

Answers to questions received during the Planning for Sustainability from the Outset Webinar

1) Where does the WI MHA receive funding?

State of WI/Dept. of Health Services (mental health block grant funds)
GLS grant (through 5/31/10)
WI Dept. of Public InstruAction (in the past, not currently—this was Safe and Drug Free Schools and Community Funds)
Charles E. Kubly Foundation (Milwaukee-based foundation focusing on depression education/suicide prevention)
Some other small grants

2) How did you measure outcomes from the money you distributed?

In addition to the cross site evaluation we are tracking suicide and self-injury data using public health statistics. Our youth suicide rates have decreased significantly since the grant began. We also required all of our grantees to participate in local administration of the Youth Risk Behavior Survey—Wisconsin has the ability to collect and analyze data by school district. These results are not yet available. We also used what we called the Community Infrastructure Survey to assess changes in knowledge, attitudes and relationships over time. The final report on this is being completed and we can share with those who would like to see it once its done. All sites also developed workplans and we required them to provide progress reports on this over time. This was primarily handled through our project mentors who did site visits on a regular basis.

3) What was the size of the GLS sub grants? All the same or customized for projects proposed goal?

The initial awards were \$19,500 in year one; \$15,000 in year two and \$10,000 in year three. They were not customized initially. If sites had carryover funds (if they did not utilize all the funds allocated in one year) they could request to carry over all or part of these and decisions about this were on a site by site basis. As I mentioned our priority in year two was to ensure that local coordinators could allocate at least .25FTE to this work. Our priority in year 3 was activities around sustainability. In retrospect I would probably reduce the size of the initial grants to \$10-12,000, and then reduce from there. Most of our sites had trouble spending \$15,000/yr. Of course, a lot depends upon the scope of what you want grantees to do. You can review our RFP to see what was expected of sites. Remember that initially we did not know what the cross-site evaluation requirements would consist of and we did not want to undercapitalize the projects so this is clearly a case where hindsight is 20/20.

4) Were grantees required to provide matching funds?

No. We asked them to include this information in the RFP but they were not scored based on this. Most were provided significant in-kind contributions, usually through the donated time of the local coordinator. Others did have specific funds to match. However, for a developmental program I would be reluctant to require matching funds from day one. As you can see, we reduced the size of the grants over time, the implication being that they would need to find other resources to replace the grant funds over time.

5) Where there a basic set of goals for sub-grantee to meet? (relates to the amount of centralized direction of the program)

Again, see the RFP for what was expected of grantees. Consistent with our state strategy, each community needed to identify the particular programs or activities they would undertake. The key requirements were to form (if they did not already have) a broad-based local coalition, develop workplans with these coalitions, participate in all-site teleconferences and meetings, and work with their mentor. As noted, the role of the mentors was critical for both guiding coalitions and monitoring their progress on a

regular basis. To the degree there was centralized direction it was to ensure that whatever coalitions were doing it was consistent with best or evidence-based practices.

6) Do you know how many folks were trained as gatekeepers?

We required all our local coordinators (9) to be trained in QPR at the start of the grant. Some coalitions already had other people who were trained. We have done some QPR T.O.T.s during the course of the grant and I anticipate by the end of May we will have trained 60-70 trainers. However, our survivors group has also trained a number of people, so the total trainers in WI is more than this. The issue has been getting trainers to train. We have implemented teleconferences as a way to provide support to people who have been trained and address problems they may have encountered. We encourage people to co-train with someone experience initially so they can get comfortable. Some states have people sign contracts about training or have monetary incentives tied to doing follow-up trainings.

7) Were grantees required to submit reports? IF so, how frequent.

As noted we were monitoring sites regularly (mentors visited every 4-6 weeks during the first year and then as needed after that). We also had teleconferences every month the first year and every other month after that. So that is how we monitored them. They were required to submit evaluation data for both the cross-site and local evaluation. And they needed to submit a progress report on their work plan each year.

8) Were efforts duplicated in other parts of the state because they proved so successful?

That is happening in a variety of ways. A number of the counties that participated in our northern regional training having been putting together coalitions. One of them had a QPR T.O.T. recently. After one successful single day summit, another county decided to do that in their area. I consulted with one community that had had two recent youth suicides and was able to present our Components of Suicide Prevention training and they selected a number of interventions to pursue. Some of this is not so much duplication as it is our ability to provide information and resources based on the work we have done.

9) Do you have the resources to help people find training they need?

If you're talking about financial resources, not now. That is one of the big things we lost with not getting refunded through GLS. But we are able to refer people to training resources and we can continue to provide the QPR T.O.T.s ourselves.