Participants

On June 30th, 2004, the Alameda County Violence Prevention Core Group had its fifth Phase II meeting related to the Blueprint development process. The Core Group is the body responsible for defining and shaping solutions to the recommendations delineated in Toward a Lifetime Commitment to Violence Prevention in Alameda County: Background and Preliminary Recommendations. In addition, members of the Core Group serve as ambassadors of the project, spreading the word and obtaining participation, input, and buy-in.

Ratification of April 15th Core Group Meeting Summary
Core Group members ratified the meeting notes from the April 15th Core Group meeting. These notes can be found at: www.preventioninstitute.org/alameda.html.

Risk and Resilience Along the Spectrum of Prevention
Core Group members examined the final priority risk/resilience factors across the Spectrum by listing key activities that can be done to address these factors at each level of the Spectrum. Please find the outcomes of this activity listed in charts at the end of this document. For definitions of these, please see Toward a Lifetime Commitment to Violence Prevention in Alameda County: Background and Preliminary Recommendations, available at http://www.preventioninstitute.org/alameda_bg.html.

Review of City Council Meeting
Core Group members debriefed the June 29th, 2004 City Council Meeting in Oakland regarding a new Violence Prevention ballot measure. A number of Core Group members had attended or viewed the council meeting, and in particular, the testimony and discussion regarding the ballot measure. Although it had been anticipated that the language of the measure would be decided at the meeting, there were several issues that emerged that staff are looking into, and therefore the initiative will be finalized at the July 20th City Council meeting. Generally speaking, the measure calls for sixty-three new police officers and $4 million for fire protection. The current split is 60% enforcement and 40% prevention. A number of people testified at this meeting. A majority asked for a 50-50 split between enforcement and prevention, while some people emphasized the importance of police protection. The final conclusion seemed to be that city staff would explore opportunities to increase prevention while maintaining the minimum of 63 police officers. It was noted at the meeting that per capita, the number of police officers is extremely low, far less, for example, than a city such as Boston. As the measure stands (i.e. 60-40), Core Group members expressed the belief that the measure should more accurately be referred to as a public safety measure rather than a violence prevention measure.
Members of the Core Group noted particular issues of concern around some language in the current measure—this includes a stipulation that funds would only go to services that have already been in existence for two years, and the Core Group wanted more information on intent and implications. There was also concern regarding the amount of funding appropriated for evaluation, which is set at 1-3% of each program. Members agreed this is inadequate to determine both the number of people served and the contribution to violence prevention as dictated by the measure.

A staff member from Jean Qwan’s office was present during this discussion, and the Core Group offered to be available to provide additional advice regarding the language of the measure particularly as it relates to promoting effective prevention.

Shape of Blueprint
The Core Group provided a great deal of input in shaping the Blueprint. The draft of the current document was sent out to Core Group members as a very early version in order to get their feedback into the content as early as possible. While the document had been referred to as a Blueprint, clearly this was a misnomer. More accurately, the document represented the collective efforts of the Core Group and the Advisory Board to date. The group discussed what a Blueprint might look like, and agreed on the appropriateness of a roadmap metaphor. Members expressed the need for clear, understandable language to ensure that the tool is easy to utilize. Members overwhelmingly agreed on the need for specificity and tangibility, and expressed that while the document is conceptually strong, it needs more specificity. There was a recommendation that clear language be added that explains the need for an office. Although concern was raised that this draft is very preliminary, members reiterated that considering that this draft is meant to be a synopsis of our process, we are on track.

Priorities and Next Steps
Core Group members acknowledged the importance of building a state-of-the-art tool, but reiterated the need to shape it more specifically for the specific needs of Alameda County. Members suggested changing the term “objectives,” saying that these current items are too process oriented, and is more like ‘areas of concern’. Members pointed to a need to identify and prioritize objectives that are measurable and doable. Core Group members expressed concern that while the Blueprint was strong on explanation of violence and the need for prevention, it does not address in specific terms what is going to be done. Members raised several questions about next steps, such as: What as a group are our priorities? What is the division of labor? The strategy? What are specific actions to be taken? (For example, we need to limit firearms.)

The next step is for the Leadership Council to make decisions regarding what is the top priority. Core Group members supported the idea that before we can take action, we have to build a strong foundation, and to build a strong foundation takes time. The Core Group agreed that now it is time to move forward aggressively with engaging a broad base of people to build a strategy that is able to stand the test of time. They expressed the need for a strong final product that will encourage ownership and responsibility, from a broad range of sectors and communities within Alameda County.

Structure
The draft Blueprint that was sent to the Core Group had a placeholder for a section regarding the structure elements for the Office of Violence Prevention. The Core Group discussed how the Office of Violence Prevention should be shaped. They offered suggestions of how to make the Blueprint a more helpful, effective, and concrete tool. Building on the metaphor of a Blueprint, members suggested that we need a set of plans—a “roadmap” of our process. They noted that
there should be a section to address why this needs to be a new county office, why it can’t just be part of another department, and what this office will do, indicating that a job description for the office would be helpful.

