Meeting Objectives.
By the end of this meeting, WG members will have:
- Confirmed sub-group composition to work on distinct pillars of the bill
- Offered guidance on aspects of SB 6514 grant, data, and resource project

Work Group meeting materials:
- Agenda
- SB 6514
- Grant and Data Project timelines
- Data definitions

Welcome & Introductions
- Meeting objectives:
  - Confirm sub-group composition to work on distinct elements of the bill
  - Offer guidance on aspects of SB 6514 grant, data, and resource project
- Standing meeting time
  - Please apprise us of your availability by clicking this link and completing the survey.

Action item
Work group members:
Please visit this link to indicate your availability for a standing meeting time.
Thank you to Mark, Sharon, Casey, Christian, and Paul who have completed the survey!
### Grant Project

- Mark described the nuances of the timeline (pasted below), indicating the SAC may be able to award extensions to June 2020 dependent on the legislature.
- Note that “Awardees” in the timeline should be referred to as “apparently successful bidders.”
- Mark proposed two separate but complementary roles of the proposed grant sub-group, structural issues and scoring:
  - **Structural issues/“Rules of the game”** would including devising solutions to questions such as:
    - Should there be a maximum award?
    - Should consortia be permitted to apply?
    - How many applicants per institution would be eligible?
    - Should indirect costs be allowed?
    - Should an element of profit be considered?
  - **Selection criteria/scoring:**
    - WSAC does not possess this expertise in house, so a contractor has been engaged to assist with this work.
- As for sub-group composition, to prevent conflicts of interest and the potential of unfairly advantaging institutions who participate in the subgroup process, Mark proposed including sector and agency representatives and excluding those are affiliated with postsecondary institutions from the sub-group, unless their institution will not apply for a grant. Those with expertise in behavioral health and suicide prevention may also be included.
- If the aforementioned experts are affiliated with postsecondary institutions, they may be engaged after signing an NDA.
- There was concern that agency reps may not know the specific challenges faced by institutions. Rosemary suggested creating a form for institutions to offer information and to comment on proposed grant elements. WA State legislature could also use this resource to provide comment.

### Data Project

- Overview of timeline and upcoming activities
  - Refer to timeline below for upcoming activities.
  - Our initial activity is developing data definitions. Institutions need to know by Fall. Due to the differences between semester and quarter schedules, the Sept deadline noted may be too late.
  - Claudia emphasized that the data collection activity be approached with a cultural lens in its entirety, rather than as an afterthought or as a single question on the instrument-broad agreement across the WG. Donn noted that the legislation calls out the specific veteran sub-group but we also need to be cognizant of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations.
  - Eric recommended we talk to registrars who have definitions for some of the data points, such as students (e.g., American Assoc of Collegiate Registrars, WA has a state chapter).
  - Cody said some 4-year institutions are tracking this; they should be engaged so we are not recreating the wheel.
  - John noted that different agencies have different definitions of veterans; additionally some schools rely on students to self-report their veteran status.

### Data subgroup

- **Data subgroup:** compile data definitions for review by sub group and work group by August 1.

  Beyond asking if it exists, ask institutions to produce crisis plans as part of the data collection activities. These plans could also be considered for inclusion in the resource project of SB 6514.

  Consider additional domains that should be captured as part of the data collection. Although we do not want to add undue burden to institutions, we are not limited to collecting the data required in SB 6514.
**Resource Project**

- **Scope of work**
  - The first goal of the resource sub-group will be to conduct a type of landscape analysis to determine:
    - What evidence-based resources already exist?
    - What are the needs of the institutions we are aiming to serve?
    - What additional resources are needed to address those needs?
  - Sub group members will be asked to look for current best practices resources. Smaller groups within the sub-group will be asked to gather information and report back to the larger sub-group.
  - Members of the sub-group may be tasked with conducting key-informant interviews among post-secondary institutions, particularly the “hard-to-reach” institutions, to identify commonalities (or differences) across institutions. The purpose of the activity would be to inform the design of resources that will provide the most value for the diversity of populations who will access it.

