

Prevention Redesign Initiative: Cohort Meeting #6 Notes
Date: May 5, 2011
Next Meeting Date: June 2, 2011

ATTENDEES

Attendee	Agency	Attendee	Agency	Attendee	Agency
Michael Langer	DBHR	Astri Zydack	ESD 101	Edie Borgman	Adams County
Steve Smothers	DBHR	Susan Martin	ESD 105	Teresa Bell	Benton/Franklin Counties
Aaron Starks	DBHR	Cathy Kelley	ESD 105	Renee Hunter	Chelan/Douglas Counties
Julia Greeson	DBHR	Deb Drandoff	ESD 112	DeDe Sieler	Clark County
Stephanie Atherton	DBHR	Rebecca Minor	ESD 112	Kelly Matlock	Jefferson County
Ivón Urquilla	DBHR	Sandy Mathison	ESD 112	Sharon Toquinto	King County
Julie Bartlett	DBHR	Barb Laurenzo	ESD 112	Carol Jernigan	King County
Linda Becker	DBHR	Erin Riffe	ESD 113	Jackie Berganio	King County
Scott Waller	DBHR	Kristin Schude	ESD 114	Katie Lindstrom	Pacific County
Dixie Grunenfelder	OSPI	Dan Bissonnette	ESD 121	Renee Tinder	Pierce County
Barbara Fuller	JBS Consultant	Diane Shepherd	ESD 123	Hae-Man Song	Pierce County
Paul Dziedzic	JBS Consultant	Mike Lynch	N Central ESD (171)	Nancy Fiander	White Swan Community Coalition
		Maureen Stanton	ESD 189	Joe Neigel	Snohomish County
				Joe Avalos	Thurston/Mason Counties
				Mehgan Sullivan	Together! (Thurston)
				Jim Cooper	Together! (Thurston)
				Tim Stampfli	Together! (Thurston)
				Rob Poletti	Okanogan Behavioral Health Center
				Joe Fuller	Whatcom County
Absent:		Absent:		Absent:	
Deb Schnellman	DBHR	Ann Allen	ESD 105	Joel Chavez	Benton/Franklin Counties
Sarah Mariani	DBHR (present by phone)	Mike Hickman	ESD 113	Shelli Young	Snohomish County
		Ann Burns	ESD 114		

Topics	Questions/Discussion/Decisions
<p>Evaluation presentation Linda Becker</p>	<p>Reviewed the updated statewide and local PRI logic model and discussed the template that will be used.</p> <p>Overview: a logic model provides a context to explain the links between problems and solutions. Logic models must contain all the needed relevant information and show clear connections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading left to right the PRI statewide and local logic model provides a framework for planning – reading right to left this logic model describes a theory of change. • For the project’s logic models we will focus on underage drinking related problems – can add other problems (e.g., methamphetamine) that are relevant for your community for use outside of the project parameters. <p>Questions:</p> <p>Where is the problem statement in this logic model? Both the consequences and consumption columns describe the problem: we would call both the problem; they are intertwined and circular. Prevention staff are usually the most focused on the consumption column; the community is often most focused on consequences (alcohol-involved crashes, for instance). We will focus on consumption; we don’t expect consequences to change over the short-term – although it would be great.</p> <p>How do you show that strategies address multiple problems?</p> <p>If you do list all the strategy impacts on one logic model, it can be hard to follow. However, if a strategy is going to address multiple intervening variables, showing all the connections will emphasize that it is a very important strategy – persuasive.</p> <p>Related suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could choose to create different versions of the logic model to share with different audiences, based on what the group will best respond to. For a community audience one could build multi-layers in a PowerPoint to show all the relationships between intervening variables and a strategy. • Could create a logic model that lists all the strategies beneath the logic model and then code them within the logic model to avoid all the arrows. <p>Action Item /Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DBHR will post on the Athena Forum versions of logic models that members of the Learning Community have found helpful. <p>Can we combine the coalition survey with the DFC coalition survey and/or Community Mobilization Scorecard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DFC survey doesn’t feed back information to the community, so many coalitions don’t find it useful. Although some communities really like the Scorecard, others don’t. • Linda will cross walk the coalition surveys that are sent to her with the Coalition Survey that is posted on the Athena Forum which we plan to use. She will see if there are questions that can be added to revise the current survey to be responsive to the impact on coalitions of multiple surveys. <p>Action Item</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send coalition surveys to Linda to cross walk – e.g., the King County survey developed by Laura Edwards. SPF-

