

**Prevention Redesign Initiative:** Cohort Meeting #3 Notes  
**Date:** January 6, 2011  
**Next Meeting Date:** February 3, 2011

### ATTENDEES

Attendee	Agency	Attendee	Agency	Attendee	Agency
Michael Langer	DBHR	Sharon Toquinto	King County	Alice Huber	DBHR
Steve Smothers	DBHR	Renee Tinder	Pierce County	Ivón Urquilla	DBHR
Aaron Starks	DBHR	Carol Jernigan	King County	Julie Bartlett	DBHR
Linda Becker	DBHR	Dan Bissonnette	Puget Sound ESD	Tina Burrell	DBHR
Heidi Dodd	DBHR	Hae Man Song	Pierce County	Julia Greeson	DBHR
Deb Schnellman	DBHR	Renee Hunter	Chelan County	Stephanie Atherton	DBHR
Scott Waller	DBHR	Edie Borgman	Adams County	Dixie Grunenfelder	OSPI
Joe Neigel	Snohomish County	Kate Brueske	Adams County	Angela Zahas	Clark County
Collin Williams	Thurston County	Joel Chavez	Franklin County	Susan Martin	ESD 105
Michael Hickman	ESD 113	Diane Shepherd	ESD 123	Ann Allen	ESD 105
Megan Azzano	Okanogan County	Deb Dandroff	ESD 112	Sandy Mathison	ESD 112
Lee Morrison	ESD 171	Karen Obermeier	ESD 114	Paul Dziedzic	Consultant
Mike Finch	ESD 171	Ann Burns	ESD 114	Barbara Fuller	JBS
Shelli Young	Snohomish County	DeDe Sieler	Clark County	Jennifer Mackillop	Puget Sound ESD
Maurene Stanton	ESD 189	Joe Fuller	Whatcom County	Sarah Mariani	DBHR
Absent	Pacific County				

Topics/Decisions	Responses/Discussion
<b>DBHR Question for Cohort 1:</b>  What is one positive outcome in your partnerships, and what are any challenges?	<b>ESD 101</b> does not yet have a community coordinator. No questions.  <b>Yakima /105:</b> We have had lots of support from partners, superintendents – they find the maps interesting. Challenge: many needy communities to choose from.  <b>Question:</b> Is there a timetable for the other requirements? <b>DBHR:</b> Not yet but should be part of community planning.  <b>Question:</b> Will we have a tool for coalition development?
<b>DBHR decision on community</b>	<b>DBHR:</b> We will put together guidelines, hopefully by the Feb meeting.

**coalitions:** each coalition will be at a different level of development. We want people on board by July 1, 2011 at the latest.

We want to meet communities where they are and go from there.

We understand there is development and evolution that will take place in communities where services have not been delivered before.

**Question:** Is there a start date for localizing the statewide reducing underage drinking campaign?

**DBHR:** No.

**Vancouver:** Positive is that we have two sites who are excited about participating (two middle schools). Both school folks are on board. Good community members who want to participate. Meeting set with advisory board. One school already has a coalition and only needs a coordinator. We have decided to have two community coordinators. Challenge: money is in contract until June 30 so we can do prework and presentations, but coalition will need to start in July.

**Thurston Co:** Our working relationship with 113 is good. We have selected two communities and are looking at process for approaching them and building coalitions. We are looking at shifting allocations/resources from current communities. We had to draw a firm line, which was a challenge. From ESD perspective we are excited to support the chosen communities.

**Question 1:** What is the expectation of the level of direct service from the community coordinator?

**DBHR:** With a half time person they will be challenged to organize and staff the coalition, but if they are trained in a particular program they may be able to provide direct services. Coordinators may be better equipped to do some environmental work. Coordinators are expected to do the PBPS reporting if the coalition can't.

**Question:** Can we have one coalition for two communities who are in close proximity?

**DBHR:** To date we have said no because each community has their own culture and data. We need community ownership. It's ok to have one person who staffs both coalitions.

**Pierce County:** Challenge in Pierce Co process- RFQ was finalized 12/17- communities with fewer risks had a much more responsive and well written submission. Higher risk communities submitted poor applications.

**King County:** We are working together to compile all data sets for school districts and community regions. A positive is that we have lots of good data, but this is also a challenge to compile in a way that shows us what we need to see.

**ESD 123:** We've got a group of passionate people ready to move forward. Adams county coalition has been together a long time and are positioned to do this work. In Pasco we have a new coalition of people who have wanted to do this for a long time. Challenge is time, budget, staffing. Pasco is needy and isolated within itself. Teresa Bell is the community coordinator. We need to get different sectors involved in the community for the coalition.

