

**Working with Sub-Grantees and/or Regions within your Grant Area: A Panel and Audience Roundtable
Jan. 25, 2013**

Notes

PANEL QUESTION 1: Describe your sub-grantee or regionally-focused set-up – do you work with sub-grantees? If so, who are they? Do you work with specific regions?

MA: sub-grantees in Cape and Islands, Taunton, and Berkshires, partners in North/Central MA and Holyoke/Springfield.

MI: Issued an RFP by county. Some projects are with Community Mental Health agencies, some with public health agencies, 1 with a crisis center.

AK: Many rural partners. Some partners include GLS Alaska Native grantees.

PANEL QUESTION 2: How do you build capacity or provide technical assistance to your regions of focus?

MI:

- two main TA activities
- needed proactive outreach for evaluation; had expected the local grantees to do the evaluation themselves
 - need to reach out to them and be proactive in contact with local grantees
 - round 2 of sub-grants: Cindy called them from the first day they met
- technical assistance meeting
 - 2 day meeting with speakers but also hands on
 - set up specifically so that people can network with each other
 - communal meals, bonfire, everyone gets to know each other
- Evaluation
 - increasing level of participation in evaluation process
 - when notified sub-grantees of funding, notified them they were expected to travel to Lansing to be together and launch grant
 - Cindy talked about importance of evaluation at that meeting
 - included a slide in kickoff meeting--looked to boost confidence and remove hesitancy about evaluation (*see accompanying documents for referenced slide)
- Set up strategic planning process
 - what they do can contribute to suicide prevention knowledge on a national level
 - at TA meeting, had folks work on strategic plans and logic models

MA:

- 2 of the sub-grantees this time are same as last time (previous round of funding)
- Community Health Network Areas (CHNA) received suicide prevention 101 style presentations
- described expectations to CHNAS
- met with evaluators in each of the CHNAS
- held monthly calls with partners and check in with folks individually
- attend local group meetings and events

AK:

- initial meetings to orient people to expectations, tools, resources
- invite staff and other stakeholders and community folks who are instrumental in the strategic planning process
- important to build social capital and bring together providers, stakeholders, community
- required to implement Alaska gate keeper training, train trainers

PANEL QUESTION 3: How do you encourage strategic planning in those groups?**MA:**

- had everyone do strategic plans from the start (*see accompanying documents for sample work plan)
- make sure that the sub-grantees coordinate through the central grant

AK:

- developed comprehensive prevention program, based on SAMHSA's strategic framework
- tell us about your community, help us gather information to better understand what your needs are
- on-going understanding of capacity
- prioritize needs and resources to be strategic about how they're going to proceed
- Planning process was unique to each, needs and plans were unique to each
- SEARCH -- moving upstream (*see accompanying documents for image of SEARHC prevention plan)
- Fairbanks -- working on highest risk populations (*see accompanying documents for image of Fairbanks prevention plan)
- being culturally relevant and focusing on sustainability

MI:

- Had a significant \$ RFP
- Planning for the RFP/Applying was a strategic planning process
- Used a logic model template from SPRC
- sub-grantees went home and worked on them
- using evaluation for sustainability
- e.g. Macomb County looked at each program component to look at questions of progress, effectiveness, getting additional grant funding. They were very successful and were able to use their data to successfully get a new grant (*see accompanying documents for logic model and evaluation plan)

Audience member comments/questions:**Comment (Corrine King, CT):**

- Use the Comprehensive Approach from the Jed Foundation with [university] sub-grantees
- Held a kick-off meeting where we explained the local evaluation tools
- Had them set up plans, made changes as needed
- checked back in with folks after a year to make sure they are on track and tweak goals if need be
- fund QPR in towns

Question (Ann Kirkwood, ID): How do you ensure they fulfill their obligations?

Panel responses:

- Didn't give money up front/got the money quarterly
- looked at the PSI to see what they're doing, make sure they're on track

- last grant they had to terminate one sub-grant because of poor performance
- More administrative oversight than strategic planning
- Have a template they had folks fill out: barriers, how they overcome them
- did an annual site visit

Question (Ann Kirkwood): Is there a price to pay in community perceptions of your program when you pull funding?

MI:

- we had a new RFP when we got refunded, and made it clear it was a competitive process, however there were some bitter feelings from groups that did not get refunded
- this was an important learning process about sustainability; the first group of grantees needed to be better prepared for when their funding went away

PANEL QUESTION 4: What kinds of networking strategies, if any, have you used to connect folks from your various regions of focus?

Question (Daniel Bill): I'm wondering if there have been face to face meetings among sub-grantees to talk about successes and failures each is having, and how to promote success?

