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**Participants**

**Facilitators**
Nate Miley, Larry Cohen, Howard Pinderhughes, Rachel Davis, and Danice Cook.

The Alameda County Violence Prevention Advisory Board held its third phase II meeting on May 20, 2004. During this meeting, Advisory Board members received a project timeline update that outlined the major outcomes to date. They also received an update on the structure for violence prevention and modified and refined it. In addition, there was a presentation on the county-wide engagement plan that was developed by the Core Group and will begin in July.

**County-wide Engagement**
The Advisory Board ratified the county-wide engagement plan, which will begin this summer. The meetings will take place in two phases, the first phase with elected officials, the second with community-based organizations. During each phase, meetings will be conducted in five regions of the county: tri cities, tri valley, central county, north county, and Oakland. The first round of meetings will take place in July and will be an opportunity to:

- present the county violence prevention efforts to elected officials such as city managers, mayors, city council members, school board members, and other public officials to get their reaction and input;
- foster county-wide understanding of and buy-in to the plan; and
- get their suggestions about community groups in their area who should be informed.

After meetings with public officials, there will be meetings held in September and October with community-based organizations throughout the county to get their feedback on the plan. Eventually, there will be a town hall meeting, or comparable forum, for the general public to hear about the plan and ask questions and provide input. Advisory Board members agreed that the forums are important and expressed a desire to be involved. They will identify participants, help shape the event, and participate in the meetings. Advisory Board members signed up to participate. Others who are interested should contact Anna Gee at Supervisor Miley’s office.

**Emerging Principles**
One of the preliminary recommendations that the Advisory Board ratified in September 2003 was to establish a set of shared violence prevention principles for all relevant sectors of the
county to support violence prevention efforts in their everyday work. Several proposed principles emerged in the Advisory Board meeting:
1. Honor existing effective violence prevention efforts.
2. Meaningfully engage those most impacted by violence including youth and adult residents in highly impacted neighborhoods.

As the blueprint is further developed, a common set of principles will be developed as was agreed upon in the initial meeting plan for the Core Group.

**Structure**
Advisory Board members received an update on the violence prevention structure and provided feedback. The proposed structure and accompanying options were based on the Core Group’s thoughtful dialogue and conclusions about what would be the best violence prevention structure for the county (a copy of the presentation is available at: [http://www.preventioninstitute.org/alameda.html](http://www.preventioninstitute.org/alameda.html)).

The structure was designed with the following needs in mind: high level engagement, opportunity for coordination, oversight, violence prevention staffing. The desired outcomes from a structure are to achieve accountability, coordinated violence prevention programming, effective non-duplicative programming, data sharing and coordination, public information, and training. In order to accomplish these outcomes, the Advisory Board ratified the structure as described below. Alameda County will establish an Office of Violence Prevention that will report to the County Administrator’s Office. The office will staff a diverse public-private Leadership Council. The Leadership Council will be responsible for ongoing strategy development and direction, while the office will carry out the day to day violence prevention activities and implementation according to the direction of the Leadership Council. The following paragraphs provide more detail about A) the Office of Violence Prevention, B) the Leadership Council, and C) the County Coordinating Council.
A. Office of Violence Prevention and Public Safety
The Advisory Board recommended that an office of violence prevention be established. An Executive Director would staff the office, and supervise violence prevention staff. The director would report to the CAO. Initially, the staffing would be entirely in-kind and the goal overtime would be to add 1-2 dedicated staff to help carry out the functions of the office. Even after dedicated staff, the recommendation is to maintain in-kind staffing to ensure effective coordination and programming.

Office Roles and Responsibilities
- Day-to-day functioning of office
- Provide staff for various elements of the violence prevention structure including the Leadership Council and subcommittees such as the County Coordinating Council.
- Implement the blueprint, strategy, and Leadership Council decisions and priorities
- Conduct training on violence prevention
- Implement violence prevention projects as appropriate
- Provide information to the public information about resources and violence prevention efforts
- Write grants to support special projects and/or mini-grants for neighborhood and community projects.

