

## PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion

February 3, 2011

### Notes

---

## Overview

### Discussion:

According to the survey results there are four combinations of people identified to need/want training depending on the topic:

- Group 1 - ESD, County and Coordinators
- Group 2 - Coordinators and Coalition members
- Group 3 - Everyone
- Group 4 - Just Coordinators

We want to know: "What are your preferences for the type of assistance and the delivery methods used for training depending on the intended audience?"

### Process:

Each location discussed the questions and recorded their responses. Notes below are the direct comments recorded and submitted to DBHR. Each location focused on two primary groups first and then as time allowed responded to the other two remaining groups. Location and Group Assignments are noted below.

### Audience Group assignments:

#### Group 1 and Group 2

- 101 – Spokane
- 105 – Yakima
- 112 – Vancouver
- 113 – Olympia
- 114 – Bremerton

#### Group 3 and Group 4

- 121 – Seattle
- 123 – Kennewick
- 171 – Wenatchee
- 189 – Anacortes
- On Phone – Okanogan, Port Townsend

### Summary of themes:

#### Audience Group #1 - ESD, County and Coordinators:

Formal training was most consistently the preferred delivery method and venue/medium was dependant on the topics and content of training. It was also important to take into consideration various levels of knowledge and experience.

Preferred venue and/or medium:

- Online/webinar - 6/6
- In person - 5/6

#### Audience Group #2 - Coordinators and Coalition members:

Formal training conducted at local level was most consistently the preferred delivery method and venue/medium was dependant on the topics and content of training. It was also important to take into consideration various levels of knowledge and experience. One group suggested that this could be delivered via Training of Trainers to ESD/County/Coordinators then they deliver to coalition members.

Preferred venue and/or medium:

- Online/webinar - 5/7
- In person (locally) - 7/7

#### Audience Group #3 – Everyone:

Again formal training conducted at regional/ local level was most consistently the preferred delivery method.

Preferred venue and/or medium:

- Online/webinar - 3/6
- In person – 5/6

#### Audience Group #4 - Just Coordinators:

Formal training conducted at state or regional level was most consistently the preferred delivery method.

Preferred venue and/or medium:

- Online/webinar – 7/8
- In person – 5/8
- Downloadable presentations – 3/8

#### Overall Ideas and Suggestions:

- Create 101, 201, etc levels and have established prerequisites in order to provide the optimal level of training for individuals based on their current knowledge and experience level.
- Connect with Drug Free Communities network.
- Use mentoring between Cohort 1 participants.

**Audience:** Group 1 - ESDs, Counties and Coordinators

**“What are your preferences for the type of assistance and the delivery methods used for training depending on the intended audience?”**

---

*Keeping in mind your local coalition(s) ...*

**1. When just ESDs, counties and coordinators need training, what would be the best way to deliver...**

- Formal Training (i.e. presentation to group, PowerPoint, curriculum, learning objectives clearly stated)
- Technical Assistance (i.e. one on one or one on small group; troubleshooting a specific issue to resolve that concern)

**Chelan:**

- Regional is ok, depends on topic

**Clark:**

- Formal training – select a curriculum or model and train specifically to that curriculum or model; don’t reinvent the wheel
- TA – available through technology (phone, email, conference call) vs in person 1:1

**ESD 101:**

- Delivery will depend on training topic. For instance media campaigns may require formal training followed by site specific TA. Data/assessment issues may be best handled by TA

**ESD 105:**

- Must sort training by level of expertise, beginners to advanced.
- Trouble shooting available as needed.

**ESD 123:**

- What training issue is

**ESD 189:**

- We need research and evaluation T/A.

**Jefferson County and ESD 114:**

- Formal Training - It depends on the type of training. Some training information can more effectively be communicated through face-to-face methods and some can

## PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion

February 3, 2011

### Notes

---

effectively be done through webinars, downloadable power point, etc. If the information is straight forward educational information, technological formats are fine. If the training deals with concepts that are more effectively processed through a discussion format, having a face-to-face training would be the most beneficial. This would also allow for similar groups (i.e. rural counties, etc.) to share information and it would also allow informal mentoring to happen between less experienced and more experienced prevention professional to happen.

