

Chelsea Wellness Coalition – Friends and Family Wellness

Meeting Summary: March 6, 2014: 6 – 8 pm at McKune Library

Attendees: Lori Kintz, Trinh Pifer, Kris Hohnke, Stephanie Doll, Courtney Stinson, Mary Hall, Nick Angel, Luman Strong, Dan Kaminsky, Jane Pacheco, Cindy Triveline, Susan J. Moore, Melissa Johnson, Shawn Personke, Jim Randolph, Renae Kempf, Jesse Kauffman, Sean McGill, Dayle Wright, Nany Paul, Sheri Montoye, Kathy Cater, Debi Werker, Melinda Baird, Ruth VanBogelen

Summary

1. Overview of proposed interventions for the Year 3 plan. Thirteen interventions total \$131,862 so a total of \$31,862 of reductions must be found.
2. Prioritization of the interventions.
 - 4 methods were presented (see page 2 A – D) and the pros and cons were discussed. A recommendation was made to do a combo of C and D – so this was added to the options.
 - Next each person was given a sticker to vote for one A – E below.
 - The vote was clear – to use a combination of C and D. From this point on we used a show of hands to make decisions. See number of votes on Page 2 for options A - E.
 - The group voted by a show of hands to try C first, then D. The result is shown as Round 1 in the spreadsheet on Page 3. Still over by \$16,900.
 - Next used the tool on about half of the interventions. This was done by the intervention leads reading off the numbers they gave for their own project. Yellow sticky notes were provided to the group so that anyone with objections could record their objection for a later step. NO yellow sticky notes were filled in.
 - After 6 interventions were done, the group STOPPED to access the tool.
 - Does the tool have the right questions for interventions? Feedback was that the tool had promise but there were some problems. For example, the scoring for the Community Center which is funds for a feasibility score was difficult to score.
 - Are intervention leads scoring their interventions correctly? Overall, the feeling was that the scores given were too high for most interventions.
 - Next the group was given options for continuing:
 - Continue using the scoring tool
 - Go back to using option C
 - Try either option A or B
 - The group decided to continue using the tool for all interventions.
 - A summary of the scores for all interventions is provided on page 3. The interventions were sorted by total score. 8 interventions were had a total score above the average. The original amount requested by these 8 was \$91,112.
 - The group came up with 4 proposals to continue
 - Try using option A – all interventions reduced by the same percentage
 - Go back to using option C
 - Use option B.

Chelsea Wellness Coalition – Friends and Family Wellness

Meeting Summary: March 6, 2014: 6 – 8 pm at McKune Library

- Allocate ~ \$10K for new projects which are requesting a small amount to get started (maybe about \$3K), then use the scoring to find the top scoring interventions for the other ~\$90K. This option was noted for reason – new projects all scored low in feasibility, good to have new opportunities in the portfolio.
 - The majority of people wanted to go back to Option C. The results are Round 2 and 3 in the spreadsheet on Page 3. At this point, the total was over by about \$5K – so the group decided to reduce all by the same percentage to get to the \$100,000.
 - Time 8:05 pm
3. Building consensus on how the coalition will use the \$100,000 in funding from CWF.
- Summary,
 - The trimming of the budget was successfully done in large part by the intervention leads willingness to reduce their requests rather than eliminating any of the 13 interventions. At no point in the meeting, did the group want to try to eliminate any of the interventions which could have been done by selecting Option B. Option B was offered three times during the meeting and this option would have allowed individuals to vote for their favorites. (Note – occasionally individuals would make comments about a particular intervention being questioned more or eliminated but again at no point in the meeting did the group want to try to eliminate interventions using Option B.
 - All interventions had a representative.
 - Because of the late hour, Ruth offered that anyone who did not agree with the decision could email the issue to her and that she would prepare a summary of the issue raised by email. The summary would include no names of individuals. Individuals can email Ruth until March 12. At this point, Ruth will email the coalition this summary and will ask the coalition if another meeting is needed for further discussion of the outcome of this meeting.

