

ASSETS FOR YOUTH WORKGROUP
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 12, 2004

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

Members Present:

Lee Davis
Kathy Dowd
Heather Kellams
Amy Smith
Kala Somerville
Bob Taibbi

Handouts

Agenda
October 8, 2004 Minutes
Feedback from Youth Leaders
Level 3 Recommendation
Summary of Web Survey of AFY Members

Staff Present:

Saphira Baker
Gretchen Ellis
Linda Rahman
Blair Cantfil

I. Welcome/Introductions

S. Baker called the meeting to order, welcomed participants, and thanked them for attending. She stated that the Assets for Youth workgroup would report to the Commission on Children and Families at their January 5, 2005 meeting. She noted that the goal for today is to make sure the workgroup is comfortable with the final report and its contents. She updated the work group on the results of the CCF Retreat, and advised that one recommendation that came from the retreat was for workgroups to be very specific and for them to ask for one or two things from the Council and Board if policy changes were needed. S. Baker stated that a priority today would be for the workgroup to pull out two things from their recommendations that need action from the City and County. She advised that if they had not had time to edit the report, they could take a week to review the specific text and give her their feedback via email

II. Feedback from Youth on Recommendations

S. Baker stated that, at the last meeting, members looked at the *Youth Voices* report and there was a general acceptance/approval of the report. Members were asked to contact the youth for their feedback on the recommendations to confirm/inform the directions the work group was proposing.

Members reported that the youth leaders believed strongly in recommendations #1 and #4, and that they should be prioritized. #1 was seen as the most important in how after school programs are developed and run, given that the need for youth input and development is critical on all stages of planning. The youth leaders understood why #4 needed further study but emphasized the need for some sort of teen facility and also noted that coming up with an increase in jobs would be critical before summer, 2005. K. Somerville asked for clarification on exactly what the teens want in a "teen center". Members discussed what the teens had originally requested (i.e., soda bar, music, dancing, and a multitude of different things). S. Baker stated that the teen center concept was not currently a top priority in the work group's report to the Commission and the work group may want to think about that and move it closer to the top. H. Boyd requested that the report should push for transportation.

III. Report Recommendations

a. Review of Recommendations; approval/additional information:

- **Missing information from SurveyMonkey study?**
- **New information on the promotional campaign costs**
- **Need to check on legality of not charging for student events.**

S. Baker stated that CCF was still working to verify the number of slots available for after school activities and was not sure if the City Rec numbers were included. She asked if everyone was confident of the results, or had any questions regarding the draft report or SurveyMonkey study. Members had no edits or comments.

S. Baker stated that in regards to the Promotional Campaign, she had a conversation with Pam Fitzgerald with the Ivy Group on ideas to get kids involved. She stated that Ms. Fitzgerald was most excited about radio and school newspaper outreach. She advised S. Baker to establish commercial partners who would help access radio and TV. S. Baker stated that if we proceeded with the website, it would be a good place to advertise what is going on after school. In terms of doing it professionally, P. Fitzgerald had suggested getting someone to develop a marketing strategy, finding a commercial partner, and securing pro bono air and print time. Otherwise, the cost would be approximately \$10,000-\$30,000, depending on our needs. S. Baker inquired from the members their thoughts about whether we should make the promotional campaign a top priority.

Members discussed the concern over space if all the kids took advantage of local programs and it was noted that, at this time, all City-County programs are not at capacity. Members also discussed whether this group would be available for grants and what the timing would be for them. It was mentioned that advertisements should refer kids to the website and not to a phone number. S. Baker stated that youth may not use the website, but parents will. G. Ellis noted that the legal issue of not charging for admission at school events still needs to be looked into. S. Baker briefly discussed the revisions that were made to the report. She advised that things had been grouped together so there was a bigger “bang”; incentives and support of the teen center/facility were under *Improving Youth Engagement*; and they expanded and re-organized recommended after-school activities. S. Baker also stated that program members may want to finesse the “weekend hours” piece and the summer opportunities piece was now listed under *Coordination* because it was the one area that was done at the last minute and requires people who are knowledgeable.