Christine (MA): this time around we haven't needed to have as many meetings because two of the sub-grantees are on their second round of funding, but we did have meetings previously with sub-grantees so they might assist each other with problems

- monthly calls were held to address issues as well, like getting in to specific schools, populations they wanted to reach, and this was ongoing
- successful events and screenings in schools were things that were shared on calls as well

Alison (MA):

- Statewide Coalition for Suicide Prevention -- the sub-grant coordinators attend these meetings
- have regional coalitions and we encourage coordinators to attend each others' events, meetings
- Cape and Islands Coordinator recently won an award at the Statehouse
- Sharing costs of bringing in outside experts

James (AK): we didn't know everyone, being at the state level, so it was a little difficult at first to have a good understanding of what everyone is doing in the state, and we didn't have all that information at the time

- we put together a suicide prevention summit in 2010 to bring everyone together
- the first piece was understanding that we are stronger than we know, but there is a lot of good work going on and there is a lot to be hopeful about
- shared stories, motivate people, this was really helpful
- regional team, Yukon Delta (Bethel region)
 - area decided they wanted to work together with four neighboring villages
 - while distance separates them, there are common issues, needs, resources that can be addressed regarding suicide
 - it was challenging to go through the strategic planning process
 - culturally appropriate information on the document
 - requires a lot of building relationships (*see accompanying documents for the brochure)

Audience Comment (Patti Clark, KY):

- mini grants for regional prevention centers
- projects based on their expertise, for example, with PSAs
- culturally competent for their community
- connecting QPR trainers across the state

Audience Comment (Jan Ulrich, KY):

- learning collaboratives that have been formed
- connecting with institutions of higher education
- using statewide listserv that counselors and other education related entities are part of
- making use of Adobe Connect to do meetings and collaborations

Audience Comment (Corrine King, CT):

- Connecticut Healthy Campuses Initiative
 - Suicide Prevention
 - Underage drinking
 - bringing in speakers
 - Coalition has been in existence for 12 years

PANEL QUESTION 5: What are two pieces of advice you have about working with regions or sub-grantees, perhaps one about something that went well, and another where you could share a lesson learned?

AK:

- Know a lot of people but continue to make new connections; really important to get out of the office and build social capital in the regions by being there
- a lot of travel needed because it's such a large state
- can use internet but it's also important to have some face-to-face time in the communities that the partners live in
- be flexible: we asked people to adopt the Strategic Planning Framework but we want to make sure it's relevant to folks

MI:

- Lesson learned: need to be somewhat prescriptive in the RFP and what we expect them to be doing locally rather than keeping it loose based on the federal RFP.
 - In the state RFP they had to pick at least 4 out of 7 activities that the state RFP listed, could include other prevention strategies as well.
 - This made it easier -- expectations, kinds of programs to keep track of
 - Made sure that the set up allowed the state grantee to meet their federal obligations

MA:

- Cape and Islands already had a Suicide Prevention Coalition, which was then strengthened by the grant -- had so many people coming together already, good for sustainability (coalition was doing some fundraising efforts)
- Berkshires -- had no prior SP activities, 1st grant helped them to form one that is vibrant and ongoing

-Lesson learned: Evaluation systems needed to be in place and have everyone know what was required

PANEL QUESTION 6: Is there anything else you would highlight about this kind of work?/General questions

Pat (MI):

- we took advantage of having sub-grantees that were doing unique, interesting work
 - like putting together a coalition
 - took advantage of great sub-grantee leader, ask them to do a breakout session at one of the annual TA meetings and share lessons and problem solving with others from around the state
 - bring up similar problems across sub-grantees
- intentionally using what local grantees are learning and disseminating to others who you may not be working with or funding

Cindy (MI):

- meeting local needs and building capacity in the current economic environment has been rewarding
- putting the dollars in to the local communities has been great, but does require some more administrative burden
- felt like folks were in good shape when the MI grant ended because people were embedded in their communities
- benefitted the state level from the local evaluation work
 - ex. We used an evaluator from one of the sub-grants to later do the state level evaluation work

James (AK):

- ability to come together, it's not just folks who have funding for instance that can do the work, everyone has a stake in our state
- the summit that we held really helped spell out that everyone is together in doing the work
 - folks crafted their 5 year plans at the summit
- capitalize on opportunities to get together with other grants, sub-grantees, regions in the state to think about plans moving forward

Christine (MA):

- Berkshire Coalition started as a result of the grant, they did not have a suicide prevention coalition at the start
- North Central MA--had to let go of their contract early, but there was a hospital there interested in doing suicide prevention work
 - the hospital started its own coalition there
 - there was a lot of support there, senior hospital staff attended coalition meetings
- Assessing and Managing Suicide Risk (AMSR) trainings in the area, in addition to other trainings that resulted in the momentum of the coalition
- continuing to work with an area that is no longer funded, providing support despite that lack of funding

James (AK):

- challenges with relationship building:
 - balance having folks do strategic planning based on what you want them to do with having them establish some ownership of their planning and work
- how do you go about engaging in relationship building without too rigid a process?

Audience Comment (Patti Clark, KY):

- incorporating Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) with regional prevention coordinators
 - taking some time to learn, realized was using the SPF incorrectly in a way, but starting to use it for prevention now
 - realizing that the numbers for suicide may not rise to a level folks from other backgrounds are used to seeing [and therefore needing to educate that it is a problem anyway]
- working with folks from underage drinking and drug prevention

Audience Comment (Jan Ulrich, KY):

- realizing that the SPF doesn't quite match up across substance abuse prevention compared to suicide prevention
- separating out suicide prevention activities isn't easily done within the SPF
- learning how to talk to each other about where boundaries are and aren't across partners

Christine (MA):

- Leverage and contact at the local level helps build a foundation. Local knowledge of how they do their work, and allowing them to share with each other is important.