

ASSETS FOR YOUTH WORKGROUP
MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 23, 2004

Virginia National Bank
12:00pm-1:30pm

Members Present:

Lee Davis
Kathy Dowd
Nikki Evans-Bowles
Sibley Johns
Heather Kellams
Relda Manuel
Tim Sinatra
Kala Somerville
Shannon Worrell

Staff Present:

Saphira Baker
Gretchen Ellis
Linda Rahman

Handouts

Youth Involvement Committee Report

I. Welcome/Introductions – S. Baker

S. Baker called the meeting to order, welcomed participants, and thanked them for attending. As W. Lawrence is not able to attend, S. Baker will be facilitating in her place. Members introduced themselves and the agency they were affiliated with. A re-cap of December meeting/action steps was given.

- Confirmation of our charge to build a plan to increase access to local community services for hard to serve youth
- We honed our vision.
- Discussed youth involvement, methods and tasked a sub-group to design an inquiry process to help understand why “at risk” youth are not more involved.
- We had a dialog on desired outcomes for increased parent involvement and noted that whether we can develop regional strategies for Parent involvement is still a question;
- We discussed the need for resources to conduct a student led focus group or survey process
- Charted our future with a general work plan
- Discussed coordination of existing services in its current state

II. Report back from Asset Mapping/School Survey Sub-group

G. Ellis reported that the sub-committee met to develop recommendations for how to elicit middle and high school youth input and involvement in the planning process for increasing access to productive activities. The committee recommends recruitment and training of a group of local middle and high school age youth to plan for and conduct focus groups of representative students in the schools, in existing program and in neighborhoods. There would be 2 youths from each area high and middle school for a total of 24 youths for the focus groups. They would be recruited and trained over Spring Break and the focus groups would be conducted in May and June. The focus groups would actively involve youths who would normally not be involved and a graduate student intern with experience both in working with youth and conducting focus groups would be hired to help run the focus groups. Recruiting will begin next month. Of the three options previously reviewed, the sub-committee felt that none of the proposals were current with our plan. G. Ellis stated the committee felt we did not have the time to commit to Community Youth Mapping. An in-school survey presented too many barriers and on-site survey would exclude the children we need to reach the most.

Anticipated time frame:

- February, 2004
 - Recruit and select coordinator (5 hours)
 - Introduce project to school and program staff (10 hours)
 - Recruit students (24 hours)

- March, 2004
 - Complete student recruitment (8 hours)
 - Design student training curriculum (20 hours)
 - Conduct student orientation (2 hours)
 - Schedule focus groups (10 hours)

- April, 2004
 - Conduct student orientation (20 hours)
 - Conduct and record 5 focus groups (20 hours)

- May, 2004
 - Conduct and record 10 focus groups (20 hours)

- June, 2004
 - Conduct and record 5 focus groups (20 hours)
 - Compile report with results of focus groups (20 hours)

Tentative Budget:

- Stipend to students: 24 x \$100 = \$2,400
- Graduate student intern: 160 hours @ \$12/hour + \$380 (expenses) = \$2,300
- TeensGive: \$5,000
- Materials: \$300

Total \$10,000

G. Ellis reported she had been contacted by a donor (private donation) interested in funding this project but could not comment further at this time.

H. Kellams commented this project would be led by youth and supervised by a small team from this workgroup. The first thing we would need are parents. There was additional discussion regarding receiving permission from parents to conduct the survey, children who would be missed due to lack of parental permission and possible barriers we would find with the schools. K. Dowd and L. Davis will talk to the schools regarding barriers. Members discussed challenges in getting the right kids for the focus groups, methods of selecting them, age levels, amount of time out of the school day and which schools to involve. S. Baker stated the logistics are not hammered down and asked if the group was willing to work on the logistics. H. Kellams agreed they were. S. Baker inquired if the committee was ready to move for approval (adopt as is) or revision? L. Davis felt we needed more details on the logistics before approving. S. Baker made the motion to approve in concept. All members unanimously agreed. H. Kellams stated the sub-committee needed all the help they could receive, as the dates are right around the corner. N. Bowles agreed to help. G. Ellis asked members of the group to please email her recommendations on kids and schools to involve.

III. Out-of-school time program capacity and need – S. Baker

Collection/discussion of estimated needs and numbers.

S. Baker collected completed surveys and distributed blank surveys to be completed. There was a discussion regarding the need for a standard of which kids we are targeting, the question of including students who have been expelled, including summer or academic year only. There was a consensus among the committee to stick to academic year only and to use this survey to get a “ball park” estimate of our capacity as a community to serve young people currently.

