

**FIRST 5 [Name of County Removed]
SWOT ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

INTERNAL FACTORS		EXTERNAL FACTORS		
	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<p>Human Resources/ Infrastructure</p> <p>(Leadership, Group/team culture, Communication, Flexibility/adaptation, Diversity, Staff characteristics Staff development...)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multilingual/multi-cultural staff • Effective communication between staff and Commission • Strong sense of teamwork has been built • All staff positions currently filled; no vacancies • Staff has broad knowledge/skill sets • Commission and staff willing to stop, reflect, identify need for change, and re-direct when necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operationally part of a large (bureaucratic) organization* • Limitations on ability for Commission discussions due to Brown Act • Commission membership is “county heavy” • Not effective communication between First 5 and funded/non-funded CBOs • Relationship between funder (First 5) and grantee a delicate balance <p>*which also has advantages</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff capabilities/skill sets allows quick response when opportunities arise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision to not fully fund staff = workforce is 1 position short • Chronic recruitment challenges/retention of staff (Commission and local CBOs) always tenuous
<p>Services/Markets</p> <p>(Quality, Quantity, Location, Community linkages, Collaboratives, Regional relationships, Expectations of stakeholders, Expectations of the public, Populations to be served, Visibility...)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission clearly recognizes needs of communities • Grant support has occurred in every community, particularly with FRCs as a major strategy; broad reach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited infrastructure (e.g., lack of enough CBOs) in the county for carrying out Commission mission • Inadequacies in physical infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing seems right for establishing 1-stop child advocacy center • Potential for regionalization (e.g., Governor’s Task Force for Central Valley); that could increase partnering across county boundaries • Increasing birth rate = more opportunities for 0-5 target group • People more open to receiving services; use this to strengthen anti-stigma type campaigns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased regulations and unfunded mandates often result in administrative burden outweighing benefit of having the money to implement the services/ programs
<p>Fiscal Resources</p> <p>(Cost, Efficiency, Sustainability, Fundraising, Leveraging, Funder requirements, Changing gov’t priorities, Return on investment...)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Panic” reaction to recent financial projections viewed as positive; led to increased understanding of fiscal picture and implications, and motivated Commission to begin looking for opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past inability to do fiscal projections • Declining revenues = living on borrowed time • Haven’t leveraged to the extent possible with existing fund sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Braiding of funding • Partnering to create a foundation with an entity with related mission • Governor’s focus on health care = potential support for Child Health Initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of adequate money through single funding source • State political will to backfill funding that was lost