



NATIONAL  
FUNDING  
COLLABORATIVE  
ON VIOLENCE  
PREVENTION

NOTE: This is the **FINAL REPORT** for grants expiring in 1996.

178411

## READINESS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

*Annual Progress Report to Funders*

PROPERTY OF  
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

### ***ANNUAL REPORT***

January 1 – December 31, 1996

March, 1997

## I. INTRODUCTION

This reporting period saw the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention and its local collaboratives engaged in a variety of activities. Local collaboratives put the final touches on their implementation plans prior to submission and prepared for implementation reviews. They also began their work to secure the matching portion of their implementation grants. The National Collaborative Board of Directors made important decisions regarding the cross site and national evaluations and the future of the National Collaborative. Board members also began to explore the role of the media in framing violence issues and the extent to which the public is ready to hear a progressive message about violence prevention.

## II. THE LOCAL COLLABORATIVES

Implementation review visits topped the activity list for local collaboratives from July through October. An implementation review team composed of board members, non-board committee members, and national office staff reviewed plans and made visits to eleven sites. (The twelfth site, San Antonio, was eliminated from the process after its collaborative dissolved during the planning year.) Site visitors spent 1-1/2 days visiting with collaborative members, listening to implementation plans, offering advice in finalizing strategies and activities, and assessing readiness for implementation. Each implementation plan was reviewed by 5 readers, including site visitors. Site visitor and reviewer assessments were tabulated and presented to the board's executive committee for final grant decisions. All eleven sites were granted implementation awards, although three of the sites were asked to submit additional information about their plan prior to the grant award. Fact sheets describing the collaboratives are attached in the Appendix.

## **A. The Planning Phase -- Important Steps**

The collaborative building process is imperfect, involving the ability to understand when to make shifts and changes and when to stay the course. Our local collaboratives demonstrated that they could learn and build on past mistakes while keeping focused on the bigger picture. Local collaboratives may not have recognized it at the time, but they did many things right during the planning phase. As they evolved, local collaboratives went through a number of important steps which served to build, connect and cement collaborative relationships. While the steps were not necessarily smooth, we found that most collaboratives spent some time at each of these phases. We also noted that because of site diversity, their experience at each phase was different, although for the most part, they ended up in the same place--with an established collaborative, tired, but ready to begin implementation.

### Building the Right Collaborative -- Acknowledging the Need to Change

The collaboratives that will implement violence prevention plans are not necessarily the ones that began the planning process. Changes in violence issues, the need to incorporate important voices in violence prevention, or the need to reach consensus on vision and mission issues often changed the composition of local collaboratives. This sometimes happened after a collaborative had already established its vision and formed its partnership. Often, larger community forces were at play when a collaborative needed to change membership, as earlier movers and shakers found it made sense to make way for a new wave of collaborators. Our collaboratives in Minneapolis, Flint and Rockford all experienced growth in, and/or restructuring of, their collaboratives during the planning phase.

#### **Alternatives to Violence Coalition (AVCO) Minneapolis, MN**

AVCO was originally conceived as a partnership between the Minneapolis Foundation, the Hennepin County Violence Prevention Collaborative, Twin Cities Public Television (KCTA), and the Initiative for Violence Free Families. It hoped to serve a coordinating function for the many violence prevention collaboratives and initiatives that had arisen in Minneapolis in response to emerging class and racial tensions in the city. Its seven member partnership also hoped to develop a public education and media strategy to highlight violence issues and promote the work of community initiatives.

Midway through its planning process, the city was hit by a youth violence surge. AVCO was approached by the mayor's office for support in reaching out to the community for input on this

emerging problem. AVCO collaborated with the Mayor's office to host a community forum in which a broad base of community agencies and residents were invited to spend a whole day discussing the violence problem, its causes and possible solutions. AVCO's ability to bring organization and clarity to this forum gave it prominence and credibility during this important moment. A result of the meeting was increased interest in AVCO as a vehicle to understand and address youth violence issues. AVCO grew to more than 40 members, as community agencies and grassroots community members joined the partnership to work on identifying issues and developing solutions for youth violence and its root causes. These new members affirmed AVCO's original vision and goals, but also felt it could play an important role in coordinating existing resources in a variety of ways to respond to violence issues.

---

### **Neighborhood Violence Prevention Collaborative Flint, MI**

The 38 civic, business and non-profit members of the Genesee County Violence Prevention Coalition convened to address community violence issues. For three years the Coalition had developed and monitored community based initiatives to stem the rising tides of violence that had erupted in Flint following the massive decline of the automobile industry and its devastating social and economic effects. As it sought to include community voice during planning, Coalition members recognized the desire of community residents to develop and drive the violence prevention initiative. Seeing this as the ultimate fulfillment of their vision of community empowerment, they worked with neighborhood residents to form the Neighborhood Violence Prevention Collaborative. This new collaborative, composed of neighborhood representatives and young people, the chairs of the Genesee County Violence Prevention Coalition, and foundation representatives, was established to acknowledge the power of residents to make decisions about how resources are allocated in their own neighborhoods. This new structure, represented a paradigm shift in the approach to primary prevention in Flint -- from an emphasis on community agency determined and led efforts -- to a focus on empowering neighborhood residents to plan, contract and evaluate neighborhood-specific primary prevention activities.