S. Baker also stated that more national context was added to the report and that she had pulled the outcomes from the recommendations into the text to clarify what the work group was asking for. S. Baker requested that work group members look at the report and give her feedback by November 30th. G. Ellis stated that it would be most helpful, if members had significant changes, to give it to CCF in a hard copy but if there were just a few changes, it could be emailed. S. Baker stated that in our minutes from the last meeting we identified potential audiences. The list consisted of:

1. The youth involved with the project
2. Parents
3. Schools Liaisons and Principals
4. The City and County School Boards
5. The City Council and County Board of Supervisors
6. The PTO Council and presidents
7. The Donors Round Table
8. Church Councils (city and county)

Members revised the list to include PTO Council Representatives, each work group organization (who will need 10-15 copies of the report to send out), the majority of after-school programs, and the Housing

Authority. S. Baker agreed to send the work group members a draft letter so they will be able to send their own reports out.

IV. Priority for Action: What recommendation(s) requires action from City/County

Members were asked to review the recommendations and decide on two strategies that would go before the City Council and County Board of Supervisors in addition to two strategies that would go before the school boards. Strategies that would require approval by Council and Board would be brought to them first before presenting to City/County School boards.

The members voted on the following top recommendations to present to the City Council and County Board of Supervisors:

Recommendation #1, **1.4 Engage youth leaders in researching the feasibility of establishing teen facilities (centers) in new or existing buildings. Engage youth in conducting and informing the study and designing any resulting initiatives. Secure funding for project.** Members discussed staying away from the wording “teen center” and to recommend establishing a center in each of the communities vs. only having one. Members would also like to see the Council and Board involve the youth in naming the centers and to ask the Council and Board for strategies to identify barriers for a successful center.

Recommendation #2, **3.2 Plan a marketing campaign to engage youth in community programming and planning. Develop and distribute promotional campaign materials to media outlets that youth and parents use.**

Recommendation #3, **4.1 Conduct a market study for an after-school bus line to address transportation barriers.**

The members voted on the following top two recommendations to present to the City and County School Boards:

Recommendation #1, **2.1 and 2.2 (merge into one recommendation) Increase on-site extracurricular activities at County middle schools, particularly Walton and Henley and keep school gyms and computer labs open for student’s use during evenings, weekends, and summers. Expand the hours of operation for public swimming pools.** Members added addressing transportation issues to this recommendation.

The members voted on the following top recommendations for the work group to accomplish:

Recommendation # **1.1, Encourage youth programs to provide structured opportunities for youth engagement, program ownership, and input through initiatives such as:**

- **Task-oriented youth committees**
- **Periodic youth focus groups**
- **Youth membership on organization boards**
- **Regular surveys of youth**

Recommendation # **1.2, Establish incentives for youth programs at schools and in the community that demonstrate youth engagement and leadership.**

Recommendation # **1.3, Create and identify effective training materials and resources to help programs involve youth in program design, governance, marketing and outreach, evaluation, and staff training. Distribute training information to youth programs through seminars, website resources, and “tip sheets”.**

Members discussed the next step for the work group and the implementation of the report recommendations:

- Should an implementation group be formed?
- Should the Assets For Youth work group take on the responsibilities themselves?
- Should the work group not meet as a group but each take pieces of the recommendations to work on?

Members agreed that if they did not work as a group, the impact would be lost and they did not want to lose the rest of the recommendations, especially number #1, *Encouraging youth programs to provide structured opportunities for youth engagement, program ownership and input through initiatives.*

S. Baker asked the members what exactly they were asking the City Council/County Board of Supervisors for? Members agreed they were asking for funds to:

- Study recommendation # 1.4, and
- To engage youth in this study

Members discussed the possibility of a one-stop service provider with teen oriented activities by taking existing programs and housing all of them in one place. They also discussed providing a separate model for the City and the County; showing them what it would look like, what all it would have, and where it should be located. The members agreed the name should be changed and how we defined it. S. Baker stated she would rework that section and distribute it to the group for their advice.

V. Next Steps

- Members will review the report and advise CCF staff of any edits.
- The report will be released at Commission meeting on January 5, 2005.
- All Assets for Youth work group members are invited to attend the Commission meeting.
- Determine a date to meet with City Council and County Board of Supervisors.

Meeting adjourned.