**Sub-Group composition**

*To include representation from student voices, racial/ethnic minorities, rural students, veterans*

- **Grant sub-group – Lead: Mark Bergeson**
  - Those who volunteered to participate in grant subgroup are: Franklin Donahue, Paul Nagle, and John Phillips

- **Data sub-group – LEAD: Sarah Hohl**
  - Those who volunteered to participate in data subgroup are: Cody Eccles, Eric Baldwin, Rosemary Simmons, Mark Bergeson, Christian Crowell, Donn Marshall.
  - There will also be opportunities to join the sub-group on an ad-hoc basis

- **Resource sub-group – LEAD: Marny Lombard**
  - Those who volunteered to participate in resource subgroup are: Sigrid Reinert, David Schulman, Casey Winecoop, Paul Nagle, Franklin Donahue, Rosemary Simmons, Christian Crowell, colleague of Eric Baldwin (Libby Skiles), John Phillips, Mark Bergeson

**Public Comment**

- Our first and foremost responsibility is to help students at postsecondary institutions (Sen Brown)
- Consider the work in Michigan OK2Say (Rep Orwall)
- We must include minorities and underserved groups in the planning and implementation of this work (Claudia D’Allegri)

---

**Institutions of Higher Education:** [RCW 28B.10.016](#) (4) "Institutions of higher education" or “postsecondary institutions” means the state universities, the regional universities, The Evergreen State College, the community colleges, and the technical colleges.

**Degree-granting institutions:** [RCW 16 28B.85.010](#) (3) "Degree-granting institution" means an entity that offers educational credentials, instruction, or services prerequisite to or indicative of an academic or professional degree beyond the secondary level.

**Private vocational schools:** [RCW 28C.10.020](#) (7) "Private vocational school" means any location where an entity is offering postsecondary education in any form or manner for the purpose of instructing, training, or preparing persons for any vocation or profession.

**Schools:** [RCW 18.16.020](#) (34) "School" means any establishment that offers curriculum of instruction in the practice of cosmetology, hair design, barbering, esthetics, master esthetics, manicuring, or instructor-trainee to students and is licensed under this chapter.
## Grant project timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Project</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop Request for Proposals (RFP):</td>
<td>June-August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Release RFP</td>
<td>4-Sep-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Required Letter of Intent (LOI) due</td>
<td>21-Sep-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Proposals due</td>
<td>16-Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Proposals screened by WSAC staff for compliance with RFP</td>
<td>10/17-10/18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Proposals forwarded to reviewers</td>
<td>19-Oct-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Scored proposals returned to WSAC</td>
<td>30-Nov-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Awardees determined</td>
<td>12/3/18-12/10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Awardees announced</td>
<td>11-Dec-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Debriefing and protest period</td>
<td>12/12/18-1/11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Contracts executed so projects can start work</td>
<td>18-Jan-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Awardees fully implement projects</td>
<td>30-Jun-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Awardees fully implement projects</td>
<td>30-Jun-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Data project timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop template, methods for data collection, definitions with feedback from workgroup</td>
<td>31-Dec-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain work group feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop data definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile full list of institutions from which to collect data (e.g., do we include vocational)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree upon assessment design/data collection methods (some of this depends on funding and time resources)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine contact at each institution to facilitate data collection (who will complete survey?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain any necessary IRB approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot test survey among WG members and others; consider cognitive interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise survey as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect data</td>
<td>1-Jun-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data</td>
<td>1-Sep-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present preliminary results to workgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write annual report to legislature</td>
<td>1-Dec-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data DRAFT definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Item</th>
<th>Draft concepts, definitions, language 1</th>
<th>Draft concepts, definitions, language 2</th>
<th>Draft concepts, definitions, language 3</th>
<th>Questions to be addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of students, faculty, and staff: behavioral health &amp; suicide prevention resources</td>
<td>Design multiple questions to get at this content: # of licensed staff counselors addressing mental health (full time, part time; type of training: psychologist, social work, LMHC, overall FTE), # of unlicensed staff requiring supervision, MH trainees (include unlicensed senior staff, MA, doctoral level, overall FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what form would this take? Short answer, essay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of students referred to off-campus behavioral health resources</td>
<td>Count those referred by professional counseling staff</td>
<td>Do not count those referred by others on campus. (Rationale: There would be no credible way to collect data that required knowledge of students referred by faculty, res life staff, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of students identifying emotional distress as reason for withdrawal</td>
<td>Count those who report MH concerns as part of medical withdrawal procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of student suicide deaths</td>
<td>Count includes those enrolled at any point in the semester of death, even if withdrawn prior to death; if death occurs between semesters but is enrolled for subsequent semester.</td>
<td>Do not count if on leave of absence, post-graduation, if between semesters and not enrolled for following semester.</td>
<td>How many of these students were veterans?</td>
<td>Should these only count those that are formally determined to be suicidal deaths by medical examiners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of student suicide attempts that result in hospitalization</td>
<td>Count includes those who go to ER/ED but are not admitted</td>
<td>Do not count students who go to Urgent Care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confirmation of campus plans for suicide recognition and referral training that IDs groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• receiving the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• recommended to receive training in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity or entities on campus responsible for the development and maintenance of the campus crisis plan that integrates policies for suicide</td>
<td>Include description of offered trainings, in addition to required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reentry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• postvention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>