

7

BUILDING BETTER BEGINNINGS: A TOOLKIT

Working with Government and Other Funders



Better Beginnings, Better Futures

An effective, affordable community project for promoting positive child development

© Hayward, K., Loomis, C., Nelson, G., Pancer, M., & Peters, R. (2011).
A Toolkit for Building Better Beginnings and Better Futures. Kingston, ON:
Better Beginnings, Better Futures Research Coordination Unit.

Design
Stéphane Gibelin

The Research Coordination Unit gratefully acknowledges the financial support from the Max Bell Foundation. This report reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the funders.

We also acknowledge the dedication of the Site Researchers whose diligence and hard work have made this longitudinal research possible.

We also extend our gratitude to the families, youth, and teachers who have participated in the research over the past 20 years.

Permission is hereby granted by *Better Beginnings, Better Futures*, Research Coordination Unit, Queen's University, to reproduce this document for non-profit and educational purposes.

www.bbbf.ca

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Learning Objectives	1
---------------------------	---

APPROACH

The Working Relationship between the Program Sites and the Government	4
An overview	4
Proposal development phase	4
Planning phase	5
Demonstration phase	6
Sustainability phase	8
The role of government in the development and implementation of the <i>Better Beginnings</i> program model	8
Working with Funders	9
An overview	9
Additional programs provided by other funding sources	9
Work and resources required	10

CHALLENGES

Challenges of Working with Government and Other Funders and Strategies to Address Them	11
Limited time to engage residents during program planning and development	12
Competing demands: Balancing government/funder requirements and community needs	13
Lack of direction and support	13
Time and resources devoted to accountability	14
Long-term funding	14

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Guiding Principles for Working with Government and Funders	18
Implementation/Evaluation Checklist	19

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Abstracts and Other Resources	ii
---	----

INTRODUCTION



LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- 1. Work involved**
Learn about the work involved in working with government representatives and funders at various stages from start-up through sustainability.
- 2. Challenges**
Understand and appreciate the challenges of working with government and other funders.
- 3. Strategies**
Be aware of strategies to deal with potential challenges and issues related to working with government and other funders.
- 4. Guiding principles**
Know the guiding principles in working with government and other funders.

APPROACH



In this section we discuss the relationship between the Ontario Government (i.e., the ministries providing financial support and direction) and the project sites during the different phases.¹ We also talk about how the project worked with other funders — the programs they were able to offer by having these additional funds, as well as the work and resources that were required in securing this additional financial support.

¹The proposal development phase occurred in 1990, the planning phase from 1991-1993, the demonstration phase from 1993-1997, and sustainability occurred when the projects received sustained funding beginning in 1998.

THE WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROGRAM SITES AND THE GOVERNMENT

An overview

Government support was foundational to *Better Beginnings, Better Futures*. Our use of the term government throughout refers to the various provincial government ministries that provided financial support, constraints, and direction. As described in Chapter 1: History and Overview, the programs that stakeholders developed in their communities were funded by three provincial ministries: the Ontario Ministries of Community and Social Services, Education and Training, and Health. These ministries provided funds for developing a proposal to start a *Better Beginnings* program (i.e., seed grant) and the funds for planning, implementing, and delivering these programs during the Planning (1991-1993) and Demonstration (1993-1997) phases. Near the end of the demonstration phase the government made a decision to continue funding the projects. We refer to the phase after the demonstration period as the “sustainability” phase, as the projects were now receiving continuous, “sustained”, funding.

The government provided support to the program sites through two internal roles within the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS): the Project Design Coordinator and the Site Supervisor.

The Project Design Coordinator was responsible for ensuring that the program model recommended by *Better Beginnings, Better Futures* was implemented in the field; the Project Design Coordinator also had a Francophone assistant to ensure that there was satisfactory communication between government officials and the Francophone project sites. The Site Supervisor/Coordinator was responsible for working with each of the project sites to implement, administer, and financially monitor the programs. In addition, each program site was assigned a government representative as its contact with the government. A 15-member government committee also met regularly to monitor and support the project.

In this chapter we will discuss the relationship between the program sites and the government during each of the phases — proposal development, planning, demonstration, and sustainability, as seen largely through the perspective of the project sites. We also discuss how the project sites worked with other funders to secure additional financial support that allowed them to offer more programs outside of the mandated 4 to 8 age range.