All intervention tables are available online at .

<http://www.5healthytowns.org/?module=Files&event=Coalition&ID=287&showID=356>, click on the “Year 3_2014_5”, The titles provide the intervention name_fiscal agent_funding request.

I. Methods that could be used for prioritization.

- A. 31.8% over so reduce all budgets so if all were reduced by 24% the total would be \$100,000
(1 VOTE)
 - a. PROS - equality
 - b. CONS – not strategic, may jeopardize success of some
- B. Individuals vote for top three (stickers) (1 VOTE)
 - a. PROS – reflection of preference for those at the table
 - b. CONS – not strategic, not transparent, can be “gamed”
- C. Group discussion, some intervention leads reduce their budgets, some decide it can wait until next year, etc. (3 VOTES)
 - a. PROS – team decision, could be strategic
 - b. CONS – some individuals are more compromising than others

Chelsea Wellness Coalition – Friends and Family Wellness

Meeting Summary: March 6, 2014: 6 – 8 pm at McKune Library

- D. Use a tool that “scores” all interventions based on value and feasibility (see attachment – tool handed out at the last meeting). **(0 VOTES)**
 - a. PROS – transparent, strategic
 - b. CONS – impersonal, potential flaws with the tool
- E. Use a combination C and D. **(19 VOTES)**
- F. No other options were proposed.

II. Original proposed amounts, results of Round 1, 2, 3 and the final amount for each intervention.

		Proposed for						
	Interventions	Year 3 Plan	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Final	% change	\$ change
EB	Farmers market	\$ 28,000	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000	\$ 22,857	18%	\$ 5,143
AUS	SRSLY	\$ 20,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 15,238	24%	\$ 4,762
ALL	Chelsea Community Center	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 14,285	29%	\$ 5,715
CWO	Wild about Summer Camp	\$ 15,960	\$ 12,460	\$ 11,460	\$ 11,460	\$ 10,914	32%	\$ 5,046
EB	Healthy Grocery Store	\$ 11,610	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 7,619	34%	\$ 3,991
MM	On the Move	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 7,619	24%	\$ 2,381
CWO	Community Read	\$ 7,500	\$ 6,050	\$ 5,500	\$ 5,500	\$ 5,238	30%	\$ 2,262
MM	Heart & Sole	\$ 6,500	\$ 6,500	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 5,714	12%	\$ 786
EB	Food Education Series	\$ 3,842	\$ 3,842	\$ 3,842	\$ 3,842	\$ 3,659	5%	\$ 183
MM	Walking Program	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,381	21%	\$ 619
MM	Bulldog Fit	\$ 2,750	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,400	\$ 2,400	\$ 2,286	17%	\$ 464
MM	Run for the Rolls	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,300	\$ 1,300	\$ 1,238	17%	\$ 262
CWO	Volunteer Chelsea	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 952	21%	\$ 248

Attachment with this document is the prioritization tool with scores for all interventions. This document is in Excel.

III. Summary of Scoring

		Proposed for	Green = above average		
	Interventions	Year 3 Plan	Value	Feasibility	Total pts
EB	Farmers market	\$ 28,000	32	25	57
CWO	Volunteer Chelsea - no interv	\$ 1,200	23	32	55
MM	New - Walking Program	\$ 3,000.00	34	21	55
CWO	Community Read	\$ 7,500	28	22	50
AUS	SRSLY	\$ 20,000	25	23	48
CWO	Wild about Summer Camp	\$ 15,960	27	21	48
EB	Food Education Series	\$ 3,842	28	20	48
EB	Healthy Grocery Store	\$ 11,610	30	17	47
MM	Heart & Sole	\$ 6,500	23	21	44
MM	Run for the Rolls	\$ 1,500	25	19	44
MM	On the Move - An Adaptive I	\$ 10,000.00	27	16	43
ALL	Chelsea Community Center	\$ 20,000.00	28	14	42
MM	Bulldog Fit	\$ 2,750.00	16	13	29