- Technical Assistance - Here, we are making the assumption that the “technical assistance” information that you are talking about has to do with the structure and the procedures for implementing the Cohort 1 plans. If that is the case, then we are assuming that the Cohort 1 Coordinator can be trained in the “Technical Assistance” information, and can then share that information with other Cohort 1 team members if it needs to be shared. Again, if this is the case, the training could be a 1-on-1, or a one-to-small-group format.

#### Okanogan and Pacific:

- Individual TA would be more beneficial.
- One training that everyone could attend then others offered as needed – flexibility to choose for needs of county.

#### 2. Based on your responses above, what venue and/or medium would be your top two preferences for that training to be provided:

- ☐ Online/webinar (w/ materials posted)
  - Clark
  - Chelan: K20
  - ESD 101
  - ESD 105: for formal trainings, webinars are good.
  - ESD 123: K20 w/ PowerPoints
  - Jefferson Co. and ESD 114
- ☐ Reading material to be used on your own
- ☐ In person trainer/TA (w/ materials posted)
  - Clark: face to face up front “front load training”
  - Chelan: K20
  - ESD 101
  - ESD 123: regionally (geographically)
  - Jefferson Co. and ESD 114
- ☐ Over the phone/conference calls (w/ materials posted)
  - ESD 105: Over the phone for trouble shooting
- ☐ Downloadable PowerPoint presentations to be used on your own
  - Jefferson Co. and ESD 114

## PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion

February 3, 2011

### Notes

---

#### **Comments:**

##### **ESD 101:**

- For broad audiences I am always in favor of group process mediums – allows for various perspectives to be shared and questions to be addressed. That said, given often present budget issues, it is nice to do this over K20 and not necessarily in person. Would depend on complexity of material and need for broader collaboration.

##### **Jefferson County and ESD 114:**

- Depends on training

**Audience:** Group 2 - Coordinators and Coalition members

**“What are your preferences for the type of assistance and the delivery methods used for training depending on the intended audience?”**

---

*Keeping in mind your local coalition(s)...*

**1. When Coordinators and Coalition members need training, what would be the best way to deliver...**

- Formal Training (i.e. presentation to group, PowerPoint, curriculum, learning objectives clearly stated)

**Clark:**

- Formal training is presentation to the group; if face to face is required it is more likely to be successful if its done locally (training should be focused on selected model)

**Chelan:**

- topic focused, bring someone to county

**ESD 105:**

- 1. Must have clear objectives with audience in mind
- DBHR power points that local ESD/County/Coordinators can use for delivery of info would be great.
- Must be at a level of common language. Avoid jargon.

**ESD 123:**

- Training issue and need
- How it is viewed and valued
- Level of training needs to be applicable(?) of coalition members

**Jefferson County and ESD 114:**

- Have the training in the county at a schedule coalition meeting time.

- Technical Assistance (i.e. one on one or one on small group; troubleshooting a specific issue to resolve that concern)

**Clark**

- TA – available through technology (phone, email, conference call) vs in person 1:1

**ESD 105:**

- Literacy level with coalition members and community members is key.

## PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion

February 3, 2011

### Notes

---

#### Jefferson County and ESD 114:

- TA available via phone, email, or in person would be great.
- We are making the assumption that the “technical assistance” information that you are talking about has to do with the structure and the procedures for implementing the Cohort 1 plans. If that is the case, then we are assuming that the Cohort 1 Coordinator can be trained in the “Technical Assistance” information, and can then share that information with other Cohort 1 team members if it needs to be shared. Again, if this is the case, the training could be a 1-on-1, or a one-to-small-group format.

#### – General comments:

##### ESD 101

- Again delivery depends on topic and also on the “age” of the coalition/working history. Some groups may need more in person formal training or in-depth TA. Groups that have worked together for longer periods of time may be able to have the coordinator and/or 1-2 coalition members trained who can bring information back to the rest of the coalition.