Proposal development phase

The proposal development phase lasted approximately one year.² The relationship between sites and the government began when the government provided guidelines for applying for seed money. The seed money (\$5,000) received was to help the applicants cover some or all of the potential costs involved in developing a full proposal. First, there were four formal government Proposers’ Conferences in London, Toronto, Kingston, and Sault Ste. Marie in late March 1990. Interested applicants received a 52-page *Request for Proposals (RFP): Research Sites*. Applicants had to submit an initial letter of interest with a broad outline of what they would include in a full proposal to receive the \$5,000 seed grant. Successful applicants had to demonstrate that they were interested in working in partnership with others, and that the programs would be located in high risk communities. The RFP provided detailed information about how to develop a full proposal for those communities awarded seed money. The RFP included background information, the purpose of the *Better Beginnings* initiative, its goals, the program model and information on the research that would be involved. The *Better Beginnings* program model stipulated that:

- programs focus on families with children in a specific age range (e.g., 4 to 8 years);
- programs be high quality, comprehensive, integrated, multi-year, and universal;
- community members be involved in every aspect of program development;
- programs focus not just on the children and their families but on the communities in which they resided; and
- programs be clearly preventive in nature rather than providing treatment for problems that had already developed.

²The project sites had from March to June 1990 to develop their proposals; the government then used the remaining time in that year to review proposals and select the project sites.



Proposal development phase *cont'd*

Developing a proposal was the first step in the government's influence on program development at the project sites. The Ministries' guidelines for what to include in a proposal reportedly caused some of the site representatives to feel that the project was being defined by the government, rather than by the communities. Some sites reported on the perceived tension between adhering to the defined mandate in the Terms of Reference for the project and ensuring that community needs were being addressed. Some site representatives described their struggle to include all the required elements in their proposal to ensure a strong submission. Nonetheless, it does appear that the amount of control that the government exerted on the development of the proposals — outside of the guidelines that were provided — was limited.

The site program model developers and government hoped that community residents would be active participants in the proposal development process. At one of the three project sites there was sustained and vigorous effort to involve residents, resulting in much higher levels of participation than were found at the other two sites. Stakeholders felt that the relatively short time frame to do the proposal development work, the large amount of work required to be successful, and the need to involve multiple professionals from the beginning made it difficult to involve community residents as equal partners in this early stage of the project.

Once the proposals were submitted some sites also expressed some frustration with the amount of time it took to hear whether or not they were successful with their submissions, which was approximately double the amount of time sites were given to prepare their proposals. The long time in hearing back was also felt to affect the momentum at the sites in developing their programs.

It was a lot of work to put the proposals together, and the sites did report some frustration with the process, as described above. Sites also struggled, to greater and lesser degrees, with maintaining a balance between developing a program model that included the elements described in the *Better Beginnings* model and responding to the needs of the community as identified by its residents. The program sites did receive guidance from the government funders — but some stakeholders believed that the level of assistance fell short. Although the program sites did have contact with the government funders in the form of written guidelines and information, there was no personal contact between stakeholders at the sites and representatives from the government during the proposal development phase of the project. This was done deliberately in order for the government to be as objective as possible. Questions about the proposal development process were handled by the Ontario Prevention Clearinghouse. However, given the detailed nature of the RFP, there were few questions that arose.

Planning phase

Once the program sites received their funding, there was a Letter of Agreement put in place between the government committee and the sites. The development of the programs at each of the sites was lengthy. The government had hoped to have all sites up and running within one year of funding; however, this process took longer than anticipated. The government approved an additional year of funding to allow program sites one more year to develop and implement their programs. At one site program development took two years and an additional few months as they were delayed in hiring their program manager. After the programs were up and running, they set about the task of establishing a formal contract with the government. The contract took the form of a "Schedule A" — the actual program components and elements, and a "Schedule B" — a detailed budget. This contract was developed during the second year of the planning phase of the project (1991-1992); that is, the project sites were planning and developing their programs and putting this information together into the Schedules A and B.



Demonstration phase

The demonstration phase was approximately five years (1993 – 1998)³. It was during the early years of the demonstration phase — that is, when programs were being developed and initially implemented — that the government exerted the most influence or control over different aspects of the program models.

³Most programming began in September of 1993 with the 1993-94 school year; however, there were some smaller programs that ran prior to September 1993.



The tension between government influence and community control was evident in a number of areas:

Programs for children outside the mandated age group

The government stipulated that 85% of all funding in each of the project communities be directly focused on programs and activities for children within the specified 4-8 age range. However, the communities believed that there was a need to provide programs for children in other age groups as well. This was resolved, to some extent, by these communities seeking funding for such programs from sources outside of *Better Beginnings* (this is discussed in more detail in a later section).

The pace of program hiring and development

Communities also felt pressured by government deadlines to recruit neighbourhood participants, design programs, and hire staff. Sites felt rushed in this process — particularly at one site where they were delayed in hiring a Program Manager. The government responded to these pressures and an additional year of funding was granted to allow the sites two years, instead of one, to have programs planned and implemented. As well, in one of the three sites, this time period was extended, again, by several additional months. Despite the extensions provided by the government, this one site still felt pressured to have programs up and running by the deadlines imposed by the government; presumably this was because it took longer than anticipated to fill the Program Manager's position, which delayed their program planning.