	SIG coalition survey was also mentioned as a good one – it is already the basis of the posted coalition survey.
<p>Sustainability Workgroup progress report Ivon Urquilla and Michael Langer</p>	<p>Members: Cathy Kelley, Barb Lorezno, Dixie Grunenfelder, De De Sieler, Katie Lindstrom, Joe Niegel, Michael Langer, and Ivon Urquilla Group has met once: next meeting end of May. Will provide progress report and recommendations at July meeting. The workgroup brainstormed ideas for sustainability plan process and content: (no decisions have been made). Ideas included the following. Plan will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be due at the end of the first year and will then be reviewed by DBHR prevention system manager; • tie to the annual resource assessment; • contain examples of sustainability strategies; • target fundraising goals for each year; • include consideration of applying for 501(c) 3 status; • identify potential grant applications; • identify PRI match. <p>Questions: Can sustainability plan be turned in early? Yes, that will be up to each coalition based on their individual progress – the due date was established as the end of the first year to be sensitive to the needs of new coalitions. Match: how will this be calculated? Will in-kind match be allowed? What will be the consequence for not coming up with match? Will we turn in match to the state? This has been an initial exploration of the idea of match. We have discussed the idea of a combination of cash and in-kind match that gradually increases as a possibility. The P/I program does require match. Match would not be returned to the state; it would be reinvested in the coalition and their strategies and activities.</p> <p>Michael's overview of sustainability:The real key to sustainability is being able to grow services from one year to the next – it's important to be able to show how you plan to do that, based on specific community needs– for instance, increasing the number of P/Is or providing more program curricula. It's about the <u>increased</u> ability in the community to get the work done and get good outcomes.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Prevention funding is an investment in the community. 2) Sustainability plans identify how you will continue to invest in the community and fund needs when current funding (in this case PRI funding) goes away. 3) Sustainability plans show how you are going to grow – not just financially, but by bringing more people into the coalitions, building capacity of leadership and programs, increasing services, institutionalizing systems change. 4) Great idea to start focusing on sustainability at the beginning of project instead of waiting until the end, results in continual expansion, rather than last minute efforts.

**Behavioral Health Expansion
SPE grant and SAPT block grant
changes information sharing**
Michael Langer

- Information sharing to keep PRI communities in the loop and communicate potential system changes as transparently as possible.
 - **DBHR is writing for the State Prevention Enhancement grant due June 3;** these are not service dollars. 80 awards will be granted. Funding is for Single State Agencies for Treatment and Prevention (SSA =DBHR) to develop capacity now that will help support communities in the future . Awards will be granted between October 2011 and spring 2012. If grant is awarded we will have three months to create a capacity plan, and then 11 months to create a five year strategic plan.
 - **Requirements if funded include:** state agencies and stakeholders form policy consortium group, epidemiology workgroup, training and technical assistance system to support providers, evidence-based programs workgroup and process (we will borrow from the Oregon system), data-driven funding allocations focused on high need communities (as we have done in identifying potential PRI communities), expanding resources for high need communities, broader support for high need communities, community process and outcome measures, ensuring the necessary cultural competency to effectively support high need communities.
 - **Goals of grant project:** 1) building emotional health, 2) preventing underage drinking and adult problem drinking, 3) preventing suicide, 4) credentialing of prevention professionals, 5) licensing of prevention contractors, 6) standards of care and rates setting.
 - **SAMHSA proposing to change SAPT block grant** – they would like provider and stakeholder comments which are due by June 6 – find the proposal on the Federal Register under SAPT block grant.
 - DBHR is providing feedback to national partner associations on block grant changes.
 - Block grant is moving towards recovery, support, and systems of care and mental health promotion.
 - Goals include building capacity and addressing gaps for both prevention and mental health promotion, and to guide development of a 5 year strategic plan.
 - Funding that comes through to support PRI may require feedback and collaboration from PRI communities.
- Action Item:** Invite representative of Department of Early Learning to join policy consortium – organization hasn't been included in similar high level groups in the past, have a vital role to play.

<p>Schedule of PRI meetings for the next year Steve Smothers</p>	<p>As previously discussed, Cohort 2 meetings will be combined with Cohort 1 meetings after initial separate orientation meetings – date the group will be combined has not been finalized.</p> <p>June 2, 2011: 9 – 12 K-20 July 7, 2011: 9 – 12 K-20 August 4, 2011: 10 – 2 in person, western WA location TBA September 1, 2011: 9-12 K-20 October 27, 2011: in person , Yakima, time TBA – date tentative based on Prevention Summit schedule November, 2011 – no meeting December, 2011 – no meeting January 5, 2012: 9 – 12 K-20 February 2, 2012: 9 – 12 K-20 March 1, 2012: 9 – 12 K-20 April 5, 2012: 9 – 12 K-20 May 3, 2012: in person, eastern WA location TBA June 7, 2012: 9 – 12 K-20</p>
<p>Update on Cohort 2 Recruitment Michael Langer</p>	<p>The following counties submitted applications for Cohort 2 for a total of 18 communities: 1) Whitman, 2)Lincoln,3) Spokane,4) Grant,5) Douglas 6) Asotin, 7) Columbia, 8) Kittitas,9) Clallam, 10) Cowlitz,11) Kitsap, 12) Skamania, 13)Island (Yakima will also be adding their second cohort community after receiving an extension to do so in the second year of the project)</p>
<p>Next Steps – Actions</p>	
<p>Next meeting date: June 2, 2011 9 – 12 K-20</p>	
<p>Action Item /Decision:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DBHR will post other logic models on the Athena Forum that may be more helpful to share with community than the model we will use for PRI – up to coalitions whether they develop other formats to share with different audiences. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send coalition surveys to Linda to cross walk – e.g., the King County survey developed by Laura Edwards. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DBHR will Invite representative of <u>Department of Early Learning</u> to join policy consortion when it is developed. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anouncement: King County is hosting a Spanish Language Strengthening Families Program (SFP) 10-14 Facilitator training, see the WSU website for details. 	

Comment [jkb1]: Why is this in here... isn't it just a comment about who is going to be on the Policy Consortium along with a lot of other people?