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Summary
Boston Against Drugs was a partnership among the city, business corporations, and neighborhood groups united in opposition to drug and alcohol abuse. In this case, the reader is asked to analyze BAD as a collaboration, paying particular attention to assessing the role of the corporate partners. Readers must make recommendations regarding future funding options necessary to keep BAD alive as well as administrative and governance changes necessary to strengthen BAD's operating effectiveness.

Boston Against Drugs was known throughout the city of Boston as an effective contributor to the war against substance abuse. Created in 1986, "BAD" was a partnership among the City of Boston, business corporations, and neighborhood groups united in opposition to drug and alcohol abuse. Activities were conducted through sixteen neighborhood task forces, known as TEAMs, an acronym for Through Empowerment and Mobilization. City staff provided support to the TEAMs and each TEAM had its own corporate partner and Business Representative on the TEAM.

In the fall of 1994, BAD was entering its last year of federal funding. The half million dollar grant the program had been receiving annually since 1990 had done much to support the neighborhood TEAMs' efforts to prevent people from using drugs and abusing alcohol. In FY '94, the federal moneys had been apportioned so that support for BAD's central office in City Hall had been thirty-six percent of the $475,000 (personnel received $159,300, while $6,300 and $5,000 went to travel and supplies respectively). The rest, $304,000, went to the TEAMs and was divided equally among them. Although prospects for
additional funding were good in the long term, it was doubtful that another federal grant could be secured soon.

John Riordan of Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Massachusetts was BAD's corporate director, the senior representative of the corporate partners in BAD's operating structure. He was concerned that if he and his colleagues in City Hall failed to develop a solution to the impending loss of funds, important activities that were already planned by the TEAMs and the efforts of City staff would cease. Riordan was considering several options but was uneasy about each:

- He could try to obtain a bridge grant from one or several foundations. That solution might be ideal but was not likely because competition for local foundation moneys was extremely high from worthy causes that did not already receive substantial corporate support;

- He could seek agreement from the corporate partners to increase their average yearly cash support of individual TEAMs from $5,000 to $10,000. He worried that such a request would be viewed as a shift in the kinds of resources partners would be expected to make in the future and would lessen their overall commitment to BAD. Moreover, it might undercut the non-financial but essential contributions of the Business Reps;

- It might be possible to ask the neighborhood TEAMs to conduct local fundraising. Such activities, however, could easily detract from their ability to conduct programs directly related to drug and alcohol abuse prevention, and few had fundraising skills.

Without funds, numerous neighborhood seminars, plays, awareness programs, forums, parades, rallies, sports tournaments, and fund-raisers -- all of which served to engage and unite people's energies in the cause of substance abuse prevention -- would have to be dropped or severely curtailed. Those events had spread the message in all sixteen communities that something was being done neighbor-to-neighbor about addiction.
Antecedents of Collaboration

In the mid 1980s, Boston Mayor Ray Flynn and City Hall staff had determined that drug and alcohol problems were rampant in all areas of the city. The mayor decided to do something about it and called on the Boston Chamber of Commerce to convene individuals who ran the major corporations in Boston. This group, known as “The Vault,” was asked by the Chamber and Flynn to confront Boston’s drug problem through direct involvement. The Vault acceded to the request and appointed a Special Task Force on Drugs headed by Gerhard Freche, then president and CEO of New England Telephone, long a sponsor of community reform activities.

The concept of partnerships with specific neighborhoods sprang from Flynn’s emphasis on services to neighborhoods. The local emphasis also built on the work of the Boston Compact for Education, another Vault project, which involved sponsorship of individual schools by corporations. BAD broadened the concept of “adopt a school” to “adopt a neighborhood.” One of John Riordan’s predecessors as corporate director put it this way:

The concept of partnerships with neighborhoods really sprang out of the partnerships that we do in the school system. New England Telephone has had for years a partnership with Dorchester High. Ours was the first, in fact. Other corporations have adopted a nearby high school. We just thought that it might work to adopt a neighborhood. BAD’s initial pilots were companies who all had had partnerships with high schools. And what we really asked them to do was take the same neighborhood where their high school partnership already existed.

