


**WV's Partnership to Promote Community Well-Being**  
Quarterly Meeting  
04-20-2007 ♦ WVPRC Offices, Dunbar  
Meeting Minutes



*Prepared by Michele Burnside of the WV Prevention Resource Center  
Approved At July 20th Partnership Meeting*

### **Attendance**

- **Partners:** Keith Adkins, Jean Ambrose, Jason Carlson, Don Chapman, Karen Eskew, Michelle Foster, Sue Hage, Dave Harris, Dale Humprheys, Mike Lacy, Steve Heasley, Helena Lee, Gig Robinson, Angela Saunders, Denise Smith, Brenda Thompson
- **PARTNERS ABSENT:** Joe Barker, Judy Crabtree, Lew Holloway (Sent Proxy), Gayle Manchin, Steve Mason, Bob Musick, Karen Salem, Judith Russell, Bill Woodrum
- **WVPRC Staff:** Jamie Albert, David Bailey, Jo Beyer, Zobeida Bonilla-Vega, Michele Burnside, Michele Bush, Wayne Coombs, Cathy Coontz, Melissa Crawford, Judy Hall, Angie Linger, Monica McFarland, Laura Sarver, Stephanie Southall, Anne Swedberg, Andy Whisman
- **Others:** Charlie Brown (Region 2 Liaison), Amanda Fisher (Proxy for Lew Holloway), Paula Flaherty (MU Eval Team), Debi Gillispie (Div of Juvenile Services), Neal Holtan (Central CAPT), Lois Manns (Region 4 Liaison), Karen McComas (MU Eval Team), April Miller (Region 3 Liaison); Linda Spatig (MU Eval Team), Tracy Wasinger (MU Eval Team), Latrisha Whitelatch (Region 1 Liaison); Gary Winter (Governor's Highway Safety Program), Megan Freeland

Partnership Chair Mike Lacy called for proxies. Amanda Fisher presented a proxy for Lew Holloway.

Lacy called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone.

The 1-19-2007 Partnership meeting minutes were reviewed. Jean Ambrose moved to approve the minutes. The motion was adopted.

HANDOUT: *Partnership 1-19-2007 Meeting Minutes*

**TO DO:**

- **MICHELE BURNSIDE:** Remove draft watermark from, add approved date to, and repost to Partnership website the 1-19-2007 meeting minutes. **COMPLETE**

Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

Michele Bush reviewed the contents of the meeting packets. In addition to the items referenced throughout this document, the packet included flyers for Mt. State Victim Assistance Symposium (July 18-20); WV Summit on Violence Against Women (Oct 1-3); and Share The Vision (Nov 14 & 15).

Laura Sarver provided SPF SIG sub-grant fiscal updates (please see handouts).

*HANDOUT: SPF SIG Fiscal Report: 4 Month Award (Oct 06-Feb 07); SPF SIG Fiscal Report 8 Month Award (Feb 06-Sept 06); FY 08 Grantee Information From DCJS; Implementation Grantee Spreadsheet from DCJS*

Linda Spatig, on behalf of the Evaluation Team from Marshall, provided an evaluation update.

*HANDOUTS: Notes from the Field (04-16-07); SPF SIG RLO-Phase 1 (01-22/23-07) Preliminary Analysis of Responses; RLO Presentation – What We’ve Learned So Far (Jan 07);*

Jason Carlson, Chair of the Policies & Procedures Workgroup, provided updates (please see updated Policies & Procedures WG 2-20-07 Meeting notes available at [www.prevnet.org](http://www.prevnet.org)) on P&P workgroup chair and purpose, Partnership membership, and Partnership orientation.

*HANDOUT: Policies & Procedures WG 2-20-07 Mtg Notes*

Jason moved that the Partnership recommend to the Governor the appointment of Laurel Kirksey as a community-at-large representative. Jean Ambrose moved that the recommendation be made pending approval from the state VISTA office. The motion as amended carried.

Jason moved that the Partnership accept the following process for Partnership Orientation.