---

### **Rockford Area Family Violence Prevention Collaborative (RAFVPC) Rockford, IL**

The RAFVPC faced a myriad of violence problems. The Rockford area had the second highest rate of violence against women in Illinois (more than Chicago, a city nearly 30 times its size), child abuse had increased over the course of several years, and street and youth violence were consuming more and more of the media's coverage of local issues. The original collaborative members were greatly concerned with family violence, particularly domestic violence. Founding members of the RAFVPC included representatives from the county health department, the university hospital and members of the judicial system. They were particularly interested in applying a public health model to violence prevention and in examining family violence as the precursor of all violence affecting Rockford area residents.

Rockford's community assessment included town hall meetings, targeted focus groups, and interviews with grassroots community organizations and members. They found that while domestic violence was a serious issue, the Rockford community was greatly alarmed by increasing street violence and, particularly the involvement of youth in violent incidents. Feeling that these were important voices to be heard, the collaborative invited 35 community residents and organizations to assist them in developing a violence prevention plan for all of Rockford. These new members were included on already organized task forces. They affirmed the importance of the collaborative's

original vision, but felt it needed to be expanded to one which focused on the development of safe, diverse and inclusive communities. Subsequently, many of the task force members were incorporated into the Collaborative's steering committee.

In all three cases, collaboratives recognized the opportunities gained by changing the collaborative membership. In Minneapolis, this shift placed AVCO in a prime position to respond to emerging violence issues. New membership provided it with the means to develop responsive program and policy within the framework of its original vision. Its ability to do so lent credibility to the collaborative's contention that it could serve an organizing and education function for local initiatives. In Flint, the shift in collaborative membership signaled a budding interest in grassroots solutions to violence problems. It challenged community-based organizations and others to practice what they preached in terms of empowering communities, but also kept them connected in a mentoring role to new collaborative members. In Rockford, the collaborative recognized the power and opportunity presented by a new collaborative membership that included a broader cross section of the community. They also recognized the strength of creating the connection between a serious issue, family violence, and its implications for young children and adolescents.

### Conducting the Community Assessment

Local collaboratives were required by the NFCVP to conduct a comprehensive assessment of community needs and resources. They were allowed to use and/or build upon existing assessments, but were also encouraged to think about non-traditional ways to learn about the needs and assets of communities most directly affected by violence. In response to this, most collaboratives used a combination of assessment measures. They capitalized upon available hard data, but contextualized it with formal or informal methods of listening to community residents. They found these direct contact sessions valuable in connecting with residents and gaining their interest, enthusiasm and involvement in collaborative efforts. East Tennessee, New Haven and Santa Barbara all conducted wide-reaching community assessments.

## **The East Tennessee Foundation Violence Prevention Collaborative Knoxville and Cocke County, TN**

The East Tennessee Foundation Violence Prevention Collaborative implemented a comprehensive assessment process to ascertain the needs and resources in selected neighborhoods in Cocke County and Knoxville, and to guide the collaborative's determination of which neighborhoods might best support the work of the collaborative. The core of the assessment process was a "listening project", a method of community organizing developed by the Rural Voice for Southern Peace in North Carolina. It was designed to train community residents with the skills to listen to their neighbors and engage them in discussion around a community issue.

The collaborative used the listening project as a way to engage community residents in the mechanics of assessing their community and to empower them to effect solutions to violence prevention issue. It provided hands-on training, and at the same time, elicited information about the things that needed to be "listened" to in each community. In other words, collaborative members trained community residents to listen to their neighbors by listening to them first. A community questionnaire was developed during the training session. Using the questionnaire, adult and youth resident teams conducted door-to-door interviews with adult community residents. Youth were heard through an open invitation session in each neighborhood.

Listening project information was then analyzed alongside data from community meetings, community demographics information, a survey of service provider, and a formal community assessment which measured, among other things, satisfaction level with current services, and the community's willingness to participate in community building activities. The result of the analysis was the selection of two public housing communities in Knoxville and four neighborhoods in Cocke County, and the identification of three cross cutting issues in each area: youth development, strengthening of police/resident relationships, and community mobilizing to connect and empower residents.

## **S.A.F.E. Haven New Haven, CT**

S.A.F.E. Haven is a youth led collaborative of representatives of twelve youth serving agencies in Greater New Haven. The collaborative instituted a formal assessment of its community through the administration of a questionnaire developed by collaborative members to youth and young adults in the region. The assessment served the dual purpose of providing the collaborative with community information and developing evaluation skills among collaborative members. Using youth as their key informant group, the collaborative was interested in learning what youth felt and thought about violence in their communities and the extent to which existing programs responded to youth needs and violence issues. S.A.F.E. Haven members surveyed 600 adolescents and young adults in schools and at a mall which was a popular hangout for youth and young adults. They also interviewed executive directors of youth serving agencies and key community spokespersons.