Building the Model

Freche made it clear to the mayor that he was interested in doing something other than merely writing a check, although financial support could be part of the package. Freche wanted to address substance abuse in ways that led to lasting progress. That goal required a long term and comprehensive approach on the part of the corporations. He also wanted to create a structure that would exist over time, no matter what the vagaries of politics or corporate leadership happened to be.
Although some neighborhood arrangements jelled quickly, others took longer to establish. Community organizations in the various neighborhoods feared that BAD would deflect both attention and funds from their causes. It took careful persuasion to get local groups to look beyond their own individual missions and approach BAD as a complement to what they were already doing. Cooperation, therefore, was often slow in coming.

To address those undercurrents, the city and businesses encouraged the four initial TEAMs to come together and sponsor activities so that all the parties could get acquainted and build trust. These endeavors engaged neighborhood leaders and created awareness of BAD's leadership and what they were trying to do. Only afterwards did the separate TEAMs begin discussions about goals and strategies. Early energy also centered on determining what resources companies and other participants would commit. That work involved doing a lot of inventorying -- finding out who was doing what and who could contribute what resources.

Pat Purcell, the publisher of the Boston Herald and the Corporate Chairperson following Freche, lent the resources of his newspaper to the program's publicity efforts, developing a media campaign that made Boston Against Drugs a more familiar name. He also used the Herald's extensive mailing list of community and business leaders, politicians, and administrators in the health care field to keep key stakeholders informed of BAD's activities. To further the public relations effort, BAD sponsored public events. During the late '80s, there were forums on drugs in the workplace, programs on AIDS, and the first "Big BAD Weekend," featuring the Reverend Jesse Jackson. "We just kept hammering at it and that was where we were effective," recalled a corporate director.

During Purcell's term, the city sought and was granted a $2.5 million federal grant from the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention to assist the BAD effort over a five-year period. The grant had four noteworthy provisions: 1) it mandated broad-based TEAM composition and supported recruitment efforts; 2) it provided funds for a program staff in the city's Neighborhood Services
Department; 3) it furnished resources for training and evaluation to equip TEAM members with skills needed to perform their work; and, 4) it provided funds to the neighborhoods to sponsor events.

In the early 1990s, BAD’s third Corporate Chair, Robert Fraser from a major city law firm, recruited experts from diverse fields to address various organizational needs essential to the achievement of BAD’s goals. The intent was to infuse both staff and volunteers in the neighborhoods with the knowledge and skills they needed. It was naive to believe that such participants, while competent and dedicated, would have all that was needed to perform well on their TEAMs. Drug and alcohol abuse were tied to issues such as family violence, inadequate education, health problems, and so forth. The insights of specialists could be helpful.

In the end, three facets of BAD’s organization and operating procedures seemed to be critical to its success:

**Collaborative Model**

The seriousness of the drug problem and inability of any one sector (private, public, or nonprofit) to effectively remedy it made cooperation with many stakeholders necessary. BAD, therefore, worked from a coalition-building model that identified and then used the unique contributions of each collaborator.

**Neighborhood Focus**

Corporate engagement with BAD was based in the neighborhoods rather than at the citywide level. Neighborhoods were thought to be more manageable arenas from which to collaborate. Therefore, while the Corporate Chair ran the Oversight Board (which examined issues from all the neighborhoods), each Business Rep was responsible to an individual neighborhood. The neighborhood TEAMs diagnosed an area’s particular substance abuse problem. The Reps then customized and funneled each corporation’s contributions directly to the people and groups in that community. As a result, less red tape was involved than if approval of specific activities had to come from City Hall or a corporation’s headquarters.
Empowerment Model

A key facet of BAD's approach, related to its neighborhood focus, was a community empowerment model -- BAD sought to equip residents with the capabilities to deal with their own issues, rather than seeking outsiders to solve problems for them. Commitment to empowering residents to establish and maintain autonomy over their affairs enabled the Business Reps to establish and respect boundaries for the corporate role. The specifics of the neighborhood programs were decided by TEAM members, not by BAD administrators or Business Reps. BAD's corporate sponsors were only one voice at the table.