B. Leadership Council
The Leadership Council will be a multi-disciplinary body responsible for overall strategy, priority setting, and community engagement. Advisory Board members confirmed that the Leadership Council should include smaller working groups. To ensure governmental efficiency and effectiveness, one of the working groups will be the County Coordinating Group (see following section). The other working groups were not explicitly determined but could be based upon previously determined function areas such as training, community information/engagement, data sharing/coordination and/or could be based on content areas such as the emerging themes of the recommendations: strong families, youth development, career opportunity development, re-entry, stronger neighborhoods, hope, and government effectiveness. Further, the overall structure of the Leadership Council and working groups needs to have specific guidelines for interfacing and coordinating with existing groups such as the Alameda County Interagency Children’s Policy Council (ICPC). Participants asserted the importance of engaging members who can influence how resources are directed. They also agreed that an initial group should take on the issue of membership and decide how each sector should be represented.
Leadership Council Roles and Responsibilities
- Develop and shape on-going strategy
- Set priorities for direction and resource allocation
- Assess where resources are used and their outcomes; as well as the need for reallocation to support priorities
- Determine relationship to and coordination with other related efforts (e.g. ICPC) and ensure that they don’t compete with local efforts
- Determine appropriate violence prevention policy for county
- Ensure community engagement/input
- Establish/ maintain effective public/private partnerships
- Coordinate with community efforts
- Establish effective working groups and maintain or disband as appropriate
- Promote a sense of hope that violence is preventable
- Provide guidance to the Executive Director of the office

Leadership Council Membership
- Youth
- Business
- Faith
- Schools/School Districts
- Cities/Municipalities
- Parks/Recreation
- Community Members
- Labor/Unions
- Media
- California Department of Corrections
- California Youth Authority
- County Government Department Agencies (members of County Coordinating Council)
- Legislative Representatives
- Grassroots Organizations
- CBO’s
- Housing Authority
- Community College District
- Other?

C. County Coordinating Group
While a majority of working groups has not yet been determined, Advisory Board members felt strongly that there should be a County Coordinating Working Group with agencies/departments whose budgets are controlled by the Board of Supervisors and that have a mandate related to violence prevention, public safety and/or the underlying risk/ resilience factors. This is to ensure accountability and implementation of violence prevention efforts that emerge from the Office.

County Coordinating Group Roles and Responsibilities
- Ensure high-level governmental coordination and leadership
- Share and coordinate data
- Reduce duplication and build on existing efforts
- Identify and reduce gaps in governmental services and functions
• Implement violence prevention strategy within participating departments and agencies
• Ensure individual agency/department follow through
• Ensure all staff is working in a coordinated matter
• Ensure current effective violence prevention city/county efforts continue
• Communicate in a common voice

County Coordinating Group Membership
• Probation
• Public Health
• Social Services
• Behavioral Health
• Sheriff’s Office
• District Attorney
• Public Defender
• Firefighters
• Libraries
• General Services Administration
• County Administrator’s Office Representative
• Other?

Youth Participation
In response to the Core Group and Advisory Board’s commitment that youth should be involved in this planning process, Prevention Institute facilitated a youth orientation in April with eleven youth from Project YES. The orientation consisted of a brief overview of the project, introduction to the Spectrum of Prevention, and overview of the risk and resilience factors. Some of the youth recently oriented participated in the Advisory Board meeting to create more exchange between youth and adults.

During the Advisory Board meeting youth participants provided a great input on the value of using intergenerational approaches and peer-to-peer strategies to address violence. They also spoke about feeling neglected and the importance of Advisory Board members interacting with youth and others in communities most affected by violence. Youth participants also emphasized the loss of recreational facilities in the community and the importance of creating realistic alternatives for young people. In addition, youth participants informed Advisory Board members of the positive accomplishments young people in the community have made to decrease violence, such as the Oakland Youth Commission’s efforts in getting a community center for teens built in Oakland.

Data Efforts
Junious Williams of Urban Strategies gave a brief overview of the data efforts Urban Strategies is working on regarding violence in Oakland. Advisory Board members that want to be a part of this group or know of others who could contribute should contact Junious Williams at juniousw@urbanstrategies.org. More information on Urban Strategies’ data efforts is also available at: http://www.infooakland.org/
**Revised Project Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Group Meeting</td>
<td>June 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Forums for elected officials</td>
<td>July 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Forums for CBO’s</td>
<td>September – October 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Blueprint</td>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Group Meeting</td>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board Meeting</td>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Blueprint</td>
<td>December 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blueprint to Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>