##### Okanogan and Pacific:

- Format “we want it in our community” for training
- “less travel involved the better”

## 2. Based on your responses above for each group, what venue and/or medium would be your top two preferences for that training to be provided:

#### ☐ Online/webinar (w/ materials posted)

- Clark
- Chelan: 2nd – K20
- ESD 101
- ESD 123: 1st
- Okanogan and Pacific: depending on topic

#### ☐ Reading material to be used on your own

- ESD 101

#### ☐ In person trainer/TA (w/ materials posted)

- Clark
- Chelan: 1st
- ESD 101
- ESD 105: 1st Choice In person is best as some of our areas don’t have internet connections, and many don’t have access to computers. In person works if the person is in “relationship” with the coalition members before delivering services/training.
- ESD 123: 2nd
- Jefferson County and ESD 114
- Okanogan and Pacific: in identified community

#### ☐ Over the phone/conference calls (w/ materials posted)

## PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion

February 3, 2011

### Notes

---

- ☐ Downloadable PowerPoint presentations to be used on your own

- ESD 101
- ESD 105: 2nd Choice - see notes above.

#### Comments:

##### ESD 101:

- Newer groups – in person (but at the site of the coalition – more intimate) or online webinar
- More established groups may be able to do on own w/ discussion as a coalition meeting or w/ coordinator going to a central meeting in state and bringing information back.

##### Okanogan and Pacific:

- Depends on topic



## PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion

February 3, 2011

### Notes

---

**Audience:** Group 3 - Everyone (ESDs, Counties, Coordinators and Coalition members)

**“What are your preferences for the type of assistance and the delivery methods used for training depending on the intended audience?”**

---

*Keeping in mind your local coalition(s)...*

**1. When everyone (ESDs, Counties, Coordinators and Coalition members) needs training, what would be the best way to deliver...**

- Formal Training (i.e. presentation to group, PowerPoint, curriculum, learning objectives clearly stated)

**Clark:**

- Formal training must tap into the existing DFC network (local)

**Chelan:**

- Presented to entire group in their county or regional training
- It depends on topics as far as what type of training (formal or tech ass)
- Regional looking at ESD boundaries

**ESD 123:**

- Formal training in community of PRI to reach largest capacity

**ESD 189:**

- Formal training would be optimal for this group and preferable in the coalition site for maximum participation.

**Jefferson County and ESD 114:**

- Formal Training (i.e. presentation to group, PowerPoint, curriculum, learning objectives clearly stated) We think at a once-a-year training that is face-to-face would help everyone stay abreast of current information, latest prevention strategies, and would allow for idea-sharing and mentorships with more experience professional prevention professionals.

**Okanogan and Pacific:**

- conference call or K20
- Webinar using go to meetings

- Technical Assistance (i.e. one on one or one on small group; troubleshooting a specific issue to resolve that concern)

**Okanogan and Pacific:**

- Same as #1 and 2

## PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion

February 3, 2011

### Notes

---

#### Jefferson County and ESD 114:

- If this is CRITICAL technical assistance that ALL participants (ESDs, Counties, Coordinators, and Coalition members) need, we believe a face-to-face is the most effective.

#### 2. Based on your responses above for each group, what venue and/or medium would be your top two preferences for that training to be provided:

- ☐ Online/webinar (w/ materials posted)
  - Clark
  - Chelan : 2nd K20
  - ESD 123: and K20 depends on training needs
- ☐ Reading material to be used on your own
- ☐ In person trainer/TA (w/ materials posted)
  - Clark
  - Chelan: brought to each county
  - ESD 123
  - ESD 189: 1st
  - Jefferson County and ESD 114
- ☐ Over the phone/conference calls (w/ materials posted)
  - Okanogan and Pacific
- ☐ Downloadable PowerPoint presentations to be used on your own
  - ESD 189: 2nd

#### Comments:

##### Chelan

- Environmental training face to face or K20
- Media training – TA K20
- Community organizing framework face to face

**Audience:** Group 4 – Just Coordinators

**“What are your preferences for the type of assistance and the delivery methods used for training depending on the intended audience?”**

---

*Keeping in mind your local coalition(s)...*

**1. When just Coordinators need training, what would be the best way to deliver...**

- Formal Training (i.e. presentation to group, PowerPoint, curriculum, learning objectives clearly stated)

**Clark**

- must be tap into the existing DFC; coordinators need to connect w/ Each other.