Governance and Administrative Structures

To support the tripartite partnership among the City of Boston, the city's major corporations, and the people, agencies, and institutions in the neighborhoods, BAD had a complex administrative and governance structure.

The Board of Oversight

The Oversight Board, which was not formally incorporated but existed as a committee of the Chamber of Commerce, was chaired by the CEO of a corporate partner. He or she served a three year term and recruited additional corporate partners by soliciting CEOs he or she knew. Those executives or their delegates constituted BAD's board. The board did not hold formal meetings but the chair met with members in order to inform them of BAD's progress and problems, to present ideas regarding solutions, and to solicit corporate partners' suggestions. Further, the Corporate Chair was a liaison and advocate for BAD with other sectors of the community. As the CEO of a corporate partner reported:

Generally, the way organizations develop in the corporate community is that you have a champion, somebody who believes in the cause. Then he either calls or writes to others -- there is a letter and then a phone discussion. You know, 'Here's the problem and here is how we think we can solve it. We need to get kids to understand that using drugs is bad.' And, I was just convinced that it was worth a shot at trying to help.
The City

Using the prestige and clout associated with his office, Boston’s Mayor personally called on business leaders and convinced them that involvement in civic projects was necessary to their being good corporate citizens. The Mayor also committed city government resources to the project. As one of Riordan’s predecessor’s put it:

The Mayor’s office carried an awful lot of weight. There’s an office within the Mayor’s office specifically for BAD. With that came a lot of things. We were able to get technical assistance, get the streets cleaned after BAD events, get the police when we needed them.

In 1987, Mayor Flynn established the full-time position of executive director for BAD in the Neighborhood Services Department. Thereafter, BAD was one of the examples he frequently cited of his administration’s campaign to curtail drug and alcohol abuse.

As a member of the City Hall staff, the executive director administered the federal grant and arranged for technical assistance, guidance, and coordination. The executive director also worked closely with the manager appointed by the Corporate Chair as corporate director to plan for BAD as a whole and for the work of the Citywide Support Group (see below). For example, in the Big BAD Weekend promotions, the executive director arranged for parade routes and police escorts while the corporate director arranged for transportation of youngsters from the neighborhoods to the downtown parade site.

The executive director also designated certain city employees as community liaisons who were charged with supporting the organizational efforts of the neighborhood TEAMs. Community liaisons provided linkages between city agencies and neighborhood TEAMs and among various neighborhoods. These liaisons facilitated cross-fertilization of ideas and programs. All were experienced in community development.
The Neighborhoods

There were two types of neighborhood representatives on the TEAMs. Some represented various agencies or constituencies within neighborhoods as required by the federal grant, including religious, parental, health, local businesses, youth serving, alcohol/drug treatment, education, law enforcement, media, recreational, civic and voluntary, and grassroots citizens groups. The other type of member was the individual volunteer, willing to donate time and talent to make the locale a better place to live and work. Meeting at least once a month, neighborhood TEAMs devised and carried out activities to prevent drug and alcohol abuse. Activities were formalized in a work plan, written after a community survey had been completed and analyzed by the TEAM. (Exhibit 1)

The Citywide Support Group

The Citywide Support Group (CSG) was mandated by the federal grant to be the policy-making body for BAD and city staff provided its on-going support. Representatives from each neighborhood TEAM sat on the CSG to insure that the direction of BAD was firmly in the hands of neighborhood residents. Fifteen other people, mostly heads of other city departments, were also voting members, although this was controversial with the TEAM representatives, many of whom felt they alone should be able to vote. The CSG met once a month and its functions included:

- Long-term planning for BAD as a whole entity;
- Policy direction for programming;
- Review of evaluation processes and outcome measures;
- Short-term planning for citywide activities.

