Spider Web Analysis Tool for Sustainability
Definitions of Foundational Elements

Purpose and Vision: The team can articulate a clear purpose and vision for the project, including the short- and long-term outcomes and anticipated impacts for the population served and the community (Carroll & McKenna, 2001). As the project evolves, integration of program components within the project and the relationship of the project with other compatible programs in the community contributes to a more defined project and purpose (Mancini, Marek, & Brock, 1999). A clearly defined logic model and a summary of the project and anticipated impacts are key marketing materials.

Implementation Quality: The project's programming is fully operational and being implemented with a commitment to the following: quality coordination of program logistics; quality delivery of the program curriculum or content; and fidelity to the program model (McCarthy & Kerman, 2010). Aspects of program quality and monitoring quality are needed for developing a system for continuous quality improvement.

Reach: The project is successfully serving or "reaching" a large portion of the intended population eligible for participation and those participating are representative of the desired target audience. This includes recruitment of the identified number of participants, delivery of the full dosage of the program to participants, and retention of participants through program completion. A key determinant of project continuation is that the stated grant proposal participant counts are being fulfilled or exceeded (Dzewaltowski, Glasgow, Estabroooks, & Brock, 2004; Marek, Mancini, Earthman, & Brock, 2009; Spoth, Kavanagh, & Dishion, 2002). Documentation of participant attendance will lead to an increased ability to demonstrate demand for services; tracking systems should be established.

Documentation of Value: The project has written documentation detailing the project's plan and value, including the following: data indicating why the program was selected (a needs assessment); a description of the evaluation plan with a summary of collected process and outcomes data; and an explanation of funding sources and collaborative partners (e.g., a summary of funders/amounts, a description of team member qualifications, and a summary of partner roles and responsibilities) (Miller, Krusky, Franzen, Cochran, & Zimmerman, 2012). This documentation, especially the evaluation findings, highlights credibility, fiscal management capabilities, and current successes. It can be leveraged to position program professionals among experts in the community and to advocate for funding (Mancini & Marek, 2004).

Evaluation Data: Quantitative and qualitative data is being collected and analyzed to actualize the project's logic model and drive decision-making. This includes monitoring community-level indicators for public health impacts and collecting, analyzing, and sharing project data (including CYFAR Common Measures) with the project team. The team has access to measures of and is aware of the current status of participation, fidelity, and impact (Johnson, Hays,

Center, & Daley, 2004). Evaluation data not only informs program effectiveness, but it can be used for continuous quality improvement, in reports to collaborators and funders, as documentation in grant proposals, for marketing and outreach to the community and potential funders, and to support program replication (Marek, Mancini, Earthman, & Brock, 2009).

Marketing of Impact: The project has solid communication mechanisms to promote the project and is actively summarizing data and marketing project impact, including: written reports; presentations to community organizations and collaborative groups; media outreach, including social media; and the use of participant and stakeholder testimonials (Batan, Butterfoss, Jaffe, & LaPier, 2014).

Effective Leadership: Leadership competence is a key factor. Leaders promote high quality programming, which is foundational to any sustainability effort. This includes developing goals and objectives; conducting needs assessments; ongoing program planning and monitoring; directing program evaluation; seeking support and fiscal management; supporting, training, and supervising staff; and involving collaborators in meaningful ways (Mancini & Marek, 2004). Efforts must be made to establish strong, stable leadership, as leadership changes create discontinuity in project visioning and the shifting of priorities. (Mancini, Marek, & Brock, 1999). In addition, shared leadership styles marked by vertical empowerment, effective teamwork, a collective vision, and the free exchange of information have demonstrated greater effects on team performance (Barnett & Weidenfeller, 2016; Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2009).

Invested Implementation Team: Project staff is ample, are trained, are flexible, work well together, are committed to the quality of programming and to the populations served, and are responsive to community changes and needs (Johnson, Hays, Center, & Daley, 2004; Mancini & Marek, 2004); Mancini, Marek, & Brock, 1999). Research has shown that the following barriers to sustainability need to be proactively considered and addressed: inability to recruit or retain quality staff; lack of full-time positions; inadequate salaries; and low staff commitment (Mancini, Marek, & Brock, 1999). Staff involvement in program design, implementation, evaluation, and decision-making increases program ownership (Mancini & Marek, 2004).

Sound Fiscal and Administrative Practices: The organization has a strong governance structure, effective management and administrative practices, and established systems for reporting and fiscal accountability (Johnson, Hays, Center, & Daley, 2004). Systems should be established to manage diverse funding mechanisms as research specific to CYFAR programming has shown that funding can be generated from grants, user fees, Cooperative Extension, local businesses, schools, foundations, fundraising efforts, contracts, the United Way, and religious institutions (Marek, Mancini, Earthman, & Brock, 2009).

Mechanisms for Recognition: The organization actively acknowledges the efforts and contributions of the implementation team, partners, and contributors (e.g., verbal or written

acknowledgement, media announcements, or awards) (Harmon, Fairfield, & Wirtenberg, 2010). Credit is shared for project successes (Mancini & Marek, 2004).

Community Support: The project has generated enthusiasm and commitment by the community to the project and its intended outcomes. Connectivity with the community through participation on coalitions, serving on external advisory boards, and professional networking has been found to contribute to project maintenance and expansion (Mancini, Marek, & Brock, 1999). Involving community members, such as volunteers, program participants, and the parents of program participants, in planning and implementation can help to raise awareness of the project and foster a sense of investment.

Strong Collaboration: The organization has forged strong partnerships to leverage resources, seek participant referrals, garner community project input and feedback, promote peer sharing and learning, and involve key community leaders (Dötterweich, 2006; Hawkins, 2012; Spoth, Greenberg, Bierman, & Redmond, 2004). Effective collaboration is the result of nurturing trust, fostering mutual respect and reciprocity, and defining roles and responsibilities. Research has shown that community collaborators can assume a variety of roles (e.g., provision of supplies, space, staffing; evaluation services; curriculum development; training; advisory board members; cash funding; supervision; fiscal management; and grant proposal writing) (Marek, Mancini, Earthman, & Brock, 2009). Community collaborators who assume a prominent role in project leadership are more likely to provide personnel support, supervision, training, and program implementation involvement (Marek, Mancini, Earthman, & Brock, 2009).

Champions: Enthusiastic Individuals, with strong communication skills, have been identified, trained, and equipped with speaking points to educate community members, potential partners or donors, and the target population of the value of the project (Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Elliott & Mihalic, 2004; Shediac-Rizkallah & Bone, 1998).

Community Fit: The project is being implemented in ways that are culturally relevant and align the intended impacts with the following: needs of the community and population served; interests of community stakeholders; community values; local socio-economic considerations, and political agendas (Proctor et. al., 2011; Mancini & Marek, 2004). Projects that more fully meet the needs of their target population (e.g., at-risk youth or families) are more likely to perceive their projects as sustained (Marek, Mancini, Earthman, & Brock, 2009). Understanding the community context and seeking ways to engage the community in program planning and implementation, such as utilizing indigenous staff, honors the community and is an influence on community receptivity and sustainability (Mancini & Marek, 2004).