Program staffing and operations

Government representatives made a number of specific program-related recommendations that sometimes caused discomfort for project members. For example, the government insisted on having one person fill a position called a Community Developer, rather than having community development be part of every staff member's job description. A second operational issue where government and site staff differed was on establishing salary levels for some staff positions. Some project personnel considered this to be overly intrusive in a domain that should have been under the project's control.

Disagreements between sites and government representatives were almost invariably worked out through

a process of negotiation, which left both sides reasonably satisfied despite the fact that there remained, at times, a residue of confusion or discontent.

Other examples of governmental influence on program development were evident. For example, at one site, the government suggested to the site, on several occasions, that more community participation was needed. They also recommended reducing the number of schools the project was working with. At a different site, the government wanted to see a more detailed description of how other agencies, organizations, and service providers would be involved in the project — and they rejected this site's plan to use purchase-of-

Demonstration phase *cont'd*

Program staffing and operations *cont'd*

service agreements to involve partners. The government also wanted the program to focus much more on the school-based programming and less on community development. And at another site the government wanted more emphasis on programs for children and parents in the government-specified age range, and insisted that they could not use the money to address the larger community.

In the early years of the demonstration phase the government also organized Round Tables and Quality Circles to provide learning opportunities for site representatives. The Round Tables provided the sites with a forum to share their experiences about project development, and were funded through the government's central budget. The Quality Circles were primarily about implementing the research, and were funded through the Research Coordination Unit (RCU). Participants in these Round Tables and Quality Circles included project staff, community residents, and various service providers who were partnering with the project sites.

After the contracts had been accepted at each of the sites, contact with the government representatives continued but was diminished. The project sites were responsible for implementing the program, as specified in their contract with the government. The Government Site Supervisor was responsible for ensuring that all the government requirements were met. The Government Site Supervisor visited each site at least once a year by herself, and once a year with the Project Design Coordinator and other members of the government committee. The members of the government committee

that visited the sites annually usually included one representative from each of the three funding Ministries. As well, each program site was required to submit an annual report to the government committee that included information on its finances as well as its progress in the previous year. This level of contact continued throughout the demonstration phase.

Nearing the end of the demonstration phase, the project sites were not sure if funding was going to continue, which caused considerable stress. Because of this concern, project sites initiated and sustained increased contact in search of more concrete information about whether the ministries would continue to fund the projects after the demonstration phase ended. In the last year of the demonstration phase, senior ranking government officials met with *Better Beginnings* project sites to learn more about them. These included separate visits from the Deputy Ministers of two of the three provincial funding ministries. At these meetings, staff, parents, children, and others reported on the positive impacts of the projects for their communities.

During the last year of the demonstration phase there was a considerable amount of planning, education, advocacy, and organizing that occurred in an effort to ensure the funding was continued beyond this phase. One idea from some of the sites was to incorporate as a non-profit organization. The government discouraged sites from pursuing incorporation, however, for several reasons. First, the Ministry of Community and Social Services was already funding close to 1,000 agencies and organizations and did

not want the primary prevention funds to be used to create more. Second, incorporation is a very lengthy, involved, and expensive process — the government felt that this could soak up much of the Steering Committees' and staff's time and budget, taking them away from focusing on *Better Beginnings*. Third, the government felt that a *Better Beginnings* site that had become incorporated had an entirely different relationship with the other neighbourhood agencies/organizations with whom it was supposed to partner. This opposition to incorporation, from the government, was present early on (as early as 1992 — during the planning phase) and continued throughout the demonstration phase. Nonetheless, one of the sites did incorporate, with the government's approval. The government agreed to this because this site's host or umbrella agency⁴ wanted out because it felt that *Better Beginnings* did not meet its mission/vision, and the government agreed.

It should be noted that in the proposal development, planning, and demonstration phases, there were no government representatives from local Ministry offices involved on the decision-making bodies at any of the three program sites.

On April 17, 1997, near the end of the demonstration phase, the Premier of Ontario announced that the government would guarantee ongoing funding for the existing *Better Beginnings* project sites.

⁴ As explained in Chapter 6: Project Organization and Management, the sponsor or host agency was the organization that was legally and financially responsible for the project — it was through the host agency that project funds from the government flowed.

Sustainability phase

Once ongoing funding was announced, the projects then had to negotiate further with the government as to what their sustainable management structure would look like. Changes to the organizational

structure of the projects occurred at two of the three older cohort sites. At Site Three, the project was already incorporated and no major change occurred during the sustainability phase.

At Site One, the project became a permanent program of the sponsor or host agency. The Project Coordinator position was terminated and the project was then managed by the Executive Director of the sponsor agency. The main decision-making body of the project (the “Coordination Committee”) was disbanded and replaced with a Consultation Committee that met less frequently and had no decision-making power. The Consultation Committee would meet with the Executive Director several times per year to provide some feedback and input on project programs.