The Corporate Partners

Corporate partners were the corporations and other large entities in Boston that agreed to provide resources to assist a particular neighborhood in its efforts to prevent drug and alcohol abuse. Firms participated in BAD because they sensed a need to establish and maintain mutually beneficial relationships with various players in the local community. For example, Gillette Corporation, located in South Boston, sponsored South Boston BAD; Bull Worldwide Information Systems, located in Allston/Brighton, sponsored
that area's BAD; and John Hancock, adjacent to the South End, was corporate partner to that neighborhood's BAD.

Firms knew they depended on a healthy environment for their businesses. One CEO described his corporation’s involvement this way:

> These kids eventually had to go to work. They came to us and we couldn’t hire them; they couldn’t pass the tests. They had to know how to read and write. So, it was good economic sense for the businesses to jump in and say, ‘let’s go, let’s do something.’

Businesses need the city to be healthy. In a diseased city, a business goes under. And with no business, there is no city. People leave; it’s empty.

Moreover, businesses acted to maintain good relations with specific groups or individuals, to garner public relations value from civic involvements, and to accommodate politically influential people who asked firms to participate. Corporations also participated to honor informal agreements, such as those established with the Vault. One CEO expressed his commitment this way:

> What is a city? A city is more than bricks and mortar. A city is more than a golden dome. A city is more than a mayor and city council. A city is made up of human beings and institutions and how you blend those together. So, the business community has an obligation, its seems to me, looking down the road, to promulgate its own future. It is in my best interest to reach out and help so that the city remains vital.

In addition, many business leaders and their employees were concerned citizens who cared deeply about the Boston community and the effects of drugs and alcohol on it. In order to carry out that commitment, they acted strategically by choosing projects, such as substance abuse, that fit into or affected their ability to achieve corporate goals. They did so both from a sense of sympathy with those dealing with drug or alcohol problems and from a sense of duty to do their part in addressing the issues, as a former corporate chair observed:

> I think from the corporate level they thought it was a good thing for the company to be affiliated with simply
because there was so much attention being focused on drugs. And, I believe it was a demonstration that these companies were willing to commit resources to address a problem in the community and city. I think there was some degree of altruism in their involvement. A lot of them did not get direct or major publicity out of it, but rather got some recognition from a small segment of the city that they were involved in.

**Evaluation**

From the corporate perspective, evaluation of BAD’s effectiveness was difficult to measure. Nonetheless, firms employed a variety of measures, such as levels of attendance at TEAM meetings, numbers of people at events, anecdotal evidence of success, and so forth. Firms continued to commit to BAD, it seemed, so long as these appraisals and assessments proved credible. As one Business Rep explained:

> We really don’t do any kind of formal evaluation process, measuring anything. It is hard to do. Basically, it is really my judgment of how things are going. If I really thought that this TEAM did nothing in the community, had no impact, then I would report that back. We would have to decide, is this something we want to continue doing? So, a lot of it has to do with my reporting back because I am the one who is there to see what is going on.

Despite the lack of concrete measures, it was thought that involvement in BAD provided firms with favorable cost/benefit ratios compared with other types of direct cash contributions they made to charities. Firms provided goods and services to BAD at prices much lower than what it would cost TEAMs to obtain them. The expense involved was minimal to firms, constituting an incentive to continue the partnership.

