

Recommendation 5.3: Support implementation of evidence-based programs to prevent child maltreatment and promote safe, stable, nurturing relationships and environments.

Work group recommendations for alignment on funding cycles, readiness assessments, etc.:

#### Timing/Phases of Funding

- 5 year funding cycles would be in better alignment with the phases of implementation, while also better supporting program sustainability.
- Readiness and capacity might be better supported if agencies were funded for at least 6 months to a year of planning before serving families.
- It would be important to clarify whether funders are able to support both exploration and program installation, as the types of activities supported in these phases might be different. Support for both would be ideal.
- Agencies would need funding to access implementation support during the planning and readiness process.
- six months of planning funding, with a “coach” to either meet with us regularly or call in regularly. This provides guidance, but also provides accountability.

#### Process/What Does Funding Cover

- Flexibility in the renewal process, would also be helpful to consider so agencies can adapt implementation plans based on lesson learned during the readiness and planning process
- the coach should know something about the model that we’re implementing, including the national or model “standards” that must be met.
- funding should be enough to pay for ongoing coaching (perhaps monthly after the first six months) and for enough administrative/manager time to dedicate to the start-up.
- for clinical and home visiting models, funding should be enough to cover ongoing reflective supervision, so that the program can have dedicated supervisor time, as opposed to one of the staff members trying to squeeze supervision time into an already packed job description.
- funders should expect gradual client enrollment (for example, 50% enrolled after six months/100% enrolled after nine months) in order to give programs time to hire and train staff and get the “kinks” out of the program.

#### Questions:

What does this mean for evaluation?

How would we recommend funders assess this in grantmaking process?

Would the coach be provided by the grantmaking org? What would this relationship look like?