**Question/Comment:** Concerned that this project is as ambitious as as the Healthy Communities Process, with less resources. Can we revisit having a project coordinator? We don't think this is achievable as presented (the task list). Suggest the year one tasks is presented as a menu of options for communities to select from. Survey monkey might be helpful to get feedback from communities on the list of tasks. We would like a more flexible process.

**DBHR:** You will have a project manager assigned to your site from DBHR. In March that manager will sit down with you to assess where you are, to determine how far you can get in your first year. Allowable time frame: DBHR does not have timeframes on the task sheet. We want to give flexibility in order to do the redesign well, but have seen communities languish for years in the planning process. We don't want that to happen. We are looking for communities to finish their planning in less than a year.

**ESD 171:** We are working with Chelan and Okanogan Counties and don't have too many challenges. We have long standing coalitions. We have a rich data set. Only challenge is mechanics of making this happen. We have selected Wenatchee-it used to have a SPF SIG coalition. Together united that coalition with the Together coalition, and they have been well trained. Challenge is reaching out to all the sectors, funding because we have already committed to other communities until June. In Okanogan, we are working with the Strong Coalition who is very experienced and focused. Our most difficult task will be announcing that we are working in one community and not others. No questions.

**Question: What are plans for putting this task document in contract?**

**DBHR:** We created this document in response questions about what our expectations are. We will take today's feedback and get back to folks. What language gets into the contract will not be decided today. The contracts must written with performance-based deliverables and payment.

**Question: Will there be one or two contracts for counties?**

**DBHR:** Some counties are in the middle, as they may have some resources to do other work in the county, aside from the selected communities. There may be PRI vs non PRI services. When more resources become available from feds, these may come with additional expectations from the feds.

**ESD 112:** We are fairly certain the site selected will be successful but we want to be sensitive to the fact that the SD has asked that the right people be on the coalition. We don't want to throw it together quickly.

**DBHR Consultant:** If the approach taken was that in six months there has to be commitments and signups or you would not work with that community, would that help or hurt? ESD 112 said that would be fine.

**DBHR:** You have tremendous school support but I'm not hearing that you have much community support. Is the school asking that they be the ones to select community members?

**ESD 112:** The SD already has a very impressive coalition with good community support. We want them to simply understand this process before agreeing to be part of it.

**DBHR:** If you know Washougal is organized, and you need a little more time for getting signatures, we can talk about that, but we don't want to distract other counties from getting the signatures in.

**Snohomish Co:** Neighborhood associations were helpful in finding a good variety of community members for

coalitions. We listened to them after asking questions that are on the PRI forms.

**ESD 189:** Positives are similar to what has already been mentioned about data. Whatcom Co paid for an oversampling of ACE data so we will have this to consider. One- tenth of one-percent funding will help us with prevention services. Good partnership with the ESD. Timeline is a challenge in looking at all the data. Hope to have two sites finalized today. Starting two new coalitions in the most needy communities is challenging. Community partners and ESD have been very helpful.

**Question:** Best practices are at 74%. Do environmental strategies get counted into the 50-75% of best practices? There are very few environmental strategies that are a best practice on the WestCapt website.

**DBHR:** We want folks to move forward with direct services and environmental approaches - we will talk this through more. We want all programs to be as evidenced-based as possible.

**Question:** We have one coalition serving two sites right now. We have DFC grants in Whatcom Co that are servicing 4 sites in 7 towns. It does not make sense for us to fragment our coalitions, but to have them collaborate – right now coalition members serve the entire county. Even if we had two coalitions, the same people will show up at meetings (such as LCB officer). Can we have one coalition for two sites?

**DBHR:** If the plans call for the same services in two sites, and if there are ways of leveraging resources to take advantage of similar trainings , that makes sense. In some unincorporated areas, you may have law enforcement that serve two areas so they could be on two coalitions. In general we need separate sectors for each town.

**Question:** Do our coalitions have the ability to tailor state strategies?

**DBHR:** Yes. We want things localized in a way that meets your own objectives and plans and community culture.

**Question:** Will there be help with evaluation for environmental strategies?

**DBHR:** We are all making this shift with available resources. To the degree you think an environmental strategy will make a change in your community, talk to your project mgr and we will support you to the degree we are able to.

**Question:** What if a coalition chooses not to adopt a state campaign?

**DBHR:** We will look at this on a case by case basis, based on the validity of the message, and not that the coalition does not want to do the work.

**ESD 114:** Challenge is focusing on such a small population with high needs. We have strong relationships with community partners and a growing momentum in prevention work. We may be making decision today on community selection.