**The Business Reps**

The key resource committed to BAD by companies was the Business Rep, a middle manager who worked directly with a neighborhood TEAM. The Reps determined the corporate resources to be contributed based on the individual neighborhood’s needs. Services such as typing and mailing minutes of TEAM
meetings, meeting notices, reminder phone calls, providing meals at meetings, photocopying, assisting in advertising, and PR for TEAM events were all examples of the kinds of resources the Business Reps provided from their corporations. These resources allowed TEAMs to concentrate on programs rather than on administrative details. Substantial, direct financial support was not given -- typically, a corporation donated between $5,000 and $10,000 a year to support its TEAM. (Exhibit 2)

As key resources, the Business Reps needed to have the confidence of their superiors, knowledge of their corporation’s assets that could be used by their TEAM, and an understanding of their firm’s rationale for being involved. They also needed to have the ability to gain the trust of TEAM members to help them form an effective group. The CEO of Bull Worldwide Information Systems described the role Bull’s Business Rep played:

First of all, because of who he was, Jimmy Bingel pretty much had poetic license. Almost a blank check. He and I would spend some time periodically doing a gut check as to where we were. He would talk to people here because he is that kind of person, particular people from the Allston/Brighton area. He had a network of local merchants and people who had an interest. So, it wasn’t just Bull being the private sector, but there was a network of people. He listened to what was going on in other parts of the community. So, he could get the real scoop. And then he just went out and worked with the kids and with the different institutions in the private sector. He created himself quite a network.

Another Business Rep described his role this way:

Primarily the role now has evolved into that of a major facilitator. I communicate with the chairperson on a regular basis around issues that the TEAM is facing. I communicate with the community liaison occasionally to find out what is going on at BAD in City Hall. And I am involved with maintaining relationships with other Business Reps.
The Current Situation

In 1993, William Van Faasen, CEO of Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Massachusetts, became the fourth Corporate Chairperson and appointed John Riordan as BAD’s corporate director. As Corporate Chair, Van Faasen was interested in: 1) strengthening the Citywide Support Group (CSG), BAD’s central coordinating unit, to insure an effective administrative mechanism was in place should federal funding no longer be available; and 2) finding partners for BAD as a means of enhancing its effectiveness and its future funding attractiveness. (Exhibit 3)

Van Faasen was worried about the future, despite BAD’s successes. In early 1995, he telephoned Riordan. After the usual greetings Van Faasen said, “John, I’ve been thinking about BAD’s funding problems and thought I’d give you a call to get your recommendations.”

Questions for Discussion

1. Whose interests are served by BAD? What do they get and what do they give? Is BAD truly a collaborative effort as it claims?

2. Assess its administrative and governance structures. What are they designed to achieve? Are they effective? In what sense?

3. What recommendation would you make concerning future funding for BAD? What consequences does that recommendation have for the BAD model of collaboration? What changes, if any, would you make in BAD’s administrative and governance structures?
Bibliography


A lucid discussion of three major theories of corporate social performance: corporate social responsibility with its emphasis on the charity and stewardship principles; corporate social responsiveness with its more pragmatic attention to action and reform by corporations; and, corporate social rectitude that develops a values and ethics component.


Defines collaboration and stakeholders and suggests two kinds of opportunities that foster collaborative efforts: resolving conflicts and advancing shared vision. See chapter 1, “Collaboration: the Constructive Management of Differences.”


Describes the fundamental principles of “federalism” as they apply to the modern corporation and to the growing popularity of alliances. Governance ultimately democratic in these structures and accountable to all U. S. interest groups.


Uses federal job training program to show importance of specific elements of a public-private partnership, including: mandate, networks, brokering organizations, common vision, crisis, and visionary leadership.
BOSTON AGAINST DRUGS
THROUGH EMPOWERMENT AND MOBILIZATION
1995 WORKPLAN

TEAM: SOUTH BOSTON AGAINST DRUGS
Contact Person: Spokesperson Phone:
Address:

1. Summarize your TEAM's overall Drug Prevention Plan COMMUNITY AWARENESS and EDUCATION
   summarizes SO. BAD's Prevention Plan. Through continued collaboration with
   local schools, youth serving agencies, civic groups, and local businesses, we
   will continue efforts to provide prevention, education, and resources to
   residents of all ages in the area of drugs, alcohol, tobacco, use/abuse.