At Site Two, the host organization (the school board) decided late in the demonstration phase that it would no longer be hosting community programs. As well, there was a wish by the project to change sponsor agencies. The sponsor agency during the proposal development, planning, and demonstration phases was the local school board, and the project experienced ongoing challenges in working with such a large bureaucracy. Project stakeholders decided to pursue amalgamation with one of their local community partners. However, the government committee and funding ministries would not give its approval for the amalgamation. Eventually the project further developed its partnership with another of its partners, and this organization eventually became its new sponsor agency. This relationship was to the satisfaction of both the project and the government.

As was the case during the demonstration phase, the project sites were responsible for submitting annual reports to the government funders during the sustainability phase.

Summary: the role of government in the development and implementation of the *Better Beginnings* program model

Government, through its Project Design Coordinator, Site Supervisor, and government committee, had a profound impact on the kinds of programs that developed in the *Better Beginnings* sites. One of the primary functions of government personnel was to ensure that the programs, as designed and implemented in the communities, stayed true to the original program model that had been recommended to and approved by government. To that end the following supports were provided to the sites:

- Round Tables to learn and gather support from each other.
- A Site Supervisor to negotiate local interpretations of the program model.
- Government Committee to prevent program model drift.

The government representatives were active in fulfilling their responsibility to ensure that the *Better Beginnings* program model was implemented as planned. At times, however, their actions in this regard were seen by some sites as being unnecessarily controlling and intrusive. One of the key features of the *Better Beginnings* initiative from the outset was that the individual projects would be truly community-based — that members of the community, working as partners with local service providers, would decide what kinds

of programs would be developed in their communities. When government representatives attempted to influence the kinds of programs that were developed, or who the programs should be offered to, in an attempt to ensure that the basic principles of the *Better Beginnings* program model were adhered to, this was often seen as contrary to the principle of community ownership of programs.

The tension between government influence and community control was evident at each of the project sites to greater and lesser degrees throughout all phases. The sites were able to negotiate with the government around different program development and implementation issues. These negotiations were largely successful, as both parties were reasonably satisfied with the compromises made. The government’s role was to ensure adherence to the original program model, while being open to adaptation to better suit each individual community’s needs. In this regard, they seem to have done their job well. The government also needed to ensure accountability; again, this role was fulfilled. However, some thought the government’s role should also have been to provide more technical support and consultation in program development and implementation. It is unclear if this expected aspect of their role was fulfilled.

WORKING WITH OTHER FUNDERS

An overview

The three project sites received core funding from the provincial ministries to provide high-quality programs to children and families within the 4 to 8 age group. Their core funding from government also allowed the project sites to spend up to 15% of their budget on community development initiatives in their neighbourhoods. However, often additional funds were necessary to adequately respond to the needs of the community, as identified by its residents. The sites would have liked to spend a larger percentage of government funding on other age groupings or on community development. To try to address the many needs of the communities, stakeholders at each site not only partnered with other service providers in their communities to help provide further programming, but they also pursued funds to supplement government support.

In this section we discuss the types of programs that were supported by the adjunct funding, as well as the work and resources that were required for the sites to secure this funding. Challenges in dealing with funders are discussed in a later section.



Additional programs provided by other funding sources

All the sites had a rationale for offering programming that was not covered by the *Better Beginnings* funding from the government. To support these efforts the sites had to be proactive and search for other funding sources. Occasionally, an organization approached a *Better Beginnings* site and offered to make a partnership that resulted in additional funding for the site.

In each of the three project sites, snack or breakfast programs were provided in the schools that partnered with the projects. In each of the sites, additional funding was secured in order to provide the programs to more children. At Site One the project was successful in receiving money from the Canadian Living Foundation to support its breakfast program. At Site Two, additional funding helped ensure that the snack program could be provided to all children in the partner school, not just those in the government-mandated age range. The project was able to secure support from the local Kiwanis club (i.e., money, volunteers and food), and funding from the Inner City Fund of the partnering school. As well, parents made donations to the program. At Site Three the project's breakfast program was able to be expanded to additional schools through outside funding sources including the Child Nutrition Program and the Bingo One Community Fund.

The projects at Sites Two and Three were also able to obtain funding that would

allow them to provide additional programming to children outside of the mandated 4 to 8 age range. At Site Two, the project was one of many partners in a coalition that was successful in receiving a federal *Brighter Futures* grant that allowed them to fund programs for children aged 0 to 4 and their families (e.g., Nobody's Perfect program, workshops for parents). As part of the *Brighter Futures* umbrella, the project became available to this younger age group through such programs as *Healthiest Babies Possible* and *Success by 6*. This project also partnered with a local community development project and obtained funding from the local Children's Aid Society to provide recreational programs for children aged 9 to 12. At Site Three the program was able to acquire funding from the Trillium Foundation to provide programs for children older than age 8.