IV. Review of Work Group Documents – G. Ellis

a. Charter:

The members discussed the draft charter for the Youth Assets Work Group. The committee felt issues to be addressed are:

- Improving communication between schools and service providers
- Improve access to communication
- Improve service through coordination
- Maximize resources

b. Work Plan – will be on next month’s agenda to verify dates and activities.

c. Name:

The Work Group agreed to keep Assets for Youth and add on a “tag” line. Suggestions for “tag” lines should be emailed to S. Baker, but the one discussed at the meeting was: *“increasing access to positive activities for youth.”*

V. How can we improve local coordination of existing services/after school resources to serve students more effectively? – S. Baker

S. Baker asked the committee to write down strategies that have worked to coordinate current youth programs (to increase access/efficiency) and areas where committee members would like to see changed. Index cards were distributed for comments and specific initiatives the work group might undertake together.

Comments included:

What works?

- Music Resource has had success by offering internship credit to youth, with an on-site curriculum where students are able to learn about a career in the music industry, increase knowledge on vocal techniques, instruments, performances and career guidance in pursuing a music career.
- The Light House has internships, work shops and individual studies for students.
- Internships help; guidance counselors learn about our programs due to internships, yet these are not generally targeted at the youth we seek to reach.
- Boys and Girls clubs have coordinated with local schools in referrals, transportation, and information to support both academics and after school program outcomes.
- The programs that have a relatively simple “application” or “registration” are easier to access.
- Internships, academic credit, word of mouth, teacher/guidance counselors’ involvement.
- Some strong collaboration models within schools and community on which to build.
- Community support and awareness of needs is high.
- Schools/community agencies writing grants collaboratively for implementation of programs – TeensGive in city schools and some county schools.
- People interested in serve learning are working together.
- Coordination has worked well when a school contact believes in a program and is willing to spend his/her time recruiting students for the program.
- Youth Guide is a good resource.
- Specific teachers/administrators have knowledge of most programs, yet this is not a common part of the teacher orientation.
- Kids recruit friends.

- Programs that are well known in the community and State are used more often; there is recognition of the program by school staff and parents.
- Some school personnel/agency staff are very involved and knowledgeable about after-school programs for youth.

What would you like to see changed?

- Giving kids opportunities to earn academic credits in after-school programs – this would be a good motivator for some kids.
- More widespread information to/from schools about community resources.
- Agencies may not know what’s going on in schools resulting in duplication, poor scheduling..
- Kids are left out because they are not tapped by schools for programs.
- Where does UVA fit in this?
- City school websites advertising programs for youth.
- Regular lunch chats among staff.
- Transportation with schools who are one mile and more has become a challenge to serve more youth.
- I don’t think there is a tremendous level of coordination between agencies. Where does a new agency leader learn about area programs?
- Lack of institutionalized place for information sharing.
- Parents fear/lack of communication, resources to connect parents
- Better coordination of information between recipients and service providers, service providers and schools, service providers and community.
- Improved collaboration of efforts to reduce duplication.
- Increase availability of information on programs.
- Provide transportation to programs.
- Boys & Girls club in Esmont.
- Programs that have income-based fees or scholarships.
- Need a calendar, list, document or other institutionalized means of knowing about all of our programs in the schools.
- Piedmont Council for the Arts in very lame in terms of youth stuff.
- Neighborhood association/involvement awareness
- There is a problem with kids having conflicts on one day (soccer practice, big sibling, TeensGive obligations) and then nothing the next day. Contact info among programs is important to resolve conflicts. Similarly coach in one sport not having info on other sports (registration dates, forms, etc.)
- Advertisement or outreach for lesser known programs so that parents, teachers, guidance counselors, etc. know what’s out there. Clear “referral” process so any of the adults listed above can make the kid known to the program.
- Opportunities for informal exchange of information on a quarterly basis. Possibly a networking lunch with school personnel and service agencies.
- Create events throughout the year so kids can build relationships with people.
- Giving agencies a 5-minute spotlight to show what they do, kiosk/computer stations were people could get information on line.

VI. Next Steps – S. Baker

S. Baker stated at the next meeting we would talk about the reality of our ideas, and which ones we might be able to implement with current resources, and which might be more ambitious -- needing additional planning or resources. S. Johns suggested waiting for the focus groups to answer these questions. S. Baker agreed that -- for the purposes of this clarifying improvements we could make related to coordination -- we should focus on those recommendations geared at professionals and teachers. Youth will be able to speak to many of the other ideas. K. Somerville suggested focusing on two things; 1) how to disseminate information between schools, kids and parents and 2) find out things kids are interested in. H. Kellams suggested developing strategies to know what other agencies do. S. Johns, S. Worrell and K. Somerville volunteered to work with S. Baker on the cards turned in with coordination strategies that have worked and not worked.

- ◆ **THE NEXT MEETING OF THE ASSETS FOR YOUTH WORKGROUP WILL BE AT 12:00PM ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13TH, VIRGINIA NATIONAL BANK BOARDROOM, 2ND LEVEL.**
- ◆ **THE NEXT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING WILL BE FEBRUARY 3RD AT 2:30PM AT BUFORD AND FEBRUARY 11TH AT 9:15AM AT BUFORD.**