2. Describe the status of your TEAM: (i.e. where & when TEAM meets, meeting frequency, number
   who attend) SO. BAD meets at the Tynan Community Center on Tuesdays, 5:30 p.m.
   Meetings are held as frequently as once a week, depending on agenda items and
   TEAM activities. Average attendance is 17-20 members per meeting, and the
   Gillette representative (corporate sponsor) actively participates by either
   attending or through regular telephone contact, as well as helping at most events.

3. How does your TEAM define membership? Any concerned citizen in the South Boston
   neighborhood is invited to join. SO. BAD By-Laws define membership as consisting
   of 15, no more than 35 members at any given meeting. The number of associates is
   unlimited. Active TEAM membership is defined as attending all meetings and
   participating at events/activities. TEAM meetings are open.
4. Describe the demographics of your TEAM: Representation from agencies, local law enforcement, clergy, DOA counselors, and residents of all ages comprise the TEAM. Every age group is adequately represented, as well as most demographic neighborhoods.

5. Describe the demographics of your neighborhood: Recent demographics indicate that our community is approximately 96% white. TEAM efforts focus targeting the BHA developments in the neighborhood to inform the 4% minority residents who are new to the community.

6. Describe your plan to ensure that your TEAM reflects the diversity of your neighborhood:

Please see attached statement. Advertisement and publicity of all TEAM opportunities/activities in the local newspaper to ensure that all areas are fully informed.

7. Please summarize the results of Community Survey IV: 328 individuals responded to the Community Survey IV, with a slight increase in male respondents. 53% suggested more youth activities and drug education. 73% responded that parents should take the lead. More than 27% indicated an increase in senior citizens having substance abuse problems. 50% indicated that both drug and alcohol use had increased.

A high number of respondents indicated that SO. BAD should not only continue, but increase education/prevention activities for residents of all ages.

8. How are these results reflected in your workplan?: SAFE DAYS and drug and alcohol education in the schools will continue in an attempt to reach more youths. Educational outreach, prevention strategies, and resources will be available to teens, parents, and senior citizens in the community. Community awareness and education for all residents will be on-going through workshops, events, and specific activities to address the growing needs and concerns in our neighborhood on drug, alcohol, and tobacco use/abuse.
9 Please summarize the strengths & weaknesses of your current year's activities: ________________

Strength's of this year's program lies in the dedication and commitment of the TEAM members. Outreach to senior citizens has increased through our volunteer efforts. Community awareness for both teens and parents has received more attention, and all initiatives will remain on-going. Due to serious illness, promotion, and retirement, our three key people in charge of the Career Exploration & Support curriculum has been put on hold. No other weaknesses/problems exist.

10. What are the TEAM's primary goals for 1995? ________________

To address the increase in substance abuse (drugs, alcohol, tobacco) in our neighborhood. Youths are drinking at an earlier age. Education and prevention initiatives will increase for residents of all ages. Community awareness is also a priority and will target parents and senior citizens. Our ACOS counselor will be working with as many schools as possible for the remainder of Year 4, and throughout Year 5 reaching hundreds of school age children (ages 6-17).

11. Please describe the process that was used to develop this workplan: ________________

Priorities for Year 5 in the CSAP grant were discussed, identified, and approved by the TEAM. More attention on workshops and education for parents will be a major part of this year's focus. In addition, SO. BAD can provide referrals and resources to those identified as most in need.
Exhibit 2

Budget Narrative

Community Awareness Breakfast: $500.00
The goal of this activity is to bring together the business community, community organizations, and neighborhood residents to acknowledge people strive to make our neighborhood a drug free community. Friends and neighbors will nominate those that they feel are working to better the community and each will be recognized at the breakfast. Approximately 150 people should attend this event and it will be evaluated by the number of participants, press coverage, and number of elected officials present.