**Chelan**

- Coalition development – regional
- Bring all coordinators together at one site for training needs. Example: PBPS reporting training. This could be regional or statewide.

**ESD 123**

- Depend on training needs

**ESD 189**

- Currently, T/A is provided from the Prevention System Manager, so formal training will probably be the priority. That being said, some topics may only require T/A and our PSM can point the coordinator to a specialist in the topic.

**Jefferson County and ESD 114**

- Again, this depends on what typed of information it is. Some training information can more effectively be communicated through face-to-face methods and some can effectively be done through webinars, downloadable power point, etc. If the information is straight forward educational information, technological formats are fine. If the training deals with concepts that are more effectively processed through a discussion format, having a face-to-face training would be the most beneficial. This would also allow for similar groups (i.e rural counties, etc.) to share information and it would also allow informal mentoring to happen between less experience and more experienced prevention professional to happen.

**Okanogan and Pacific**

- Written guidelines so they can be referenced later

## PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion

February 3, 2011

### Notes

---

- Technical Assistance (i.e. one on one or one on small group; troubleshooting a specific issue to resolve that concern)

#### Clark:

- same as 1-3

#### Chelan:

- assessment – one on one small group
- Depends on what the topic is
- Media – K20 or face to face

## 2. Based on your responses above for each group, what venue and/or medium would be your top two preferences for that training to be provided:

- ☐ Online/webinar (w/ materials posted)
  - Clark
  - Chelan: 2nd – K20
  - ESD 123: 1st
  - ESD 189: 1st
  - Jefferson County and ESD 114
  - King
  - Okanogan and Pacific
- ☐ Reading material to be used on your own
  - Okanogan and Pacific
- ☐ In person trainer/TA (w/ materials posted)
  - Clark: face to face up front “front load training”
  - Chelan: 1st
  - ESD 189: 2nd
  - Jefferson County and ESD 114
  - Pierce
- ☐ Over the phone/conference calls (w/ materials posted)
- ☐ Downloadable PowerPoint presentations to be used on your own
  - ESD 123: 2nd
  - Jefferson County and ESD 114
  - Okanogan and Pacific

## Comments:

### ESD 121

- King – Prefer webinar scheduled (not on own); join in when it’s happening
- In person training is hard to organize although important especially for complex topics
- Like download PowerPoint if not too involved

## **PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion**

**February 3, 2011**

### **Notes**

---

- Do not get around to reading materials so this is a low priority
- Pierce – would prefer in person training and follow up with phone call.
- What about different levels? i.e. Level 101, 201, 301 etc – if hiring new coordinator it would be different than existing coordinator. Could have prerequisites for levels.
- Since it's a new way of doing things everyone would benefit from training again at different levels.
- Announce trainings – make sure everyone has the baseline and individuals don't need to be trained in R & P again. Supports different levels and identify prerequisites such as SAPST and Art and Science of Community Organizing – allows people to by-pass “basic” training and go to need level.
- What training we get we need to pass it down to others in the communities.

#### **Jefferson County and ESD 114**

- Depends on type of training

#### **Okanogan and Pacific**

- More of the expectations in a guide the better

## **PRI Clarity and Training Survey Discussion**

**February 3, 2011**

### **Notes**

---

#### **Overall General Comments:**

##### **ESD 121**

- Linda – “how do you connect w/ principals and schools – How about identifying mentors?
- Discussion - Have a directory of resource list of who has expertise is okay. Relationships are more important and have them at training to highlight who has specific expertise. Athena Forum another way to connect.
- Dan gave feedback. – (Began with who/what are coordinators) and where do schools fall in this process. “no PI speaks for any principal”.

##### **ESD 189:**

- These would be the crucial trainings that should be offered first: Clarity on the “list of expectations on the PRI Year One Tasks” (which tasks are set in concrete and what has flexibility based upon coalition action plan or coalition readiness?)

##### **Okanogan and Pacific**

- Where is school in groups?