

**Vermont Department of Health Strategic Prevention
Framework Advisory Council Meeting
February 8, 2007
Best Western Hotel, Waterbury
9:00 am-12:30 pm**

Objectives

- ❖ To provide updates on planning processes related to the Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant
- ❖ To gather input and recommendations to inform the final draft of the plan

Agenda

Welcome- Overview of Process

Lori Tatsapaugh Uerz, Strategic Prevention Framework Coordinator
JoEllen Tarallo-Falk, Center for Health and Learning, Facilitator

Strategic Prevention Framework Key Learning's and Vision

Barbara Cimaglio, Deputy Commissioner, Division of Alcohol & Drug Abuse Programs

Resource Allocation Strategy

Marcia LaPlante, Prevention Chief
Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs

Strategic Prevention Framework Plan

Lori

Grant Review Process

Lori

Wrap-up and Next Steps

Lori

Evaluation

Group

Strategic Prevention Framework Advisory Council Meeting
February 8, 2007

Present: Mark Floyd, Lisa Remick, Barbara Cimaglio, John Flannigan, Anne Dorwaldt, Mike Glod, Mike Reiderer, Judy Ashley- McLaughlin, Chris Finley, Sandra Dooley, Susan Kamp, John Searles, Jessica Rosato, Monica Weeber, Debbie Haskins, Jim Bellino, Betsy Ferries, Bruce Wilson, Cindy Hayford, Bess O'Brien, Rebecca Ryan, Abbey Axelrod, Michelle Salvador, Patty Baroudi, Corbett Sionainn, Theresa Gleason, Meika Zilberberg, Sarah Oudekerk, Marcia LaPlante, Kelly Hale Lamonda, Diane Smith, Theresa Lay-Sleeper, Mary Beth Vassar, Yvonne Zietlow, Linda Piasecki, Bob Flewelling, Carol Rose, Lori Uerz

Task #1: Supporting Capacity-Building at the Community Level

What is a reasonable timeframe for a low capacity community to build capacity?

Recommended Timeframe:

Group	Recommended timeframe	Reasons
1.	Flexible – up to 4 years	Community defines its own need using benchmarks Not every group will proceed the same through the process Depends on readiness
2.	Flexible – up to 3 years	1 year-some structure and political will 2 years 3 years-no structure and political will
3.	Flexible – up to 3 years	Some communities have never done this before and it may take a year to form a group Rural vs. urban have different challenges Momentum/readiness- political will, expectations and mission all vary
4.	1-2 years	Important to gain momentum while people are fired up We are an impatient society looking for results Difficult to bring together groups that haven't worked together-they may need education
5.	2 years	Quality of capacity building with the goal of sustainability front and center The "busy" people are who you need – scheduling- go where they are Training skills to be able to work with youth is time consuming

Questions:

Group 1

1. Can we let potential grantees define timeframe?
2. Focus should be on need to sustain capacity. This should be addressed in the RFP.
3. How do we help them keep up momentum/motivation?

Group 2

1. Is there a difference between geographic and cultural communities?

Group 3

1. Leadership – will there be a point person?
2. Who will be invited/targeted?
3. What's the incentive?

Group 4

1. Does each group need to have representatives (e.g., parents, teens, etc.) present from day one?

Group 5

No questions

Task #2: Implementation Grant Criteria

Input on key criteria related to the scoring of grants.

What percentage of the score out of 100 should be related to...

Group	Recommended %					
	1	1	2	3	4	5
Criteria						
High need	50	40	X	15	20	25
High capacity	30	40	X	70	40	50
Youth/18-25 yr olds engaged	*	20 **	Youth 40% Young adults 60%	15	40 ***	25

Note: Group 1 provided two scenarios

Group 1

Provided two scenarios:

* The goal is to engage 18-25 year olds, but not a priority -they should not be penalized because they do not have them already engaged. They should be rated on what the capacity- building plan is with this age range.

** Requirement:

- 1) Plan to engage
- 2) Already engaged

Answer yes to either, receive full points.

Group 2

These are Implementation Grants therefore you are not dealing with high need/low capacity, So focus on capacity among high capacity groups working with youth and young adults.

Group 3

- 1) What if you start out with a population of youth and they drop out?
- 2) What's the definition/criteria of engagement? Do you have to be at the meetings/ Can a youth do work at a school but not be part of the coalition? How do you measure "involved"? Can we think about other ways to engage kids?
It is probably unrealistic to get 16 y.o. "to the table."

Group 4

*** Define this criteria as: "Experience and/or plan to actively engage youth"

Group 5

How do you plan to increase and maintain youth/18-25 yo involvement?

If you have been successful in building capacity what assurance do they have they will be awarded an implementation grant?

[Editors note: If you look at this data in light of the recommendations on Task #3: Using Adults 18-25 yo as Resources it reinforces the recommendation to make engagement part of the plan and not a requirement at time of proposal writing.]