Members offered suggestions as to how the office will function. One member envisioned the office as a “one-stop-shop” for resources, such as for best practices and to share information and strategies between cities in the county. Concern was expressed regarding the possibility of the office being so overwhelmed and overburdened that it will not be effective. One suggestion was that the office could collaborate with existing entities to share some of the responsibilities, allowing the office to focus on policy, program development, and grants. Members voiced the need to review best practices and identify what is already being done, so as to establish what we need to incorporate. Members saw the next step as going to the community and asking what we need to do in each of the seven areas, then going to the county with the specific things the community would like to see.

**General Reflections**

Members recognized that it is phenomenal that all Core Group members, Supervisor Miley, and Prevention Institute have been so committed to this initiative. The next set of meetings will begin to address future planning. Supervisor Miley restated his dedication to this project, emphasizing that he will continue to play a key role until it can stand on its own.

**Next Steps: From Core Group to Leadership Council**

The Core Group is already looking ahead to the work of the Leadership Council in planning, developing, and implementing the Office of Violence Prevention. The Core Group was in agreement about the need for more specifics in terms of conducting an awareness campaign and engaging members of the community. Core Group members spoke to the need to be ambassadors of the Blueprint, and to get participation, input, and buy-in. To ensure that no momentum is lost in transitioning from Core Group to Leadership Council, Core Group members felt the need for a plan to be developed illustrating the preliminary structure of the Leadership Council, and how it would fit in with other county efforts. Members also pointed to the need to have a communication strategy, and a mission statement, describing who we are, and what we are accomplishing. The Core Group agreed that the preliminary structure needs to be determined in the next and final Core Group meeting. Implementation of this structure will be the job of the Leadership Council, with the understanding that this structure will be amended over time as it changes to fit the county’s needs.

**Funding**

Members participated in a discussion regarding funding for the blueprint development process. The California Wellness Foundation contributed $150,000 to support development of the Blueprint and the ongoing strategy development process. This funding represents a portion of the overall budget to work on finalizing the Blueprint, and garner support for effective implementation. Additionally, the county has a contract with Prevention Institute, and various departments and agencies have contributed to that fund, including: Supervisor Miley’s office, the sheriff’s department, Deputy Sheriff Association, firefighters, East Bay Regional Park District, Every Child Counts, and Kaiser. However, additional support is still needed to maximize the effectiveness of the effort. Core Group members agreed that obtaining funding from groups within the County demonstrates a sense of commitment that will help the effort to gain support from potential funders outside the County.

Core Group members also spoke to the need for Federal resources in the Blueprint development process. Ensuring an effective violence prevention strategy calls for local, city, county, state, and federal levels of government to align in support of this effort and to bring resources to bear
on prevention. It is for this reason that Core Group members feel that it is important to get Barbara Lee’s office on board.

Finalize County-wide Engagement Piece
The Core Group briefly reviewed the upcoming Regional Forums, which will be held every Thursday in July. The purpose of these forums is to get more input and buy-in from elected officials and community-based organizations, and to address the needs of communities. Core Group members recognized the importance of attending these meetings.