Results of the survey challenged some of the assumptions of collaborative members and affirmed others. They found to their surprise, that agency executive directors expressed eagerness to work with youth to develop responsive services. Another misperception was challenged when the assessment revealed that those youth engaged in services were pleased with program services and scope. Collaborative members did learn that many youth were unaware of or unable to connect with available services. They also learned that young people wanted an additional police presence in their communities. Finally, they found that youth had a very high level of exposure to violence and felt unsafe at home, in school and in their communities. Their assessment revealed a need for: 1) an organizing mechanism to allow young people to develop and explore solutions for their concerns, 2)

a refuge for many of the region's youth, and 3) an organizing agency to help existing groups to implement youth driven strategies for change and conduct outreach to vulnerable youth.

### **The Pro-Youth Coalition Santa Barbara, CA**

An increase in gang activity and the National Collaborative's request for proposals converged in Santa Barbara at a time when the community foundation and other agencies were actively engaged in planning and program efforts to address burgeoning youth violence issues. The planning funds from NFCVP provided an already established gang task force with the opportunity to expand their ranks, continue their planning and implement their ideas. The task force recruited representatives from community-based agencies, law enforcement, the courts, the religious community, school systems, and public health and housing, and formed the Pro-Youth Coalition.

The Coalition cast a wide net to hear from different sectors of the community. They held youth forums in two communities, learning from over 150 youth and adults about their perceptions of youth violence in the community and ideas for strategies to prevent it. The forums were video-taped and aired on local television. Focus groups were held with Latino residents in two other communities. Additionally, the Coalition surveyed local violence prevention resources and received more than 230 responses. Finally, the Pro Youth Coalition established four working groups to explore specific areas of violence prevention. These groups -- School-based Prevention, Community-based Prevention, Juvenile Justice, and Public Policy and Public Awareness -- identified available existing resources and gaps in the service delivery system, issues which needed to be addressed, and key players who should be included in the solutions.

Each of the four working groups returned with proposed activities. In a massively thorough, painful, and creative synthesis process, the Coalition compiled the community assessment data and the working group recommendations. After numerous meetings, they were able to develop a comprehensive and cohesive gang violence prevention strategy which integrated many divergent voices and theoretical perspectives.

Community assessments provided collaborative members with new skills which often gave many their first taste of civic participation. In Knoxville, listeners were able to hear how their environment affected their neighbors. The listening process established bonds among people who had much in common but no history of connection. In New Haven, the involvement of collaborative members from beginning to the end of the collaborative process helped to demystify procedures which had often been conducted on youth by those outside their community. In Santa Barbara, the assessment involved a large number of people in a process of listening and synthesizing community and professional voice, standard research procedures, and literature reviews to develop a comprehensive strategy to support youth and their families.

## Organizing and Involving the Grassroots Community

Violence is not an isolated phenomenon, rather it is a symptom of deeper community and societal issues. To truly prevent violence, our collaboratives told us, communities have to be rebuilt in places where they have been torn down and built afresh in places where they have never existed. Building community is a long term endeavor, but with violence as a vanguard issue, some local collaboratives made a good start. Organizing and involving community residents is hard work. It means establishing trusting relationships between outsiders and insiders and between insiders and insiders. It means organizing and involving citizens person by person and small group by small group. It means having the charisma and credibility to keep hope alive under very trying conditions. Although employing different methods, local collaboratives in New Orleans, Spartanburg, and Washington, were successful in organizing at the grassroots and greater community level.

### **The Crescent City Peace Alliance New Orleans, LA**

Constantly besieged by violent episodes during the planning year, it became clear to the Crescent City Peace Alliance that its violence prevention focus needed to galvanize the entire city. In its broad form, the CCPA brings together a multisectoral, interdisciplinary group of actors from across the city, including members of local government agencies, the faith community, the philanthropic community, the social service community and the business community. Recognizing the great need for concerted effort, these groups readily came together, but also realized that there was a need to incorporate the "wisdom of the community" in the development of the collaborative and its violence prevention activities. The collaborative also saw itself as a vehicle to facilitate positive connection among the diversity of residents in New Orleans.

Seven neighborhoods were involved in providing information and insights into local violence issues. The community assessment process, implemented through individual meetings with neighborhood residents, community forums and town hall meetings, reached more than 1,000 people and allowed residents to define issues, prioritize neighborhood resources. Two neighborhoods emerged from this process as having an infrastructure of diversity, involved residents, responsive agencies and the will to engage in a long term process. The CCPA worked with the three neighborhoods to develop long and short term goals for violence prevention and develop resident task forces to accomplish these goals. The larger CCPA collaborative was then structured to include three members from each of the neighborhood collaboratives onto its executive committee, the policy making body for the total collaborative. In this way, the



"wisdom of the community" is used to define issues and develop solutions that affect them locally and to work with others in the city on more global issues.

