

Family & Youth Development Advisory Team
June 5, 2003
Meeting Minutes

Attending: Kathy Jablonski, Nancy Berry, Ann Dolloff, Catherine Violette, Thom Linehan, Claudia Boozer-Blasco, Charlene Baxter, Wendy Brock.

This meeting was help by PictureTel at four sites: Taylor Hall, Grafton County, Sullivan County and Rockingham County.

Item: Needs Assessment and Plan of Work Process

Wendy asked Catherine if there were any comments or observations she had from the in service on qualitative research presented the day prior to this meeting. Catherine indicated the in service was well received and comments were numerous about the content, although these did not mention the POW needs assessment process directly. One observation of relevance to our decisions is the importance of deciding on the questions to be answered first, before deciding on the process to be used. Will Family & Youth Development conduct a joint needs assessment process? How will that relate to the organizational process being led by Nancy Franz? Members urged that there be consistency in the counties with regards to processes used. Suggestions were to keep the process simple, stick to a realistic time frame, and have this structure in place so it is accomplished in January and February 2004. Utilize the county data notebooks that are already in place and add to these so staff have information in one place. Look at secondary data sources and at the organization's strategic plan. Should we be orchestrating a process for which the specialists provide leadership and coordination? Suggestion made to back up a step from assigning specialists to certain topic or discipline areas since that is making an assumption that certain areas will be in the plan of work.

Conclusion: Let us learn more about what Nancy Franz is proposing, then develop program area sections that are compatible. Decide who will frame the questions. The members recommended that the specialists not frame the questions since that is not a fair request to them for something that is to be program-wide. Nancy recommended using the success of Sullivan County's needs assessment in 1999 during which they asked broad questions to assess overall county needs. Nancy indicated that three other counties had mirrored their process as well. The suggestion was made to check in with each county regarding what kind of process they used in 1999 and to ask what they liked and would recommend vs. did not like and would not recommend from these processes.

Members also requested and reiterated the need for training for Advisory Councils in the near future, including "what is the role of the county advisory council?" in the needs assessment process.

Overall, the program areas should determine internally the functions of a needs assessment, what is it designed to do? Review and be familiar with county demographics, county data, and topics of interest to county residents. Ask specialists to develop situation and trends statements and to update status of existing programs, including evaluation and

impact data. Utilize primary and secondary data sources. Go to university faculty for assistance on situation and trends, and for analysis of needs assessment information.

At the county level, ask broad questions, such as “what is going on in _____ County?”, and “what is it like for a family? – a grower? – a volunteer? – a small business?”

Discussion ensued about need to retrain and retool current staff if needs and overall program direction change. What is the direction we will get from leadership – and especially what about the need for consistency for a process to be conducted in each county? Charlene and Wendy will follow up with Nancy Franz regarding these ideas and suggestions. Members felt there have been ample discussions about the needs assessment process and we need now to just get on with it!

Item: Satellite Series

The satellite series on Cultural Perspectives on Parenting was discussed. Iowa State will offer this series of two conferences this fall. Charlotte has agreed to provide leadership and coordination in lieu of a Family Life Specialist. Thank you to Charlotte for her consideration of this request. How should this be implemented in NH? What will the interest level be in the topic? The current recommendation is to utilize one site, preferably Manchester, since it is anticipated that interest may be less than with the Adolescent series last year.

Item: In services for the upcoming year

Wendy and Charlene shared that specialists had recommended that in service offerings be scaled back in the coming year to allocate sufficient time for conducting a needs assessment process for the next plan of work. It makes sense to redirect some of the time otherwise spent attending in services and planning in services on this other very important function. We continue to endorse conferences and professional development activities in addition to UNHCE in services. Specialists will be asked to be aware of such opportunities that staff may have an interest in and to share such information whenever they learn of it.

Item: UNH Foundation

Beverly Shadley is our new contact at the UNH Foundation. She will work with program areas to identify three high priority program focus areas that should generate donor interest. Bev wants to help each program area generate a potential donor list and she is working with program leaders to develop a process for this. Bev’s interest is to generate donors at the \$25,000 and higher potential for endowments. Question to think about is “who is out there that has a passion for these types of programs and this organization?” This process will be ongoing and Wendy and Charlene are working with Bev to develop high priority program case statements and potential donors lists. Team members were encouraged to provide feedback on both these topics.

Item: Update on budget

Information on the budget remains uncertain. There will be retirements, separation incentives, and other deficit reduction strategies in place. It was suggested to propose an

in service on “supporting colleagues in times of change.” More information will be shared regarding budget issues as soon as it becomes available.

Item: PictureTel

Discussion was held on how to generate more support and revenue for PicTel units in the counties. Nancy commented that Sullivan County Commissioners were asking many questions about the self-supporting nature of the technology. It doesn't appear to have the potential to generate enough revenue and cost savings to pay for itself, and that is one of the concerns they have spoken about. Should we be representing it to counties in this way? How can we better market the technology to get more users? Schools, government agencies, police and fire agencies, and others are prime candidates for using this programming. County Commissioners in Sullivan County approved the funding for one more year. Nancy reported that Dave Foote is developing marketing materials to support use of PicTel. Suggestion was made to use testimonials in the brochure from satisfied customers – like Ray Burton and other county commissioners. Other ideas for using PicTel were discussed – food safety training like SAFE for school and nursing home food service personnel. The idea will be to get more people to use it and experience the benefits of programming using PicTel. Concerns regarding use after business hours and the associated costs were raised again by team members.

In services for staff on using PicTel are needed – including walking through the start up procedures, troubleshooting if problems occur during a program; and also training in how to have successful meetings, trainings and in services on PicTel, which is the content piece are both needed. Team members were urged to reply to the on line survey from ITDE as these were items included in the survey.

Next meetings are September 10, 1:30 – 4:00 on PicTel and December 5, 9 – noon, also using PicTel.

Minutes recorded by Charlene Baxter

FY Dev Adv. Team 06 05 03