As well, in two of the three project sites, the local Ontario Early Years Centre (OEYC) sought out the *Better Beginnings* projects when searching for locations for their programs. In Site Three, the project was already running a Francophone preschool program. The additional funding secured through OEYC enabled the project to expand program times, the programming offered, and to buy new equipment. At Site Two the OEYC selected the *Better Beginnings* project as one of its program sites and a new preschool program was subsequently born in this community.

Additional programs provided by other funding sources *cont'd*

Finally, Site Three was very active in seeking out additional funding sources to provide a variety of different programs for the community. This particular site incorporated as a charitable organization. Since that time, all non-government funding received has gone through this “Educational Fund” to support programs and activities not funded by the core funding provided by the provincial ministries. By the end of the demonstration phase, the Education Fund was raising more than \$100,000 annually for these additional programs. These additional monies came from various fundraising activities, as well as through grants from different foundations and funding organizations. Examples of programs or activities funded, outside of those described above, included an Environmental Program (funded through a private foundation) and an arts program funded by the Council of Arts. The *Better Beginnings* project, therefore, provided a foundation from which other programs, funded through other sources, could be launched.



Work and resources required

Government funding provided a critical foundation for these programs. This funding was sufficient for the basic *Better Beginnings* program, but was insufficient to meet all the needs identified by the communities. Importantly, government funding provided an infrastructure of resources that sites used to develop applications for funding from other sources. Also, having government funding likely played a role in other funders contributing to the project because the government’s involvement acted as a stamp of approval.

Each of the program sites had to devote time and resources in acquiring additional funding. Indeed, without the core funding provided by *Better Beginnings*, these projects probably would not have had the resources necessary to devote to fundraising. Project Managers assumed the responsibility of seeking out grants from private foundations and other funding organizations. Through their networking efforts — not only with one another, but within their communities — Project Managers became aware of granting opportunities. They then had to put work into reading the application requirements and

developing an application. To be successful, these applications required a lot of time and effort to develop. And, if the application was successful, the funding organization or foundation required accountability for the funds allocated. Again, Project Managers assumed the responsibility and additional work required to report back to other funders.

All of that work — finding out about foundations or other funding organizations, working with them, developing and submitting applications, and then communicating and reporting back to funders — required a lot of the Project Managers’ time. And, often, the return on investment was not substantial — that is, the amount of money being received was not always a large sum. As well, there were additional bookkeeping responsibilities to keep track of the different grants and funds. This was particularly true at Site Three which received a significant amount of additional funding. Given that the projects were often receiving funds from multiple donors or funders, the resources invested in fundraising were significant.



CHALLENGES

CHALLENGES OF WORKING WITH GOVERNMENT AND OTHER FUNDERS AND STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS THEM



From the outset the provincial ministries funding *Better Beginnings, Better Futures* recommended a program model based upon a thorough review of the literature and research. Their role was to ensure that the programs were true to this model. They also needed to ensure accountability and that the sites adhered to certain timelines. The project sites and the government, therefore, were thrust into a working relationship from the very beginning of the project. Not surprisingly, then, there were challenges that arose in this working relationship. In this section we discuss the challenges that the project sites faced, and possible strategies to deal with them.

Limited time to engage residents during program planning and development

After the sites received their funding they needed to thoroughly develop their program models, with all their components, as well as their budgets. These components of the program model were part of a contract entered into with the government. There was a great deal of work to be done in what was perceived to be a short time. Part of that work involved getting residents engaged in the process of developing the program model and all its components. Stakeholders faced challenges in this undertaking: some of the sites had had very little resident involvement in the proposal development stage because of a very tight timeline, and after the project was approved they were almost starting from scratch to engage community residents. Or, they may have had residents involved, but that momentum was lost in the interim between when the proposals were submitted and funding was received. Engaging residents was further complicated by the multicultural nature of the communities.

Given the challenges faced, some stakeholders did not feel that adequate time was given to engage residents fully or meaningfully in the development of the program model, as was recommended by the government. There was a feeling that

the government did not understand the process, and therefore the amount of time and work, involved in community development. The workload, particularly for the Project Manager and those most closely involved in program development, was intense, and it was very challenging to try to meet the demands of the government and have residents engaged in the process.

Nonetheless, although this perception was present, the government was responsive to the sites' needs. The government had originally anticipated a one-year planning phase; however, discussions with the sites, as well as information provided by researchers, resulted in a longer planning phase being granted. As mentioned previously, the sites received an additional year of funding to allow for a two-year planning phase, rather than a one-year phase. As well, the government also allowed one site several more months for its planning phase because it was delayed in hiring a Program Manager, which hindered program planning and development.

It is important that the planning process be neither too fast nor too slow. As discussed in **Chapter 2: Developing Your Program Model**, you may lose the trust and voice of community residents if you move too quickly.