### **Stop the Violence Collaboration Spartanburg, SC**

The Stop the Violence Collaboration of the Spartanburg County Consensus Project was developed to reach into communities most directly affected by violence. Two communities, were selected for violence prevention by the collaborative following a formal assessment of community needs and resources across the county. Each community had strengths deemed essential by the collaborative to conduct violence prevention activities: common meeting places, the presence of involved community policing efforts, and businesses and other organizations willing to collaborate with community residents. Despite this neither community had a history of community organizing, and violence and related problems had eroded relationships among neighbors.

In its engagement of these communities, STV staff went door to door in each community, speaking to residents and informing them of the mission of the STV collaborative. Town hall meetings were held, as well as interviews and other contacts with community businesses and social service agencies. Most of these contacts were designed to provide a vehicle for social interaction among residents. Core groups of individuals emerged in both communities who were willing to work with STV staff to mobilize and organize other residents in their communities.

### **The Circle of Hope Washington, D.C.**

The neighborhood strategy of the Circle of Hope collaborative engaged three communities in Washington DC: Anacostia; Columbia Heights and North Capitol. The neighborhoods were at different levels in community connectedness and violence experience. Anacostia, an African American community, was reeling from a high level of street violence involving youth and young adults and had seen once solid family structures deteriorate as the violence escalated. Columbia Heights, the most racially and ethnically diverse community in Washington, includes substantial populations of African Americans, Latinos and a growing population of Asians. Youth violence was the primary issue of concern for residents of this community. North Capitol, a primarily African-American community, also had a youth violence problem, but felt that the more pressing need for its community was economic development. High rates of unemployment among youth and young adults fostered the involvement of these populations in drug trafficking and violence.

The Circle of Hope entered into partnership with respected community based agencies addressing the identified violence issue in each community. These agencies then worked with COH staff members to organize interested residents into resident/agency collaboratives. The lead agency, with technical support from the COH staff, engaged community residents in assessment of their community and in identification of a violence issue and solution. The Anacostia community chose to focus on strengthening family bonds; Columbia Heights on promoting positive racial bonds among youth, and North Capitol on economic development and support of African American males.

Engaging grassroots participation in the planning phase was the first step in community building in each of these collaboratives. It was also for many of the

grassroots participants the first time they had participated in community decisionmaking processes and the first time they had been invited into the developmental stages of an initiative in their own communities. It allowed them the opportunity to connect with their neighbors and participate as stakeholders in an issue/initiative which directly affected them. The Crescent City Peace Alliance's focus on galvanizing the entire city and capturing the wisdom of those most directly affected by violence went a long way toward countering the natural skepticism that grass roots participants brought to the process. Inviting them to the larger collaborative decisionmaking table further cemented their confidence in the CCPA's sincerity in hearing their voices.

The two communities in Spartanburg had been historically ignored by greater city and county communities. They each had long term and severe violence and/or drug problems and disconnectedness and mistrust among community residents. Successful law enforcement efforts to bring safety to these communities had unwittingly reinforced the isolation among community residents, as people's awareness of violence problems was raised by the presence of police activity in the community. The Stop the Violence Collaboration encouraged people to come out of their locked homes and to begin to develop ties with their neighbors.

In Washington, the neighborhood process fed into the larger Circle of Hope process and worked through the remainder of the planning year on bridging barriers and strengthening relationships among the separate communities, identifying areas of common interest, and developing overarching strategies which would address violence issues and involve neighborhood collaboratives in peer support activities.

#### Mobilizing Decision-makers

Equally as important as involving grassroots residents and organizations in local collaborative work is the involvement of those who broker power and resources. The process of bringing decision-makers to the collaborative table can be difficult, as it means yielding authority and control over individual resources to an unknown and evolving force. It also means that

collaborative staff have to learn to efficiently manage the time and demands of very busy people. Ultimately, decision-makers came to the local collaborative table for the same reason as did others: their commitment to promoting peace and developing healthy communities. Our East Bay and New York collaboratives engaged very high level and high powered members in their respective collaborative processes.

### **The East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership Oakland, CA**

The East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership emerged in response to the awakening reality of policy makers that violence did not respect jurisdictional boundaries. The Partnership is a collaboration among elected and appointed officials from 21 cities, 2 counties, 23 law enforcement agencies and 19 school districts along the I-80 corridor in northwestern California. It was established to enable communities to work together and communicate better across boundaries, to share information about good programs, and to pool resources and apply jointly for funding. Forming an effective partnership meant that members had to develop consistent laws and policies and be willing to support the efforts of one another during the implementation of their activities. Funding from the NFCVP helped the Partnership to pull together its governance structure, conduct its community assessment and develop strategies to involve the community in their work.

### **The Fountain For Youth New York, NY**

Equally effective in uniting power brokers, the Fountain for Youth in New York City built upon a concept which had been envisioned by several of the city's youth development experts. The challenge for the Fountain during the planning year was to pull these experts together during a time when a drastic reduction in prevention services to youth programs and an increase in youth violence threatened the city's decade long progress in providing youth development services. While juggling demanding work schedules and national demands on their time, Fountain members committed themselves to developing an infrastructure of support for youth and youth workers in all of New York City. They created a bold vision for the Fountain which was intended to reach all of New York's five boroughs. It would be an organizing force for the wealth of youth leadership in the city. It would connect and transfer the experience and wisdom of more seasoned organizations to those of budding agencies through the development and wide dispersal of youth development curricula and through sharing staff and other resources. It would become a forum for the training of youth workers and for the development of youth leaders. Finally, the Fountain For Youth would become a force for a youth movement which would unite the entire city on behalf of youth.