Read Aloud Program: $100.00
The goals of this activity are to increase the visibility of our neighborhood BAD in the community, to model for students our BAD members’ love of reading, and to present a prevention message to students in our schools. We target 300 students in grades K-5 and twenty teachers in the Spenser school. We will evaluate the activity by the number of students participating and the number of parents and teachers joining our TEAM’s efforts.

Community Outreach: $300.00
This activity seeks to provide the community with information about drugs of all kinds as well as doing outreach in the community. In accordance with the Community Survey, information about tobacco prevention will be a major focus. We will evaluate its success by the number of flyers distributed, the number of new TEAM members, and the amount of interest generated in our activities.

Neighborhood BAD Retreat: $1800.00
The retreat’s goal is to provide training for TEAM members to increase skills and build TEAM cohesiveness. This year’s training will focus on practical skills and information concerning drugs, alcohol, and tobacco abuse. The goals will be to develop better training skills within the TEAM itself, thereby increasing the likelihood of post-grant continuation of community prevention activities. The retreat will target 25 TEAM members and will be evaluated by the number attending and the number of community training sessions held in the neighborhood subsequent to the retreat.

Neighborhood Family Day: $1800.00
The Family Day provides a forum in which our residents can gather together to discuss issues of alcohol, drug, and tobacco abuse in our community and also celebrate our community, families, and children. It is a substance free field day held at the end of our community’s parade where all community organizations are invited to set up information tables and awareness materials are distributed to all participants. The target group is the 500 people who attend the parade, and we will evaluate its success by the number of organizations and people participating in the field day activities.
Parade: $1100.00
   The goal of the parade is to increase our neighborhood BAD's visibility and to strengthen ties to other community groups. It is the single most visible event in which we participate. We work together with the Merchant's Association and the Parade Committee. Our corporate partner marches with us. We will evaluate its success by the number of BAD members marching in the parade.

Parent Training: $1800.00
   Parent training provides parents with increased options to help teach their children, peers, and community to prevent drug, alcohol, and tobacco abuse. We sponsor bilingual/bi-cultural training to forty parents. Children's activities and social events bring together parents of both English and Spanish cultures to share their parenting experiences. Success will be evaluated by the number of parents trained and by a parent evaluation to be completed at the end of training.

Neighborhood BAD Line: $0.00
   The voice mail line creates immediate access to information about our activities. The company providing this voice mail account had donated the service to us. We will evaluate its success by the number of telephone calls and number of participants in our events.

Poster Contest: $1000.00
   This is a poster contest in our grammar and middle schools that provides a positive way for children to express their thoughts and feelings about alcohol, tobacco, and drug abuse. Six winners will be chosen and given $100.00 US Savings Bonds. Evaluation will be the number of contest entries.

Family Walk: $600.00
   Working with other community organizations, our TEAM will organize a sponsorship walk to encourage the participation of all segments of our community. Funds raised by the event will be divided among the various community groups. We are targeting 100 residents as walkers and at least five other community organizations. We will evaluate its success by the number of organizations participating, the number of walkers, and the funds raised.

Note Card: $0.00
   The goal of this activity is to begin private fundraising to increase our post-grant sustainability. Using posters that win this year's Poster Contest, the MBTA [Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority and this TEAM's corporate partner] advertising and printing departments will render posters on blank cards that will then be sold throughout our community to raise funds.
B.A.D. Helps Boston Fight Substance Abuse

By age 13, 30% of all boys and 22% of all girls have begun to drink alcohol.

What can you do about it? Team up with B.A.D.

B.A.D. is an active coalition of concerned neighborhood residents, local government, and the business community. Simply put, B.A.D. promotes community health by working to prevent alcohol, tobacco, and other drug abuse.

Since 1985, B.A.D. has been bringing this vital message to Boston through its unique TEAM approach. TEAM stands for “Through Empowerment and Mobilization” and means that only by involving residents, business, and government can Boston work to solve the problem of substance abuse on our streets and in our neighborhoods.