Task #3 Using Young Adults (18-25 yo) as Resources in Prevention Planning

What are your suggestions for how the grant process requires the engagement of 18-25 year olds? e.g., Should representation be required at time of proposal? Should grantees spend time relationship building first?

There was unilateral agreement that there should not be a requirement in capacity-building grants to have a certain number of 18-25 yo's involved during RFP preparation stage. All groups suggested this be a required end-goal for the plan.

Require engagement through the plan- allow time for relationship building in four steps:

1. Reaching out/building trustful relationships
2. Engaging in process –ask what they need, provide incentives (3)
3. Empowering them/taking them seriously and involving in decision-making. Let the target population own and design the implementation.
4. Providing training (e.g., on human development) and technical assistance

There is a need to differentiate between college and non-college audiences.

Build state infra-structure to foster involvement through:

- Court order and diversion programs
- Tax breaks for 18-25 yo's who are involved
- College system
- Parent-Child Centers
- High Schools working with seniors systemically around the state
- Identifying major social venues and social environments – go where they are

Ideas on how and who:

- Get diverse representation
- Set up interactions/mentoring
- Offer appropriate incentives – make it fun!

Task #4 Supporting Mentoring Among Communities

How do we fund implementation grants to support mentoring relationships?

Options suggested:

1. Communities can self-select a mentor grant as part of the capacity building grants(4)
 - a. Let grantees figure out who the mentors are. They may have relationships with one community/coordinator vs. another.
 - b. State helps those that don't have knowledge to make matches.
 - c. Use geographic criteria for awards.
 - d. Budget can include the cost to the mentoring agency (they should be paid).
2. Fund capacity-building development grants that create partnerships between high capacity and low capacity communities for the purpose of mentoring a specific community. (4)
3. Set up a separate, flexible pot of money for groups to apply for as mentors. (4)
Include a separate budget for mentoring (i.e., 10% of budget). Provide additional incentives for community with experience to mentor others.
4. Require previous grantees/high capacity coalitions to mentor in order to receive another grant award. (3)
5. Provide funding (salary) for professionals from established organizations to consult to others (e.g., experienced coalition directors or advisors already working with underage drinking population – VTLSP/SADD, START Officers/SAPs, etc.).

What are some useful mentoring activities that could develop capacity in communities?

- Create Director-Director mentor relationships (6)
 - a. Assist in developing local plans
 - b. One on one discussions with current coalition leaders and potential low capacity areas (individuals or groups)
- Phone and email consult
 - a. Conference calls on specific issues (6)

- Event sharing (5)
 - a. Mentees attend mentor events (trainings, community activities); facilitate if possible
 - b. Do workshop writing/improvisation circle groups and theatre games to get folks feeling and ready to talk about issues
 - c. Community forums- inviting low and high capacity areas
 - d. Participating in mentoring community's events, observing mentoring community's processes
- Common training experiences (6)
 - a. Attend trainings together - Mentor assists with information presented
 - b. Cross-trainings (mentor/mentee)
 - c. Get artists to come interact with mentor/mentees to talk about best practices and look at the plan
 - d. As part of the "learning communities" – high capacity grantees/communities can offer presentations
 - e. Training in best practices
 - f. Someone with appropriate knowledge and capacity could develop trainings and related materials addressing the effective engagement and utilization of 18-25 yo
- On-site observation and consult (4)
 - a. Visit each others groups and activities for observation
 - b. Site visits- sharing of expertise and materials
 - c. Site visit-half day meeting with coordinator, advisory board, participants
- Program replication (2)
 - a. Work with groups with specific successful programs
 - b. Sharing of programs that have been delivered
- Build statewide infra-structure
 - a. Develop a list of skills for each existing grantee to cross-fertilize across the state
 - b. Communication with successful communities about what worked and didn't work
 - c. Seek out 18-25 yo leader to represent and support different groups – we all know a special 18-25 yo that would rise to leadership
 - d. Have designated person to coordinate mentor relationships
 - e. Peer mentoring with those who have money and those who do not
 - f. Mentoring between capacity-building and implementation groups
 - g. Grantees should have access to other grantees successes and failures by website, publications, workshops

What are your ideas for how a mentoring relationship can be built into the structure of these grants?

- Get artists involved with advising and presenting best practices
- Provide resource list of people who are willing to help by mentoring
- Require grantee to have at least one representative from a low-capacity community
- Require partnerships between high and low capacity

Other suggestions made at meeting:

- Provide money for organizations, artists, professionals to give advice about best practices
- Provide a mapping requirement as part of the grant applications related to capacity-building
- Reference and include arts in communications, e.g., "Arts/Communications
- Provide criteria/benchmarks for capacity building
- Provide criteria for target group representations
- Provide training on human development to inform developmentally appropriate strategies for reaching target audiences