The obvious benefit of collaborating with decisionmakers is the ability to focus on macro-level issues and to bring bigger picture vision to collaborative efforts. The East Bay Partnership is poised to bring massive systemic change to a wide geographic area in northwestern California. The Partnership's efforts will be sustained as the collaborative

continues to experience success in the development of laws, policies and financial resources directed to violence prevention. In New York, the Fountain for Youth also promises a grand legacy, as greater quality and effectiveness of youth serving agencies will be enhanced if the Fountain is able to realize its vision.

### Putting the Collaborative to Work

Planning for implementation, while necessary, is a time intensive, tedious process. While the planning issue might arouse great passion (as does violence), the process can also be emotionally draining. To keep interest fresh, to experiment with unproved ideas, to interrupt the tedium of reworking mission statements or analyzing assessment data, some collaboratives incorporated action in their planning phase. Putting collaborative members to work yielded positive benefits, as the efforts led to local prominence, established programmatic credibility and fostered the recruitment of new members. Collaboratives had significant accomplishments during the planning year in Spartanburg, and East Bay.

### **Stop the Violence Collaboration Spartanburg, SC**

The experience of early success is central to the engagement of grassroots citizens in violence prevention. The Stop the Violence Collaboration put collaborative members to work early in the planning process. Collaborative members were assigned to various action teams to assist in the assessment of their neighborhood strategy. They connected with neighborhood residents to develop goals and objectives for the community. In one community, residents were anxious to begin neighborhood enhancement projects to clean up streets, repair broken down homes and board up homes which were known havens for drug trafficking and consumption. Action team members picked up 92 bags of trash on one block of the community. Collaboration members were also successful in engaging the county to begin housing code inspections on homes having visible standard housing code violations. Finally, the collaborative partnered with scholars from an area college to rehabilitate houses and mobile homes in this same area. This did much to galvanize and engage community resident involvement in violence prevention.

## **The East Bay Public Safety Corridor Project Oakland, CA**

During the planning phase, the East Bay Partnership put the considerable power and resources of its membership to work grappling with one of the nation's toughest violence issues: handgun control. Over the course of the planning year, the Partnership developed a comprehensive gun control strategy. The strategy contained several facets, including a ban on the construction and sale of junk guns in the Bay Area, establishment of consumer product safety standards for firearms, a requirement of trigger lock mechanisms on every firearm sold, the end of resale permits to individuals operating out of their homes or in residential neighborhood, an increase in the city business tax rate for gun dealers, the revenue of which will be applied to regulation and monitoring of gun shops and to youth firearm violence awareness and prevention programs, and the development of common standards for issuing concealed weapons permits. Despite heavy resistance from firearm support groups, the entire Corridor Council endorsed the strategy and to date 19 local governments have passed it.

Putting collaborative members to work during the planning year cemented relationships among collaborative members, but it also boosted members' belief in the collaborative process. The emerging collaborative in the Spartanburg community has already experienced much success in changing the dynamics of the relationship between police and citizens in the community and in engaging county government in their efforts. Impressed by the activities of the STV collaborative in one community, the county government has elected to devote a number of its resources to determining what it would take to fulfill the vision of the community collaborative and to transport this model to other communities.

In East Bay, it was important that this collaborative of "doers" was able to demonstrate its ability to make the collaborative work. Selecting a tough issue which exposed Partnership members to individual political scrutiny and resistance demonstrated the power of the collective. The collaborative's ability to hold together on this politically charged issue provided it with much impetus to begin work on other important issues. It has also set forth a model for inter-jurisdictional work for other areas of the country.

## **B. Making the Match**

The local collaboratives have applied to the National Collaborative for implementation grants totaling more than \$3 million. Implementation grants range from \$244,000 to \$300,000 for the two year period. To match these grant requests, local collaboratives have pledged to raise six million dollars in cash and in-kind services. During the course of the planning process, many sites began their fundraising among their collaborative membership. They were successful in acquiring support from local non-profit agencies, city departments, and programs funded by federal sources such as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Bureau of Justice Assistance HUD (two local collaboratives have COPS funding) to provide in-kind resources. In certain cases, collaborative members were also able to provide cash support for violence prevention activities. However, local collaboratives have looked primarily to local and national foundations for cash support. To facilitate the local collaborative's ability to seek matching funds and to allow for a continuation of service during fundraising, the National Collaborative provided start up funds of one half of the grant request to local collaboratives. Local collaboratives are expected to complete their first year fundraising by March 1, 1997.