STRATEGIES

- From the outset discuss with government and other funders the importance of allowing sufficient time to develop and implement your programs. Researchers have found that the developmental phase for prevention programs can take up to two years to complete. Ensure that you communicate this to government and other funders.
- It is important that government and other funders are aware of the sometimes lengthy process of engaging residents in program development.
- Assure government and other funders that you will create a detailed work plan for the development and implementation of your initiative. Build in sufficient time and resources to engage residents.
- Review the work plan frequently and alert government and other funders when plans go awry. Good communication with your funders, and the government, will help in the long run to develop a solid working relationship and negotiate solutions to challenges that arise.



Competing demands: balancing government/funder requirements and community needs

As discussed in **Chapter 6: Project Organization and Management**, the value of community participation received much more attention as a core operating principle than others. It seemed that community participation had more resonance with project participants and leaders than the other values (e.g., service integration, developing high-quality programs). The government was sometimes perceived as interfering too much in the development, and delivery, of programs trying to respond to community needs. Because of

the sites' commitment to community participation, stakeholders often perceived competing demands between meeting the government requirements for the program model, and responding to needs as identified by community residents. These perceived competing demands often resulted in a process of negotiation which was arduous, challenging, and frustrating at times. However, in the end both parties were usually reasonably satisfied.

Lack of direction and support

During the proposal development and planning phases, there were some stakeholders that perceived that the government did not provide enough direction and support. In particular, there was confusion about defining and implementing the concept of "service integration". The sites felt that the government representatives did not provide enough guidance or assistance around what they expected from the sites in terms of the integration of services.

There was also a perception among some stakeholders in the early years that the government's guidelines were not supportive of developing a true partnership between staff, service providers, and residents. This issue was discussed earlier.

It seems clear from the reports written on the *Better Beginnings* programs at the sites that the government did fulfill its role as overseer of the project. The government also held Round Tables and Quality Circles, in the early years, to help the sites explore program development issues and exchange information with others.



STRATEGIES

- Ensure clarity with government and other funders on program model requirements.
- Discuss the possibility for negotiation around these same requirements, and the process by which those negotiations would take place. Have these discussions early on in the funding process.
- Communicate with the government or funders when information on guidelines is not clear. Work with governments and funders to ensure that any information related to program model requirements is clear and understandable.
- Negotiate, up-front, for the level of support and guidance you think your organization will require in developing and implementing your prevention initiative and renegotiate when needs change.
- Encourage the government to use technology to help exchange information — between the government and your organization, or between your organization and other grantee organizations (e.g., on-line exchanges, teleconferences, videoconferences).

Time and resources devoted to accountability

Stakeholders at the three *Better Beginnings* sites had to devote time and resources to ensuring that they fulfilled all accountability requirements from the government as well as from the other funders from whom they had received grants. With respect to the core funding received from the government, site representatives met frequently with government early on. There was a considerable amount of time spent in face-to-face meetings, site visits, and teleconferences.

Once the contract was signed with the government, the amount of time communicating and working with the government did diminish. Nonetheless, the projects were still responsible for completing annual reports on the programs' progress and implementation. The Project Manager's role was particularly taxed during the early years, and it was challenging to find the time to fulfill the government's requirements.

STRATEGIES

- Ensure that you are aware of all accountability requirements from government and other funders.
- Build in time and resources to not only meet those requirements, but to ensure good communication with your funders.
- The good working relationship you develop and nurture will be important when unexpected issues arise which require negotiation.
- Calculate the amount of human resources needed to track and report back to a funder on a grant.
 - For example, estimate the number of hours it would take an administrator to track and report back on a grant and multiply that number by their hourly wage.
 - If you're applying for a \$2,000/year grant, but you estimate it will take an administrator six hours per month to track (at \$25/hour), then the cost of tracking that grant would be \$1,800. That would leave only \$200 to be spent on programming
 - A general rule is that administration should not exceed 30% of your grant to track.

Long-term funding

When the *Better Beginnings* communities were granted their funds, it was clear that the project was a demonstration project with a set timeline. Participants knew from the outset that the funding was not permanent. Once the contracts were signed and the programs were implemented, the project sites began to question early on what would happen at the end of the demonstration phase. Not knowing if funding would continue beyond the demonstration phase was challenging, early on, in their efforts to partner with other service providers. The feeling was that more clarity about long-term funding would have provided greater stability in the project and enabled greater participation of other service providers.

As the demonstration phase neared the end, there was tremendous uncertainty about what would happen to the projects. This caused staff, parents, residents, and others a great deal of stress. Stakeholders at each of the sites devoted a lot of time, energy, and resources into planning for an uncertain future. There was a great deal of planning, advocacy, and organizing which occurred during the final year of the demonstration phase.

