

AI/AN Capacity Building Project 13-14 pre-meeting: August 12, 2013 (12-1 pm), AICC

Attendees: Angel Baker (Administrative Manager at DMH PSB, MHSA, and provides oversight for UREP); Zohreh Zarnegar, Melanie Cain, Gloria Sheppard, Carrie Johnson, Glenda Ahhaitty, Mirtala Parada Ward, Nina Tayyib

Nina provided a background on what the UREP capacity building projects are intended for:

- The budget for the AI/AN UREP capacity building project 13-14 is \$60,000.
- each UREP capacity building project is developed, proposed and approved by UREP. The goal is to build the capacity of community.
- Projects must follow the guidelines for UREP CSS funding. This includes 6 principles that explain what the funding is meant for and how it should be used. Nina reviewed 6 principles.
- The goal for this funding is to improve penetration rates. DMH encourages the UREPs to think about what's obtainable/measurable.

Nina reviewed the process:

- This pre-meeting is to start with discussion about ideas including those suggested from the AI/AN Learning Collaborative
- UREP co-chairs and/or assigned person will submit proposal. The key points to be addressed in a proposal are on agenda in bullet.
- The approval process starts with the UREP. Then the approved proposal is submitted for approval to PSB and EMT.
- If approved, the next steps include confirming the mechanism of funding (which may include the proposal going out to bid. It's really important to be fair and transparent so bidding may be requirement. It is also important for the proposal to be specific about whom you want to receive this and why (what makes them special).
- Discussion about the project (i.e. Ad Hoc meetings) outside of official UREP meetings is a decision of the UREP. It is up to the UREP co-chairs to coordinate with the UREP community members for additional feedback. If you decide as a committee that you would like to hold outside meetings, they DMH suggest that you assign a person to communicate the discussion to larger official UREP.
- Nina is not available outside of work hours. If during work hours, Nina is able to attend if requested.
- The project will need to end by June 2014 so the sooner the final proposal is submitted, the better.
- DMH is open to having multiple ideas/proposals. They would all need to be presented to the UREP committee so that they can vote and decide what to propose to DMH.

The previously discussed idea of having a foundation/nonprofit for training, similar to the LBHI setup, that would function as a fiscal intermediary will not be an option for this project.

- This is because we are using public mental health funds and there are limitations on what we can use them for.
- The goal is to have time limited project Angel added that DMH does not pay for foundations.

- Mirtala: If AI/AN UREP elected to become 501c3, then there may be some options (but DMH monies could not be used).

Nina shared past UREP projects:

- The Latino UREP did Promotoras/community members to do O&E and reduce stigma
- API UREP trained peer advocates/consumer council to become leaders/advocates
- AAA UREP developed informational brochure/life links
- EE/ME UREP developed informational brochures and distributed at community events for O&E.

DISCUSSION

- Carrie suggested hiring a consultant to follow up with ideas from the community described in the Learning Collaborative project. It is important to listen to what community wanted.
- This include reducing stigma, outreach to community, working on brochure on mental health issues. We need to work on trust building and reduce disconnect of community members.
- We can utilize different agencies to do trainings, including substance abuse, and connect to resources.
- We can train community members on traditions and cultural activities that help to heal from trauma.
- Nina shared the structure that the API UREP used to train peers: O&E, interview/select members, training of members to understand topics/resources and public speaking. This year, they are doing internships/job placement.
- Melanie shared feedback from AICC staff:
 - A speaker series about important mental health issues
 - Developing a brochure
 - Since the Conference is more clinical maybe do something community based (powwow)
 - Complete a needs assessment. Carrie shared that there have been many needs assessments and we know what the community wants.
- Gloria suggested paying for training clinicians on AI/AN model, specifically “Mending The Circle”, which is Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Treatment adopted by Dolores Bigfoot.
- Zohreh suggested developing a Fetal Alcohol Syndrome focused project.
 - She shared that there is a lot of info out there about FAS, but it is not accurate often.
 - A brochure could be developed that identifies risk factors, describes prevention and early intervention.
 - There could be a train the trainers option (OBGYN, RN, parents, etc.). Dr. Zarnegar volunteered to be a trainer.
 - The project would be relevant to the AI/AN community because FAS rates are 400% higher in AI/AN than other populations.
 - Glenda recommended finding out how many AI/AN FAS clients are in DMH and what services we have available.
 - Zohreh shared that CA has only one center that specializes on FAS, which is UCLA. They are working with the University of Washington.