Several of the local collaboratives have been creative in their match fundraising. Collaboratives in Spartanburg, SC and New Haven, CT have developed innovative plans for their matches which draw upon broad-based, interdisciplinary support. The Stop the Violence Collaboration in Spartanburg has elicited cash and in-kind contributions from 22 local organizations representing a variety of sectors. These include:

American Red Cross	Northside/Una Community Resident
City of Spartanburg	Salvation Army Community Center
Corporate Partners -- Una	School District Six (Mentoring Programs)
County of Spartanburg	Spartanburg Area Chamber of Commerce
Cleveland Elementary School	Spartanburg County Foundation
Department of Juvenile Justice	Spartanburg County Public Library
Flagstar	Spartanburg Housing Authority
Habitat for Humanity	Spartanburg Religious community
Health Resource Room	Stop Drugs Now

Metro Spartanburg Boys and Girls Club  
Milliken Foundation

United Methodist Church  
Wofford College -- Bonner Scholarship Prog.

These funders have pledged more than \$600,000 per year in cash and in-kind resources to support the collaborative's efforts. This is more than double the expected match for the Stop the Violence Collaboration.

In New Haven, the S.A.F.E. Haven collaborative took the task of fundraising to heart and considered raising money the way they knew best. While they will look toward foundations for a large portion of their match, they will add \$22,000 from basketball tournaments, lunchless lunch fundraisers, car washes, a bachelor auction, local festivals vending and hot topic workshops.

S.A.F.E. Haven will also receive support from a variety of state and city offices, from Enterprise Community program, and will be included in a grant proposal to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development grant. Finally, they will charge fees at their theater performances, training institutes and Unity March Conference.

### III. NATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: PREPARING FOR IMPLEMENTATION

#### A. Program Technical Assistance

As local collaboratives move from planning to implementation, the national office staff worked with project directors and technical assistance experts to refine national technical assistance program to respond better to sites' implementation needs. Following is the description of the national technical assistance plan for the first year of implementation.

##### Assessment

In December the national office hosted a two day cluster meeting to orient new project directors and facilitate the development of first year technical assistance plans for each local collaborative. Prior to the cluster meeting, the project directors received pre-assessment worksheets which they completed after interviewing six collaborative members. The interviews were intended to elicit broad local input into the content of the technical assistance plan. They also facilitated the orientation of new project directors to their collaboratives by fostering interaction between new directors and those who had historical knowledge of the initiative.

Using their pre-assessment worksheets and their implementation plan evaluation prepared by national office staff, collaborative members participated in several exercises designed to clarify the specific areas in which their collaboratives were having difficulties. They examined the effectiveness of their collaborative's leadership, the level of community involvement, communication strategies, relationships, and the planning and implementation of violence prevention strategies. Based on this self-assessment process, each collaborative made three to four technical assistance requests of the national office. During the workshop, these requests were reviewed with the technical assistance



providers and approved by the national office staff. The requests were then taken to their local collaboratives for final approval.

### National Resources Bank

As a result of the workshop, review of the implementation plans and conversations with local collaborative members, national office staff refined plans for a national bank of technical assistance providers. Collaboration building and maintenance, community organizing and development, partnering with youth, and media advocacy emerged as the content areas for which sites need assistance. We identified the following four providers who will work directly with sites in response to these needs:

#### ***Collaborative Building and Maintenance***

The national office has contracted with Gillian Kaye and Tom Wolff, authors of From the Ground Up: A Workbook on Coalition Building and Community Development, to provide support to the sites on collaboration and community organizing. This book was provided to local collaboratives during the planning year and several of them found it useful. Kaye and Wolff are well regarded experts in collaboration building and community organizing. Also on their team are Dr. Carl Ellison and Diane Johnson, who bring with them many years of experience in community health and development, conflict management and diversity training (See Appendix for bios). This team conducted the December workshop, will help in the planning and execution of the February conference, and will provide site specific TA to several local collaboratives.

#### ***Partnering With Youth***

The local collaboratives intend to implement a variety of programs for youth, including after-school and recreation activities, youth leadership training, and various skill building activities to promote positive youth development. Most are confident in their ability to mount and conduct these activities, but are less confident in their ability to meaningfully include young people in collaborative decision making processes. Local

collaboratives have struggled with ways to obtain valid youth representation and define meaningful roles for young people.

The board of directors of the NFCVP has also sought support for this issue. To answer both needs, the national office staff has developed a contractual agreement with the Center for the Advancement of Youth Adult Partnerships. This team has successfully integrated young voices in the decisionmaking process for city government in Hampton, VA, and on boards and advisory committees in that city; for several national and local youth serving organizations; on school boards across the country; and with private sector organizations. The Center will help the national board explore why and how it wants to partner with youth, and assist in the development of an appropriate structure for that partnership. The Center will also work directly with the local collaboratives that are grappling with partnership issues. Information about the Center is included in the Appendix.