Announcements
The Core Group established that members would confirm through Prevention Institute or the Supervisor’s office, which meeting(s) they plan to attend. The Blueprint and the Regional Forum agenda will be resent to members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Spectrum</th>
<th>Risk Factor: Community Deterioration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strengthening Individual Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>• Organized mentor programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promoting Community Education</td>
<td>• NCPC’s train communities on supportive neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Educating Providers | • Training youth on advocacy  
| | • Safe Schools Plan and services/ resources available and how they work  
| | • What does each group do—we need to understand what each other does |
| 4. Fostering Coalitions and Networks | • Organizing opportunities for youth  
| | • NCPC’s  
| | • Schools—community service and service learning programs in schools, connect to classroom instruction  
| | • PTA’s |
| 5. Changing Organizational Practices | • Fostering interdisciplinary collaboration is the way that business operates  
| | • Park and rec. programs for youth and other programs  
| | • Keep schools open 7am-11pm—community schools |
| 6. Influencing Policy and Legislation | • Hold property owners accountable for blight  
| | • Incentivize redevelopment/ opportunity zones—prioritize certain areas  
| | • Land-use planning—how communities grow and foster place and connection  
| | • Address blight/ graffiti immediately  
| | • Community service re: graffiti/ weed abatement/ mentors, etc |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Spectrum</th>
<th>Resilience Factor: Emotional/ Cognitive Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Strengthening Individual Knowledge and Skills | • Improve reading, writing, literacy skills  
| | • Parenting skills/ classes  
| | • Focus on social-emotional development  
<p>| | • Conflict resolution, anger management, empathy |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Spectrum</th>
<th>Risk Factor: Discrimination and Oppression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Strengthening Individual Knowledge and Skills | • Raising awareness of diversity in school  
• Raising historical awareness  
• Self-esteem/emotional literacy as factor in prejudice  
• Schools: start diversity awareness/conflict resolution early and continue throughout |
| 2. Promoting Community Education | • Fact-based community awareness through arts—mural?  
• Framing county development in the achievements of all races/cultures  
• Recognize tensions between non-white cultures (e.g. Black/Latino in some communities)  
• Recognize and address discrimination/oppression including sexual oppression |
| 3. Educating Providers | • Annual county score card on ethnic and racial relations to be released at conference  
• Examine what’s being done  
• Recognize and understand role/impact of gangs—recognize complexity of issue  
• Recognize issue of “rankism”—status level as form of discrimination |
| 4. Fostering Coalitions and Networks | • Child abuse prevention, women and human rights commissions countywide  
• Create network, conference  
• Conference |
| 5. Changing Organizational Practices | • Need to develop a clear system of responsibility  
• Strengthen role of Human Rights Commission. Commission of the Status of Women, etc.  
• Youth of all cultures need to know about people like them that have achieved in all areas |
| 6. Influencing Policy and Legislation | • Create county-wide curriculum at all schools and for all levels  
• Curriculum needs to be required/standardized and at same level of importance as reading and math  
• Economic development opportunities for all  
• Build skills into teacher credentialing  
• Instead of holding separate “months” for each ethnic group, build ethnic/racial relations into an on-going curriculum and community awareness for multi-cultural collective consciousness  
• Promote efforts to bring more multi-cultural youth into educational/career opportunities |
| --- | --- |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Spectrum</th>
<th>Resilience Factor: Ethnic, Racial, and Inter-group Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Strengthening Individual Knowledge and Skills | • Use students to promote positive ethnic/racial relations  
• Oakland Schools currently have optional curriculum on conflict mediation with race/ethnicity component—consider making this mandatory, and building upon it  
• Workshops on undoing racism—conflict resolution courses on same level as reading, writing, and math. |
| 2. Promoting Community Education | • Creating mural, fact-based community campaign on history of racial/ethnic relations  
• Events that teach history/culture of all ethnic groups |
| 3. Educating Providers | • Conference where report card could be released and where activities can be shared that strengthen relations |
| 4. Fostering Coalitions and Networks | • |
| 5. Changing Organizational Practices | • Strengthen role of Commission on Status of Women, Human Relations Commission  
• Conflict resolution at elementary level |
| 6. Influencing Policy and Legislation | • New framework that addresses collective struggle of all groups  
• County-wide program/ policy for teachers and other administrators around undoing racism/ discrimination  
• Psychosocial education course instituted in School District curriculum  
• Standardized curriculum |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Spectrum</th>
<th>Risk Factor: Witnessing and Experiencing Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Strengthening Individual Knowledge and Skills | • Intervention with perpetrators  
• Programs targeting youth 0-5 |
| 2. Promoting Community Education | • Network of providers having rotating meetings on a quarterly basis; meet with community members (through police chief meetings, fire, etc.)  
• Holding events for domestic violence awareness month |
| 3. Educating Providers | • Screening tool to assess violence (pediatricians, public health nurses)  
• Educate providers re: inventory of services |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Spectrum</th>
<th>Resilience Factor: Artistic and Creative Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Strengthening Individual Knowledge and Skills | • Apprenticeship programs for youth  
• Also work to target youth who aren’t in schools |
| 2. Promoting Community Education | • Youth work with AC Transit to do art work for AC Transit  
• Helping communities see youth as positive commodity |
| 3. Educating Providers | • Apprenticeship programs for youth—help businesses understand the importance of this |
| 4. Fostering Coalitions and Networks | • Engage local museums/ schools—increase this collaboration  
• Corporate collaborations  
• Local universities/ colleges  
• Arts colleges—possibly create program where working in mentoring programs in schools is a college requirement  
• Chamber of Commerce  
• Community groups, churches |
| 5. Changing Organizational Practices | • Recruit “at risk youth” for employment (creation of murals, etc)  
• Put back vocational training in schools  
• Create community garden programs in schools  
• Services (vocational) for adults on probation  
• Establish youth radio programs in schools |
| 6. Influencing Policy and Legislation | • Funds for after school programs/ programs in schools (PE, music, arts, etc) (Look at the Richmond bill to put property taxes aside to bring these programs back)  
• Funding public art |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Change the term “Prevention” to calling it “Homeland Security” (other programs have received funding this way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding for ex-offender programs/ youth mentorship programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>