Group revisited the idea of training community members to be health educators. Carrie suggested the name be the American Indian Community Wellness Project. There was some discussion about what to call the outreach workers.

- Mirtala discussed the promotoras projects and how this model may be useful for this idea. This includes training experts in community, regardless of education level to do culturally appropriate and effective outreach, engagement and education. In Boyle Heights, they are holding similar trainings for parents about how to keep your kids in school. EE/ME are proposing to train high schoolers.
- Mirtala shared copies from Ana's Promotoras program. Nina will fax over curriculum for different projects. She suggested hire consultant to do trainings.
- Melanie suggested that the trainings could be offered in different languages like Navajo and maybe local tribal languages.
- Glenda suggested that AI/AN community educators work with high school, including Sherman Indian High Schoolers, whose families are based in LA.
- There was a discussion about having the program countywide and maybe selecting people from each service area. Since AI/AN are countywide, it was agreed that the program should be countywide.
- Kurt was recommended by Carrie as the consultant. He was the lead of CRDP and he has met with all counties and knows community members in counties. He also has credentials (MPH). He is based in Oakland which may be a good thing since a local consultant here may have a bias.
- There was an idea to maybe set up community advisory board

The group decided to present the idea to the AI/AN UREP subcommittee

AI/AN Capacity Building Project 13-14 Meeting: August 12, 2013 (1-2 pm), AICC

Attendees: April Skinas, Ava Imotichey, Carrie Johnson, Dan Dickerson, Donald Salcedo, Glenda Ahhaitty, Gloria Sheppard, Larry Gasco, Melanie Cain, Sam Chan, Zohreh Zarnegar, Mirtala Parada Ward, Nina Tayyib

Introductions and Blessing

Melanie presented the background on the capacity building project, including reviewing the CSS guiding principles. There was a clarification that the project needs to focus on at least one CSS guiding principal, not all.

Carrie discussed idea that was developed during pre-meeting, of a consultant developing a program where community workers conducted education and training to the community.

- She shared that the idea built off of AI/AN Learning Collaborative, which was done with the community and asked community members what they want.
- Larry asked if AI/AN UREP developed idea to address the need for AI/AN in behavioral health field. Could this be an opportunity to do something different? Perhaps encourage students early on and be encouraged to come into the mental health field.
- Carrie shared that she spent five years on learning collaborative and it was the community ideas that we continue with this work by doing a community wellness project that includes outreach, trust building and capacity building in terms of mental health. The community wanted to connect more.

- Carrie shared the pre-meeting discussion on how the promotoras model could be used to incorporate community members to outreach and training community about intergenerational trauma.
- This project could help bring AI/AN agencies together countywide. This project could include mentorship/training to the youth about getting into mental health field.
- Community voices are so important and this would give venue to have a voice. They don't come to UREP meetings now but maybe if we do this project, then they will.
- Larry said that he likes the idea and promotoras model and feels that it has worked very well.
- Glenda mentioned the Latino UREP project idea that is done with high schoolers to educate parents to decrease drop out rates. MPW shared that LAUSD is training education promoters.
- Ana shared that her promotoras program was very successful. Particularly since the Promotoras are from and/or live in their respective community. Also, they speak the language and know how to connect with community members. Sam and Ana discussed the success of the program and how it received national recognition (National Association of Counties Award).
- Sam Chan said that he and Larry are involved in LA County roundtable through CALMHSA on Stigma and Discrimination, Suicide Prevention and School based mental health services. This could be incorporated into the proposal.
- Sam Chan has also worked with existing NAMI group using storytelling using promotoras model. Specifically the Magnolia community. He shared that it is not so much about anti-stigma but more about O&E improving MH literacy. Group is set up as SLT but not stakeholder group.
- The committee discussed how there isn't a AI/AN promotoras type model that has been developed yet. There was a suggestion that this program be summarized in a report after it is complete, so that it can be further developed future projects (potentially even future UREP projects).