#### *Media Advocacy and Public Awareness*

Throughout the planning year, the public relations firm, Malkin and Ross, has assisted national office staff in developing a communication and public education strategy. During the summer, they began to devote time to working with the sites on developing skills and strategy for the work they hope to do with local media. Malkin and Ross conducted a media education cluster workshop to provide sites with the skills to use and form relationships with local media. They will continue to provide individualized assistance to local collaboratives during implementation. In particular, Malkin and Ross will help with the development of written media plans, basic materials in preparation for a press conference, and background and promotional materials on the national and local collaboratives.

In addition, we have developed a contract with the National Crime Prevention Council to assist the national office with bi-monthly technical assistance newsletters, and to provide on-site technical assistance to local collaboratives in developing public awareness and education strategies.

### Local Technical Assistance Funds

Each site will be awarded \$10,000 grants for local technical assistance. While we originally anticipated that the sites would use these monies for hiring collaborative facilitators, discussions during the assessment workshop led to several optional uses of the local dollars. Local technical assistance will be used to support any technical assistance request that is unique to a site (provided either by a local person or an expert identified by national office staff). The grant may also be used by sites to purchase additional visits by one of the providers listed above, or to bring in experts from other local collaboratives for peer learning.

### Conferences and Workshops

As part of national technical assistance, we will conduct three cluster meetings and one national conference. The cluster meetings are topical workshops which provide intensive training on a common content area. Two members of each collaborative generally attend these meetings. Two fall cluster meetings provided local collaboratives with media advocacy education and training in the development of technical assistance plans for the year. We will host one more cluster meeting in late spring/early summer which will probably focus on evaluation and the relationship between cross site and local evaluators. In February five members of each local collaborative will be invited to Washington for our annual national conference. The national conference will allow the local collaboratives to connect with members of the NFCVP Board of Directors and to share their implementation strategies with each other and the public. We will use this as an opportunity to showcase potential technical assistance providers and allow sites to connect with those individuals they might find most helpful.

## **B. Cross Site Evaluation**

The National Collaborative board approved the COSMOS evaluation proposal reported in the last funder's report. The cross site evaluation will examine the basic characteristics of the eleven collaboratives and their communities and measure the effectiveness of a violence prevention activity jointly selected by national and cross site evaluators. An executive summary of the COSMOS plan and a matrix of site activities are included in the appendix.

### **III. NATIONAL COLLABORATIVE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

#### **New Board Members**

Local collaboratives elected two project directors and two foundation representatives to represent them as board members on the National Collaborative Board of Directors. These elections were approved at the group's fall meeting. Kojo Livingston, Project Director of the Crescent City Peace Alliance in New Orleans, Terri Freeman, President of the Foundation for the Capital Region, and George Garnett, Vice President for Programs at the Minneapolis Foundation will participate as full voting board members, recusing themselves from participation in discussions in which they have financial issue. Angela Wood-Zuzevich of the Rockford Area Family Violence Prevention Collaborative is the other project director representative and will join the board at its spring meeting.

Susan Nall Bales, Executive Director of the Benton Foundation also joined the Board of Directors. Ms. Bales brings to the board a wealth of knowledge and experience in communications and media relations. She is currently involved in working with a variety of not-for-profit organizations in media advocacy and policy development.

#### **Preparing for Implementation**

The National Collaborative Board of Directors examined the National Collaborative's original vision and mission to ensure that the NFCVP remained consistent with the direction of local collaboratives as they move to implementation. Board members reaffirmed support of the National Collaborative's mission, gave preliminary support to the selection of initial target audiences for the National Collaborative message, developed operational goals for the implementation year, examined its interest in involving youth and charged national office staff to restructure board committees and staff to support implementation. They also began forays into formalizing the partnerships

with local collaboratives, examined media framing of violence, and approved the first report from the national evaluator.

### **Mission consistency**

The mission of the National Collaborative on Violence prevention is to address violence and its related problems in a coordinated way, and to nurture a violence prevention movement through advocacy, public awareness, and a focus on prevention. Board members continued to embrace this mission as one which captures the philosophy underlying the establishment of the National Collaborative. But they had differing opinions regarding the scope of NFCVP involvement in a national violence prevention movement and the extent to which the National Collaborative's national agenda should be driven by the work of the lessons of the local collaboratives. After much lively discussion, Board members decided that the National Collaborative should play an active, convening role in the national violence prevention movement by hosting meetings, forums and seminars on violence issues. Lessons from the local collaboratives should influence, rather than dictate, our active involvement in the national movement and any policy positions the National Collaborative might develop.

### **Target Audience**

Board members felt that the National Collaborative should be assertive in disseminating the lessons from the local collaborative experience to a wider audience. They held that there were a number of prospective audiences for the messages of the National Collaborative, including the philanthropic community, the general public, federal, state and local government and the general violence prevention field. Members decided that since the Collaborative is well placed to do so, special emphasis should be directed to reaching the larger philanthropic community with lessons from our collaborative experience. It was felt that the philanthropic community would benefit greatly from understanding the connection between community building and violence prevention.