The TEAM approach enables neighborhood teams to design alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention programs that are targeted to the specific needs of their neighborhood. Family members, police, clergy, health care providers, and teachers work together to help their community combat substance abuse.

How B.A.D. TEAMs Work in Your Neighborhood

All across Boston, members from 16 B.A.D. neighborhood TEAMs are working to develop short- and long-term strategies to address their communities’ specific prevention needs. They develop the plan and put it to work.

Each TEAM is free to come up with its own creative approaches to reducing substance abuse in its neighborhood. Some examples of B.A.D. TEAMs at work include:

- Sponsoring alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention courses at a neighborhood branch library for parents and youth
- Training youth sports league coaches who, in turn, educate their teams about substance abuse prevention
- Exposing teens firsthand to the harmful consequences and risk factors associated with substance abuse by having them attend a drug court trial
- Working with senior outreach organizations to identify and help isolated senior citizens avoid substance abuse and over-medication problems

B.A.D. is based on the notion of partnership: alcohol, tobacco, and other drug abuse affects individuals, families, and entire communities. Our best hope for fighting this problem is to work together.

Tom Menino, Mayor of Boston, and Honorary Chair, Boston Against Drugs

Alcohol, tobacco, and other drug abuse is as much a public health problem as it is a public safety problem. As with any illness, it’s better to prevent it than to treat it. That’s what B.A.D. is all about.

Bill Van Faassen, President and CEO, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts, and Chair, Boston Against Drugs
B.A.D. at Work With the City of Boston

Each B.A.D. neighborhood TEAM is paired with one of Boston’s sixteen largest and most active businesses. It is just one of the unique elements of the B.A.D. program, and it’s proven successful enough to be replicated throughout the city. B.A.D. Business Partners, with their neighborhood TEAMs, create and implement innovative education and prevention initiatives that B.A.D. Business Partners include:

- Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts
- Bank of Boston
- Boston Edison
- Boston Gas
- Bell Worldwide
- Systems
- Brigham & Women’s Hospital
- Faulkner Hospital
- Fleet Bank
- Gillette’s
- John Hancock
- Insurance Company
- IBM
- MBTA
- Massport
- New England Telephone
- The Raymond Group
- Tufts University

B.A.D. Partnerships Are Good Business

B.A.D. Business Partners are taking an active stand. They’re helping Boston’s neighborhoods reduce substance abuse, and they’re helping their own companies create meaningful, volunteer opportunities for their employees. B.A.D. Business Partners provide support through a variety of financial and in-kind services.

- A teen business bureau was set up by one B.A.D. Business Partner to train teens in marketable skills as an alternative to becoming involved in the drug economy.
- One Business Partner included educational materials designed by its TEAM in a mailing to 10,000 of its Boston clients.
- Each year, one Business Partner hosts a gala to honor the positive work being done by B.A.D. team members.

And while Boston businesses are working hard for B.A.D., B.A.D. can give back by working with these businesses to educate their employees and combat workplace alcohol, tobacco, and other drug abuse. B.A.D.’s “Focus on the Workplace” program helps businesses develop ways to identify substance abuse problems and cut down on accidents, absenteeism, and other problems associated with workplace substance abuse.

How Can You Get Involved?

Whether you’re concerned individual wanting to make a difference or you represent a small business, a large business, or a community group, B.A.D. needs you. The best way to get involved is to join your neighborhood TEAM. No matter how much or how little time you can commit to our mission—there’s a way for you to help.

- There are short-term volunteer opportunities at B.A.D. community events.
- If you’ve got more time, explore becoming an active member of your local B.A.D. TEAM.
- And if you can make a long-term commitment, B.A.D.’s coordinated citywide effort needs your help.

Call us today at (617) 635-3283, or stop by our offices in Room 708 at Boston City Hall. We need you to help make a better Boston.