Project Discussion

Number of community workers:

- Larry said if the committee goes with Carrie's ideas, he is wondering if the AI/AN UREP has enough people from focus groups to select from.
- Ana suggested starting with 5 or 10 people, since there is limited amount of time and funding.
- It was suggested that it is important to have community workers connect during the project. Nina mentioned that API UREP included a monthly meeting of workers to provide ongoing support along with training to process their experience out there. Ana said that her program had similar meetings and they were called "booster sessions".
- There was a concern about community's interest in volunteers for this project, because of their own historical trauma. Ana said there was a lot of interest for their project. Nina shared that API had the same concerns but still had a lot of interest and individuals who volunteered.

Training topics:

- Ana suggested that they limit the trainings to 2-3 (i.e. Child mental health 101, Adult mental health 101, etc.).
- Sam Chan suggested that the topics be narrowed down to a few as well.

- Mirtala suggested using Ana's power point as a guide to develop the proposal.
- Nina will email sample curriculum as well to co-chairs that they can pull from.
- Donnie suggested looking at Native Wellness Institute Curriculum (based out of Portland). This is a train-the-trainers model. It is community-based and addresses historical trauma. Donnie has been trained on this model and this model worked very well the project he was involved with.
- Committee agreed that substance abuse should be addressed in the training topics.

Consultant recommendations:

- Carrie suggested Kurt Schwiemann who is from in Oakland.
- Melanie suggested incorporating some clients in recovery from AICC

Other proposal ideas:

- Gloria shared that AI/AN Mending the Circle TFCBT was suggested, but could be integrated as part of the training aspect. Carrie shared that she is trained in that and could do the training.
- There was discussion about whether to present the AI/AN Mending the Circle as another proposal option.
- Gloria said it is not necessarily competing project and could be integrated into the proposal discussed.

Funding:

- Nina confirmed that the funding amount available for 2013-14 is \$60,000 and the project will need to end on June 2014.
- The next steps include drafting a proposal (main points are on the agenda). It will then go through the approval chain at DMH.
- DMH will follow up with the mechanism by which the funding will come. It is important to be very specific about what you want to do, including names of potential trainings, specific individuals, etc. along with a justification.
- Dan asked who will get funds. DMH confirmed that the entity/person who will carry out this project will receive the funding. In the proposal, DMH will need to be told if there is some person/entity that is preferred and that will inform the funding mechanism (which has to be fair)
- There was a question about next year's funding. DMH confirmed that it can't be confirmed at this time. There will be an opportunity for a new project, if there is money, around March 2013.

Next steps:

- Nina shared that today was the introductory meeting.
- The committee needs to select who you want to draft the proposal. We will have one more official meeting to discuss proposal draft and vote on what will be submitted.
- Nina is available only for official UREP meetings that are held during work hours. If UREP co-chairs or members want to hold ad hoc meetings to discuss this proposal, that is fine. Nina will attend as her schedule permits and requested. At minimum, it was recommended that UREP designate a liaison to assure that the feedback is provided to the committee during the formal UREP meeting.

- The UREP was informed that more than one proposal can be submitted.
- MPW shared that all the proposals could be presented to the UREP subcommittee and then emailed out for a silent vote that was sent to DMH.
- The committee was encouraged to submit the proposal as soon as possible. We hope to have approval before December, but a definite date cannot be guaranteed.

Glenda volunteered to get feedback from the community before the next meeting.

- Glenda shared that the LAC Mental Health Commission meeting occurs during working hours (3rd week of the month). She will announce the project there.
- Also, AICC meetings occur monthly in the evening on a Tuesday night and they have a MH committee as well. She will also present the proposal there.
- Glenda shared that she has rec'd a lot of criticism regarding the UREP meetings only being during work hours. DMH reiterated that it is okay to have evening ad hoc meetings, but they will not be official UREP meetings. The information can be shared at the general UREP meetings.
- Larry had concerns about DMH participating in planning meetings since the project should be based on community feedback. Therefore, it is better if DMH is not there.

Proposal draft:

- Larry said that he would feel comfortable with Dan and Carrie to refine and draft a proposal for this into a project.
- Carrie and Dan agreed to draft a proposal that incorporate ideas mentioned at the meeting. Carrie said she could get it done by the end of this week.
- The proposal will be emailed out to subcommittee along with a request for feedback (to co-chairs) and/or other proposal ideas for the follow up meeting.