</td>
<td>Focus area</td>
<td>Primary constituency</td>
<td>Services provided</td>
<td>Institutional affiliations</td>
<td>Groups of young people (youth involved on a sustained basis?) Youth leaders in the organization?</td>
<td>Other notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Center for Hope and Healing</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Family, friends, and survivors of sexual assault</td>
<td>Free and confidential 24 hour hotline, sexual assault survivor support groups (women, youth, LGBT), medical advocacy, legal advocacy, individual counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>specific counseling groups and services for teens and YASS program that &quot;offers free professional development training for youth organizations and youth workers&quot;</td>
<td>They offer services for family and friends as well as survivors – some parallels with OurIFU’s engagement with a young person’s wider community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for Public Counsel Services</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Children who are removed from their homes because of claims of neglect or abuse. And children, youth and families who need legal help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Legal Aid</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Clients in need of legal assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts Legal Assistance, LSC, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Harvard Law School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys and Girls Club of Greater Lowell</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Youth ages 7-18</td>
<td>After-school educational, social, recreational and cultural programming for youth ages 7-18.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local business and organizations May sustained groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging the Gap (the Salvation Army)</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Court-involved and at-risk or high risk youth ages 12 to 17</td>
<td>Multi-month curriculum for court-involved youth that includes topics such as building self-esteem, how to deal with peer pressure, anger management and decision making, communication skills, relationships with family members, friends, figures of authority, culture and diversity, violence and gangs, the effects of drugs and alcohol, job seeking and financial planning, legal issues and ethics.</td>
<td>Massachusetts Cultural Council and United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley</td>
<td>Sustained group. Not youth-led.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Incorporated of Greater Lowell</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Junior Achievement (financial literacy), Operation SMART (science, math and relevant technology), Photovoice (research, literacy and photography), Re-Bold (violence prevention), American Textile History Museum Threads of Learning and Pottery (creative arts) and Chicas Leyendo (Latinx initiative literacy program).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May sustained groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise Above</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Youth in foster care</td>
<td>Funds for lots of &quot;extras&quot; for youth in the foster care system: musical instrument rentals and purchase, dance, music and other lessons, team sport fees and uniforms, equipment and league fees, bicycles, roller blades, pads and helmets; class trips; religious/cultural celebrations (Quinceanera, Confirmation, etc.); Post-secondary education and training and apartment set-ups.</td>
<td>DCU for Kids, Build A Bear Foundation, Greater Worcester Community Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Teen Equality Center (UTE)</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Young people especially &quot;disconnected&quot; young people</td>
<td>Street Outreach and Gang Peacemaking, Transitional Coaches, Education, Workforce Development and Social Enterprise, Youth Empowerment Corps, Civic Engagement and Enrichment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA Department of Children and Families, MA Department of Youth Services, Boys &amp; Girls Club of Greater Lowell, YWCA of Lowell, Lowell Community Health Center, Big Brothers, Big Sisters of Greater Lowell</td>
<td>Sustained programs with youth leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Sample Network Analysis Survey

### Appendix  Network Data-Collection Instrument

Listed below are organizations in [name of community] that we believe are involved in some way in the provision of health and support services for chronic diseases. We would like to know the extent to which your organization is involved with, or linked to, the others on the list for providing a full range of education, prevention, screening, treatment, and support services to patients/clients who have or might have a chronic disease like diabetes, cancer, heart disease, asthma, arthritis, mental illness, or substance abuse.

We have listed four types of involvement your organization might have with these other agencies. These include links through exchange of information, through shared resources (joint funding, shared equipment or personnel, shared facilities, etc.), or through patient/client referrals (either sent or received or both) between your organization and the agency listed.

Please go through the list below and indicate which agencies your organization has been involved with for provision of chronic disease services of any type. Simply place a check (✓) in the box that applies, to the right of that agency’s name, but only for those types of links that occur with some regularity (not just an occasional referral, for instance). Please indicate your involvement for each of the four types of relationships listed. If you had no regular involvement with an agency regarding shared information, shared resources, or patient referrals for any type of chronic disease service, simply leave the box or row blank for that agency.

In the last column, we would like you to rate the overall quality of the working relationship you have with each agency you have checked. For instance, can you trust the other agency to keep its word, to do a good job, and to respond to your organization’s needs and those of its clients? To do this, please circle the number that best reflects relationship quality using a scale where: 1 = poor relationship (little trust), 2 = fair relationship (some trust), 3 = good relationship (trust), 4 = excellent relationship (high trust). Again, if you have no relationship with a listed agency, simply leave the cell blank.

At the end, please add any organizations you are involved with that are not listed but that you believe are valuable to your organization in helping it address chronic disease issues in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations/agencies</th>
<th>Types of links</th>
<th>Relationship quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Check ✓ the box if you have this link)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared info</td>
<td>Shared resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other organizations: please list and respond as above | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |

We would now like to know what the benefits and drawbacks have been from cooperating and collaborating with other agencies in the provision of chronic disease services. For each possible benefit or drawback listed, please indicate, by placing a check in the appropriate box, whether your organization, through its involvement with other agencies, has already experienced the benefit/drawback, expects to experience it, or does not expect to experience it. Check ✓ only one box for each benefit/drawback.

**Benefits:**
- a. Ability to serve my clients better
- b. Greater capacity to serve the community as a whole
- c. Acquisition of additional funding or other resources
- d. Acquisition of new knowledge or skills
- e. Better use of my organization’s services
- f. Building new relationships helpful to my agency
- g. Heightened public profile of my organization
- h. Enhanced influence in the community
- i. Increased ability to reallocate resources
- j. Other benefits (please list other major benefits):

**Already occurred** | **Expect to occur** | **Do not expect to occur**
---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
- a. Yes | Yes | No |
- b. Yes | Yes | No |
- c. Yes | Yes | No |
- d. Yes | Yes | No |
- e. Yes | Yes | No |
- f. Yes | Yes | No |
- g. Yes | Yes | No |
- h. Yes | Yes | No |
- i. Yes | Yes | No |
- j. Yes | Yes | No |

**Drawbacks:**
- k. Takes too much time and resources
- l. Loss of control/autonomy over decisions
- m. Strained relations within my organization
- n. Difficulty in dealing with partners
- o. Not enough credit given to my organization
- p. Other drawbacks (please list other major drawbacks):