**Question:** We could use TA for training in Jefferson Co since they are so small. How do we make our existing county-wide coalition work with the selected small community? Not sure if we should have a subcommittee for the selected community.

**ESD 112:** Process went smoothly and there is already a drug free coalition and coordinator in place. Pacific County has turned in their application to DBHR.

**Questions:** We don't think tasks are overwhelming and like the way it is outlined. The July 1 start date is the soonest for us due to money tied up until then. For the Selection Cover Sheet which is due end of January, we are fairly certain we will have school signatures, but for coalition members, their commitment will need to come after the training so they know what they are committing to. This is a delicate walk for some community members who do not know what they are getting into. The form feels like a forced process. Important for us to have concrete expectations that don't change throughout the year.

More important to us than signing a form is making sure the coalition is equipped to provide a quality product.

**DBHR:** We want to ensure that 8 out of 12 sectors have committed – we understand some sectors may pull out as they learn more about what is expected of them to support the work. We do need to know the support from the community so we know what the level of investment is. Even if you simply show them the document of tasks and ask if they can support it, that would be helpful.

**ESD 121:** Our readiness of coalitions will be different – we have several communities we are working with. We have a coalition that has not focused on drug prevention. Our hope for evaluation is that components are built into every part of the project. Specifically, how it will combine PBPS with RMC designs. Information Dissemination: The process is important, but our communities will need to learn what they are – the chain of communication. We want to recognize the community coalitions are often grassroots and there are a combination of people involved. Some are volunteers so we hope the project strongly supports the coalitions while asking coalitions to respond to our requests. We at the local level need to pay attention to how we are setting up trainings – when people are available and so they don't have to travel far.

**DBHR:** The communications process will need to be sorted out soon – it may be different for each community, but we suggest a once a month meeting with all partners.

**King Co:** We advocate for getting all evaluation components as soon as possible. We hope there is a focus on cultural competency throughout the process.

**Question:** Can we get lead time to plan for visits from DBHR managers? Our meetings are scheduled out far in advance. The SPF SIG coalition member surveys are very good. Our coalitions do not normally meet in summer – after June they don't meet again until end of Aug or early Sept. Will there be a change to admin funding guidelines so that we can get some admin costs? This is a hardship. For our application, does that come from the county or ESD?

**DBHR:** The application comes from the counties to Steve Smothers. Admin: there is none for prevention dollars but there may be a way to develop the contract to get to what we need without the budget details about admin – with performance contracts it may be more focused on paying x for x product. There will not be additional money for admin but you may be able to have flexibility in budget detail.

**Question:** When will Cohort 2 start?

	<p>DBHR: Formally we do not expect it to start until July 1, 2012. If there are agreements with counties/ESDs to start sooner, we can talk about that. HYS data will come out in March/April so that might help.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> What is the process for Cohort 2?  <b>DBHR:</b> We will put out a call in late summer or fall to those who are interested in starting in July 2012.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> Expectations for FTE for P/I?  <b>DBHR:</b> 1.0 FTE for every site, unless the school size is very small.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> Next year when we bring on another county, will more PRI funds be coming? If I have 6 communities next year, do I get more funds?  <b>DBHR:</b> The current schools will not get less funding if you add more communities. Shifting of funds across ESDs will need to happen in order to eventually cover all counties across the state.</p>
Getting Started: What does DBHR and OSPI expect will happen in the selected sites?	Refer to chart of tasks for Cohort 1 in year one. This list was developed from past learnings about program development and implementation. DBHR will need to meet with coordinators to gain baseline data about communities. This will begin in March.
Planning	Existing plans may need to updated. DBHR can help with a framework
Implementation	To have the best opportunity for success, DBHR has several expectations. Actively participate with learning community and share successes and challenges. We expect you to localize statewide media campaigns. DBHR needs to have a good understanding of how coalition development, evaluation and reporting are working. County Coordinators will report into PBPS - School Coordinators will report into the OSPI system.

Next Steps - Actions	Assignee	Due Date	Status
Applications due - we have not received any requests for extentions.		Jan 18 2011	
Learning Community Mtg at Div. of Child Support. This is an in person meeting in Olympia, with videoconference available. Format and content is important, not just where we meet. Have counties present the agenda/info, instead of responding to questions from DBHR. We should have our communities chosen by then.		Feb 3 2011	This will be a K-20 meeting.
Establish a mtg date with DBHR prevention manager to talk about baseline data.		March 2011	
Develop a list of DBHR managers who will be assigned to each county.		TBD	