- Following a Partnership motion to recommend to the Governor a new Partner, the Partnership shall also motion to **appoint a sponsor for the new Partner**. The sponsor should be whoever recommended the new Partner and/or whoever already has an established relationship with the new Partner.
- Michele Burnside will then provide the sponsor with an orientation packet containing the following items:
  - Welcome Letter from Chair that highlights Partnership website, PrevNet, WV SPF SIG Website, Prevention Training & Events Calendar, Meeting Dates
  - WV SPF SIG MOU
  - Partnership Executive Order
  - Partnership By-Laws
  - Partnership Membership List
  - Partnership WG List
  - Partnership Annual Report
  - SPF SIG Summary (WV SPF SIG Website Homepage) & Current Plan
- Before the next Partnership meeting, it will be the responsibility of the sponsor to contact the new Partner, provide the new Partner with the orientation packet, and provide any necessary additional information.

Sue motioned to amend the process so that Michele Burnside’s name is replaced with the word staff. The motion as amended carried.

Brenda Thompson moved to appoint Jean Ambrose as the new youth’s sponsor, pending youth appointment. The motion carried.

Gig Robinson moved to appoint himself as Gary Winter’s sponsor, pending Gary’s appointment. The motion carried.

Sue Hage moved to appoint herself as Dale Humphrey’s sponsor. The motion carried.

Angie Saunders, Chair of the Sub-Granting Work Group, reported she is pleased with the process and outcome of the SPF SIG sub-grants more so than any sub-grants she has worked with.

HANDOUTS: *Coordinated Planning and Sub-Granting Workgroup 1-31-2007 Meeting Notes*

Trisha Whitelatch, Regional Liaison from Region 1, stated that it is still unclear to her and folks in her region as to whether the process is truly competitive or collaborative. More specifically, what is the process from here on out? Will implementation grants be automatically renewed each year, or will the 12 current counties be competing against each other as well as the 10 continued planning counties next year? On behalf of the Sub-Granting WG, Angie Saunders provided some clarification: No, this is not really a competitive process. It is true, there were some scoring systems applied to assess critical portions of implementing the grant but the highest scores were not the only consideration. If it had been, there would have been no need for grant review. The [Partnership's Sub-Granting Workgroup] considered the score of plans (scored by the PRC staff to tell us if the plan was complete and ready for implementation), as well as the readiness score (supplied by the PRC through Community Development Specialists), the grant application scores (scored by the PRC), the data (supplied by Andy and demonstrating their need in various areas, which we compared to what they were asking to implement), and their oral presentations. We did not score the presentation and, obviously, there was no score given to the data. A true competitive process would have assigned a score to everything and the highest scores would have prevailed, as you are aware, that did not happen. It is true, if you look at the highest scoring counties (based on their applications, plans and readiness), most of them were funded, however, there were a few that were recommended for continued planning rather than implementation for various reasons. If the application did not address the needs demonstrated by their data or included in their plans, then those applications or portions of the applications were not recommended for funding; if the county did not seem to have a plan of implementation that made sense, those applications were not considered for funding; if the application did not meet the deadline, those applications were not funded and so on and so on. You can refer to the committee notes for particulars on each application, but the answer is -- no it is not a true competitive process and where scores were used, every possible precaution was taken to insure that each county was treated exactly the same. An example of this is the application: a group of professionals (PRC staff) scored the application, each person filled out a score sheet and the highest and lowest scores were thrown out, then the remaining sheets (three or more) were averaged. We recommended implementation funding for the majority (12) of the applicants and offered technical assistance (continued planning grants) to 10 counties which were struggling with their plans, I don't think you can ask for much more than that.

Steve Heasley moved that the Partnership will continue to support implementation projects making progress toward stated goals contingent upon available funding. The motion carried. Angie Saunders, on behalf of Mike Lacy who had to step out of the room, referred the statement to the Sub-Granting workgroup for communication to sub-grantees.

Sue Hage, Chair of the COSS WG, reported that the WG is reassessing its purpose.  
HANDOUT: *Coordination of Specialists and Services WG 3-9-2007 Meeting Notes*

Andy Whisman provided an update on the topic of student surveys. PRIDE will not be done by most local school systems in 2007. The DOE grant work is about a unified student survey. Rick Deem is the contact at the State Bd of Education for this grant. Mike Lacy referred the issue to the Epi WG.