However, once the projects were established in the communities, and developed good reputations, that issue became less of a concern.

STRATEGIES

- Discuss with your funders strategies for sustainability.
- Build in time and resources to plan, advocate, and strategize for long-term funding.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES



Guiding Principles for Working with Government and Other Funders

1. **Core funding is necessary for the planning and implementation of high-quality prevention programs.**
 - Advocate with government and other funders regarding the need for secure funding.
2. **Community-based prevention programs take time to develop — ensure government and other funders allow sufficient time for the planning phase.**
 - Researchers have found that the planning or developmental phase for prevention projects can take up to two years to complete.
 - It is important that government and other funders are aware of the sometimes lengthy process of engaging residents in program development.
 - Negotiate with government and other funders for sufficient time in the developmental phase.
3. **Ensure clear guidelines and requirements from government and other funders.**
 - Information related to program model requirements, from the government and other funders, needs to be clear and understandable.
 - It is important to be aware of what support and guidance the government or funders will be providing in developing your prevention initiative, and to negotiate for more support and guidance if necessary.
4. **Ensure adequate time and resources for accountability and reporting to government and other funders.**
5. **Develop and maintain a good working relationship with government and other funders.**
 - It is important to discuss any issues or concerns you have with government and other funders.
 - Negotiate for what you need to deal with those issues and concerns.
 - It is equally important to keep the lines of communication open and ensure that government and other funders are aware of your successes, as well as any challenges you are facing.

Implementation/Evaluation Checklist

- Have you done your research on what funds or grants may be available from different funding bodies and different government funders?
- Have you thought about whether you will need more than one funder to implement your initiative?
- Are you aware of the requirements of your funders with respect to accountability? Do you have the necessary resources in place to fulfill these requirements?
- Are you clear with regard to the type of working relationship you are expected to have with the funders? Will they provide consultation or technical expertise? Are they willing to negotiate to ensure that any program model developed fits with your particular community?
- Are you clear with regard to what potential funders or government bodies you will be applying to for program funds?

APPENDICES



APPENDIX A:

Abstracts and Other Resources

Abstracts

Allen, M., & Lau, C. (2008). **Social impact of preventive HIV vaccine clinical trial participation: A model of prevention, assessment and intervention.** *Social Science and Medicine*, 66(4), 945-951. [DOI:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.10.019.]

Preventive HIV vaccine trial participants may experience problems related to trial participation, including difficulties with personal relationships, employment, education, health care, housing, health insurance, disability insurance, life insurance, travel or immigration. During the 19 years that the U.S.-based National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) has conducted preventive HIV vaccine trials, we have developed a model to prevent and resolve social impact related to study participation and assist study participants who report such events. Key elements of the model include: informing potential volunteers of risks prior to enrollment; standardizing data collection methods on social impact events; reviewing and following-up on reported social impact events; assisting participants, including provision of free HIV testing to differentiate HIV infection from vaccine-induced HIV antibody; implementing broad-based and targeted community education programs for achieving community support; communicating with scientific and health care communities; and working with government agencies, non-government agencies and industry on mechanisms to address SI. This approach, established in collaboration with NIAID-funded clinical trial groups, serves as a model for prevention, assessment, monitoring, and intervention for social impact related to preventive HIV vaccine clinical trial participation. Although further research is necessary, this model could be adapted for use in different clinical trials.

Burzichelli, C., Mackey, P. E., & Bausmith, J. (2011). **Dropout prevention programs in nine mid-Atlantic Region school districts: additions to a dropout prevention database.** *Issues & answers. REL 2011-no. 103. Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic.* [Available from: Pennsylvania State University, 108 Rackley Building, University Park, PA 16802. Tel: 866-735-6239; e-mail: info@relmid-atlantic.org; Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/projects/project.asp?projectID=229>]

The current study replicates work of Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Northeast and Islands. It describes dropout prevention programs in nine Mid-Atlantic Regions (Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania) school districts serving communities with populations of 24,742-107,250 (as of July 2008). All nine districts have high dropout rates, large racial/ethnic minority student populations, and high percentages of students from households living below the poverty line. The study is driven by two research questions: (1) What are the characteristics of dropout prevention programs and policies in the nine districts?; and (2) Which programs have been reviewed by the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse, and what were its findings? The study found that: (1) No district reported dropout prevention policies apart from those establishing the reported programs; (2) Only one program model was reported by more than one district; (3) The most common core strategies were advocating for student needs (64 percent of programs), engaging and supporting families (57 percent), and monitoring school attendance