## **Implementation Goals**

To support the local collaboratives during implementation and to begin work on the national front, the National Collaborative Board of Directors developed the following goals to guide the initiative during the two year implementation period:

- build strong local collaboratives
- conduct outreach and education to the philanthropic community
- widely disseminate lessons learned from this process
- become an active part in the national violence prevention movement

The Board committed itself to extending the life of the NFCVP to at least two years beyond the implementation period. Board members also committed the NFCVP to provide support to local collaboratives during this extended period, although the nature of this support was not decided. The new goals and time commitment reflect the National Collaborative's continuing realization that violence prevention work through collaboration is hard, that local collaboratives will experience some difficulties as they make the transition from planning to implementation, and that the actual work of the collaboratives needs to occur over a longer term to be effective. The new goals also reflect the desire of board members to form closer ties with local collaboratives and to play a more active role in the national agenda.

## **Youth Involvement**

The Center on Adult-Youth Partnerships, a technical assistance group based in Hampton, VA, led National Collaborative board members through a series of exercises to determine why and how the National Collaborative could involve youth in its decisionmaking processes. In their preliminary survey of board members, the Center found that there was consensus regarding the involvement of youth in national activities, but Board members were divided in their opinions about youth involvement on the National Board. Some members felt that youth should be included as full board members to the National Collaborative; others felt that youth should serve in an advisory capacity; still others felt that youth should serve on local collaborative boards, but questioned their

role at the national collaborative level. Board members were also divided in their opinions on the age of youth to be involved. Based upon the session, the Center posed four options for youth involvement on the National Collaborative Board of Directors. A subcommittee was developed to consider the pros and cons of each option and bring a recommendation to the full Board in its spring meeting.

### **Restructured Board Committees**

To support the new goals and the needs of the local collaboratives, the committees of the National Board have been restructured as follows:

*Local Collaborative Partnership* - combines evaluation, technical assistance and program development and program policy functions.

*Philanthropic outreach and education* - works to increase understanding and participation in violence prevention by the philanthropic community

*Public Education and Communication* - works on message development, dissemination and connection to the wider violence prevention field

*Fundraising and Finance* - develops and monitors fiscal strategy

Complete descriptions of these committees are attached in the Appendix.

### **Race and Violence in the Media**

In its ongoing plans to understand the connection between media framing and public perceptions of violence the Public Education and Communications Committee held two educational sessions. The first session was organized by the Advocacy Institute and presented the work of the Berkeley Media Center. This group is currently working with the Pacific Center on Violence Prevention to develop effective media strategies. Primary messages emerging from this session were that media advocacy should be integrated into the early work of violence prevention collaboratives, media advocacy should be connected to public policy strategies, and that violence has become a code word for race and as such reinforces negative stereotypes of people of color, particularly African Americans.



Implications of this latter message included the general public's dismissal of African Americans as spokespersons for violence prevention.

The second meeting, held in December, was an open meeting on "Violence and the Media" to which national pollsters were invited as panelists. Panelists provided information to collaborative members regarding the public's perception of violence and its receptivity to a prevention message. Pollsters reported that violence remains one of the top concerns of Americans. They noted, however, that Americans did understand to some extent the complexity of violence issues and were receptive to messages about prevention. They stressed that these messages should be connected to real concepts and prevention ideas and solutions, not masked in professional jargon. The meeting was planned in conjunction with a cluster meetings to allow representatives from local collaboratives to participate.

### **Partnering with Local Collaboratives**

Several partnership issues were raised by the community foundation representatives to the National Collaborative Board. These included the amount of programmatic time and resources expended upon local collaboratives by community foundations, the tensions in the grantee-partner relationship between the local and National Collaboratives, and the amount of involvement the National Collaborative should have in local issues. A committee composed of community foundation representatives, National Collaborative board members and national office staff was convened to examine partnership issues and draft an agreement which will outline the expectations the National and local collaboratives have of each other.

### **The National Evaluation**

The Board of Directors approved the report submitted to the National Collaborative by national evaluator, Debra Rog of Vanderbilt's Center for Policy Studies. Dr. Rog's report traced the history of the National Collaborative, examined major decisions, reported on

the impact of the program on local collaboratives, and noted the Collaborative's accomplishments thus far. Dr. Rog's report covered the period from inception of the National Collaborative in 1993 to midway through the planning phase in 1996. The executive summary of this report is attached.

#### **IV. FUTURE ACTIVITIES**

During the next 6 months the National Collaborative will continue to support the implementation activities of local collaboratives. Our national conference to be held from February 12-14 will showcase the national technical assistance bank, feature the work in progress of local collaboratives and officially kick off our implementation phase. The National Collaborative Board will continue its work to support the local efforts and to begin to connect our effort to the larger violence prevention community.

## **APPENDIX ONE**

### **LOCAL COLLABORATIVE FACT SHEETS**

## **APPENDIX TWO**

### **NATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDERS**

## **APPENDIX THREE**

### **CROSS SITE EVALUATION EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND LOCAL COLLABORATIVES' PROPOSED ACTIVITIES**

## **APPENDIX FOUR**

### **NFCVP COMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS**

## **APPENDIX FIVE**

### **NATIONAL EVALUATION EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

PROPERTY OF  
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000