Each of the 4 Regional Liaisons provided updates/reports. Summaries of their reports, submitted by the liaisons, are pasted below. Region 2's update included the distribution of a letter outlining recommendations from the Region.

Steve Heasley provided an overview of the Children and Family Funding Study.  
HANDOUT: *WV Funding Study – State & Federal Expenditures for Children & Family (PowerPoint Presentation Print Out)*

Wayne Coombs initiated a group discussion around the question: "How can we raise Partnership visibility?"

## Summary of Proposed Action Steps for Partner Members

- Clarify prevention, capacity, evidence-based, and prevention system messages (definitions).
- Facilitate legislative “study resolution.” UNDERWAY
- Inform relevant legislative committees.
- Create WV Partnership “tagline.”
- Create news release template for local CPPs.
- Encourage CPP to use tagline.
- Purchase wearable marketing items (i.e. polo shirts with logo).
- Participate in local events such as County Prevention Partnership Meetings and/or RLOs.
- Encourage CPPs to invite legislators and media to participate.
- Develop and distribute quarterly news releases such as CPP features.
- Develop media contacts.
- Participate on Prevention WV television show.
- Increase Partner member affiliation awareness of the Partnership and CPPs.
- Continue to support Regional Liaison inclusion.
- Link to other efforts/build relationships beyond the usual suspects.
- Define core values/standards, and ask for official buy-in by home agencies...support the thinking instead of a document. This is about a systems approach not tasks.
- Outreach with intention (maybe one on one) to the 26 non-invited counties (loss of social capital impacts building a prevention system).
- Alternative locations for Partnership and/or workgroup meetings...travel expenses must be considered.
- Emphasize benefits of RLOs to home agencies and community groups.
- Partnership is bigger than SPF SIG.

Sue Hage moved to refer these items to the Policies & Procedures WG so it can draft a reasonable Partnership marketing plan. The motion carried.

Items for the July 19 meeting agenda were declared as follows: Work Group Reports (Including P&P, UDP, SG); County Liaison Reports; Drug Court Overview; CADCA Overview; PEN Project Overview.

### TO DO:

- **MICHELE BURNSIDE: Communicate with Greg Puckett of WV CADCA regarding CADCA Overview at next meeting. COMPLETE**

The meeting adjourned.

### OTHER HANDOUTS:

*Intervention WG 3-20-2007 Meeting Notes*  
*Community & Youth Input WG Meeting Notes*  
*Comprehensive Plan WG 4-5-2007 Meeting Notes*  
*SAMHSA National Outcome Measures*

*All meeting notes referenced in this document are available on the Partnership website, which is accessible via [www.prevnet.org](http://www.prevnet.org). All other reports, if not included below, are available by contacting the WV Prevention Resource Center.*

### REPORTS

**Region 1 - Regional Liaison Report**  
**Submitted by Latrisha Whitelatch**

**1. Five funded counties:**

Implementation Counties: Marshall County, Ohio County, Wood County  
Extended Planning Counties: Calhoun County, Doddridge County

**2. March 22 RLO Summary:**

In attendance: staff from 4 of 5 funded counties, Tom Scott (Pleasants County project director), and CDS.

*RLO Agenda:* State partnership update/conversation with liaison; Information/strategy sharing; Debrief and prepare for next meeting

*RLO Topics:* Focus groups/ study circles; Impact evaluation; Community readiness scores linked to specific activities (i.e. social marketing)

*Logistics:* All meeting will start at 10am, on the fourth Tuesday of the month. RLOs will be in different locations in the region.

*Schedule*

April = no meeting

May 22 in Moundsville = strategies that match readiness scores (group brings materials)

June 26 in Calhoun County = Teen & Drug Court (Shari Johnson)

July 24 in Ohio County = Focus groups

August 28 in Pleasants County = TBA

September 25 in Doddridge County = TBA

- 3. Concerns Raised at March RLO:** Whether the SPF SIG process is collaborative (based on data/need) or competitive (based on a competitive grant process); Funding beyond seven months: Will we have a renewal process or a new “competitive process”?; Level of funding: Will subsequent RFPs give us a specific amount to apply for? Will all 22 funded counties be eligible for subsequent implementation funding, or will it remain limited to the 12 current implementation counties?