Abstracts, cont'd

(53 percent); (4) The most common service goals were to improve academic performance (95 percent of programs), decrease truancy (66 percent), and provide support during transitions (60 percent); (5) The most common student subgroups targeted were students with academic needs (90 percent of programs), students from low socioeconomic status families (60 percent), and special needs students with behavioral challenges (57 percent); (6) Programs that targeted specific grades were most likely to focus on students in grades 9 or 12; (7) Teachers were involved in 86 percent of reported programs, guidance counselors in 78 percent, and principals or other administrators in 67 percent; (8) The most common forms of community involvement engaged parents (69 percent of programs), youth or social services staff (28 percent), mental health services staff (28 percent), police (22 percent), and mentoring program staff (21 percent); twelve programs (21 percent) reported no community involvement; (9) Districts funded all or part of 79 percent of reported programs; state governments had some financial role in 41 percent, the federal government in 26 percent, and private sources in 7 percent. Four programs (7 percent) did not report a funding source; and (10) As of May 1, 2010, only 1 of the 58 programs--Talent Development High Schools--had been reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse, which found only one small study that met its evidence standards with reservations. Appendices include: (1) Study methodology; (2) Dropout prevention interventions evaluated by the What Works Clearinghouse (as of May 1, 2010); (3) Introductory letter; (4) Model commitment letter; (5) Interview guide; and (6) Interview template for recording data. (Contains 2 boxes, 9 tables, and 5 notes.) [For the summary report, see ED516739.]

Chehimi, S., Cohen, L., & Valdovinos, E. (2011). **In the first place: Community prevention's promise to advance health and equity.** *Environment and Urbanization*, 23(1), 71-89. [Retrieved from www.csa.com.]

This paper highlights the role of community prevention in improving overall health and in supporting health equity. By addressing the underlying causes of illness and injury, community prevention efforts can prevent illness and injury before they occur. The paper presents three frameworks that support quality community prevention efforts. The first, Taking Two Steps to Prevention, analyzes the underlying causes of illness, injury and health inequities and helps identify key opportunities for intervention and prevention. The second framework, the Spectrum of Prevention, guides users in thinking through the elements of a comprehensive community prevention strategy: strengthening individual knowledge and skills; promoting community education; educating providers and leaders (in all sectors); fostering coalitions and networks; changing organizational practice (within government, health institutions and workplaces, among others); and influencing policy and legislation. Both Taking Two Steps and the Spectrum are explained through the demonstration of two successful and ongoing community prevention efforts: first, preventing smoking; and second, promoting breastfeeding. The third framework, Collaboration Multiplier, focuses on developing sustainable interdisciplinary partnerships capable of addressing a variety of health and social problems. Collaboration Multiplier provides a matrix that clarifies the contributions that different sectors bring to a particular health or social problem and helps develop a shared language and understanding for working together.

Abstracts, cont'd

Sylvestre, J.C., Pancer, S.M., Brophy, K., & Cameron, G. (2004). **The planning and implementation of government-sponsored community-based primary prevention: A case study.** *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13*(2), 189-195.

Governments at all levels have become increasingly involved in initiating and funding projects within which community residents work collaboratively with local service providers in the development of programs for the betterment of themselves, their families, and their community. Inherent in these initiatives, however, are a number of possible sources of tension which, left unresolved, may hamper the intentions of governments to seed grassroots solutions to community problems. A qualitative research methodology was used to examine the nature of the relationship between government and community representatives (both residents and local service providers) in establishing community-based primary prevention programs under the auspices of the *Better Beginnings, Better Futures* initiative of the Government of Ontario. We examine a number of issues and tensions that have arisen from this project, both during the development of the program model by the government, and through to its implementation in several communities in the province.

United States House Committee on Education and the Workforce. Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families. (1999). **School violence: Views of students and the community: Hearing, May 18, 1999, Superintendent of Documents.** [Retrieved from www.csa.com]

In context of shootings at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, and other schools, examines possible reasons for violence, and the federal government's role in prevention efforts; testimony from violence witnesses.

Other resources

- Mercy Corps (2003). **Ferghana Valley field study: Reducing the potential for conflict through community mobilization.** Available online at <http://www.mercycorps.org/files/file1134154677.pdf>
- HIV/AIDS Prevention Project (HAPP) (2000). **Internal evaluation report.** Available online at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDABW263.pdf

The following U.S. sources, which may provide some ideas for funding within the Canadian context, are available online at www.financeproject.org

- Flynn, M. & Hayes, C. D., (2003). **Blending and Braiding Funds to Support Early Care and Education Initiatives.**
- Hayes, C. D. (2002). **Sustaining Comprehensive Community Initiatives: Key Elements for Success.**
- Langford, B. (2000). **Creating Dedicated State and Local Revenue Sources for Out-of-School-Time Initiatives.**
- Padgette, H. C. (2003). **Finding Funding: A Guide to Federal Sources for Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives.**
- Wright, E., & Deich, S. (2002). **Replacing Initial Grants Tips for Out-of-School Time Programs and Initiatives.**



Better Beginnings, Better Futures

An effective, affordable community project for promoting positive child development