**Region 2 - Regional Liaison Report**

**Region 3 - Regional Liaison Report  
Submitted by April Miller**

**Funding & Protocols:** There is concern regarding funding protocols for this year and next. To date, the implementation plans have not officially been approved making it very difficult to plan. There is concern over the short period of time left this year combined with the 2 months lost while awaiting approvals. Funded counties are in the position of needing to hire coordinators and also implementing activities, with a limited amount of time left and uncertainty about the funding process. There is concern that there may be a similar lag next year. The counties would like some assurances that there will be a continuous plan through next year and beyond. Clarification of funds and plans are required in order for them to move forward. The funded counties are drafting a letter outlining these concerns. The letter will be sent to the Statewide Prevention Partnership this week.

**Regional Learning Opportunities:** The group consensus was that the RLOs were beneficial, providing an excellent opportunity for building capacity, networking and trainings. Region III would like to continue the RLO process as long as trainings are relevant and meet the needs of the counties involved. There were several questions regarding RLOs including:

- How much regional control do we really have for RLOs? *Training needs have been identified, but the group is unclear as to how far we can go.*
- How will the partnership fulfill identified needs for trainings? How much assistance will we get from the PRC? *Region III identified evaluation as one of the most important areas of additional training required for the counties. The Partnership has said that they cannot pay for an outside trainer for evaluation nor could they provide assistance internally (PRC staff). Funded counties in Region III are considering pooling funds to hire a trainer.*

**Building Capacity in Region III:** Region III agreed that prevention efforts would have a greater impact if funded and unfunded counties could work together. Initiatives in the funded counties would be more effective if the implementation funds could cross county lines through inviting unfunded counties to participate in training opportunities, programs and other events. The issues and concerns the counties have in Region III tend to overlap. Initiatives in one county would impact another and efficient coordination of those activities through cross county support would make sense and impact more people.

- How far can Region III go regarding working with or including unfunded counties? Is this an option?

**Issues in Unfunded Counties:** The decision not to support Teen Court has raised a dilemma in Tucker County and presumably in other counties with very low populations. Funding secured through the \$5 assessments to magistrate charges will not support teen court in smaller counties (only \$3500/yr. generated in Tucker County)

- Could the partnership and other state agencies consider looking at Teen Court on a case by case basis, rather than making a blanket decision not to fund the program at all?
- Are there any other opportunities available for this type of initiative?

#### **Region 4 - Regional Liaison Report Submitted by Lois Manns**

Region 4 is in the process of redeploying its resources and mobilizing energies for the current phase of SPF SIG. Although there was considerable disappointment about the limited funding of projects from the region, those in attendance at the RLO are planning to fully utilize the extended planning period to improve their work plans and continue with the development of their programs. Following the discussion with the PRC staff in attendance at the RLO held in Summersville, the group decided to continue the RLO process on a monthly basis. It was further decided that each county will alternate as location for the RLO and provide the training format and content. It was decided that the RLO topics would be information that is helpful to the region's members in their coalition building efforts as well as in their understanding of the primary prevention approach and the grant process.

Congratulations were given to Pocahontas County for receiving an implementation grant.

By a unanimous vote, Lois Manns was elected as the Regional Liaison to the Partnership.

The April 18, 2007, RLO was convened at the Raleigh County Board of Education. The topic was "Empowerment Domains". Carrilyn Carey, SPF SIG Coordinator for SHAPED, Raleigh County facilitated the session. She prepared workbooks for all attendees and provided a thorough overview of the subject matter and allowed for discussion by the attendees. We were pleased to have in attendance the new coordinator for Fayette County as well as several new partners who were attending an RLO for the first time.

The May RLO is scheduled held in Fayette County on May 9, 2007. The tentative topic is "Risk and Protective Factors".

As Regional Liaison, I have started an email group which will function as a local listserv for the region. This will, hopefully help to improve communication and provide opportunities for sharing information and technical assistance.