

Talking about Prevention

A Communications Toolkit for Child Welfare Advocates

A set of resources for state child welfare advocates working to change the conversation around prevention and to build stronger, more supportive systems for families and children

JULY 2026



Funded by the SPARC Network

Contents

What's in This Toolkit?	3
Grab and Go Language	4
Dos and Don'ts	8
Avoid the Traps and Mind the Gaps	10
Talking Points for Policymakers	13
Bridge and Pivot Guide	16
Closing Note for Advocates	19



What's in This Toolkit?

This toolkit includes five resources plus a brief introduction that sets the stage.

- **Grab and Go Language.** Ready-made language you can pull off the shelf: vision openers, values, problem framing, solution framing, and short-form templates
- **Dos and Don'ts.** Topic-area tables you can scan before drafting
- **Avoid the Traps and Mind the Gaps.** A preflight checklist for any draft: seven habits of thought it might be cuing without meaning to and seven things it might be missing
- **Talking Points for Policymakers.** Modular, droppable points designed to be tailored to your bill, your rule, your state
- **Bridge and Pivot Guide.** A three-step formula for handling the four traps that derail prevention conversations: *Fatalism*, *Zero-Sum*, *Family Bubble*, and *Pathologizing Poverty (and Race)*

Framing Your Approach to Prevention

This toolkit is designed to be an effective resource no matter how your organization defines prevention or how it is used in the states and communities you work within. The vision, values, explanations, and traps described here are the connective tissue; the specific programs, policies, and solutions are yours to name. Wherever you see a bracketed prompt like *[name the policy or program you are advocating for]*, that is your cue to drop in your own definition of prevention, your own approach, and your own ask. The guidance gives you parameters to work within, not words to memorize, so you can sound like yourself and your organization while pulling public thinking in the same direction: making sure every child is happy, healthy, and safe.

A Note on Audience

Different audiences have different interests, constraints, and incentives. A family looking for assistance, a legislator working a budget cycle, and an agency leader managing political risk are going to encounter communications in different venues and with their own lens on the problems and solutions. But that does not mean they require different frames. They require strategic choices. What changes is which elements you emphasize, which solutions you name first, and which entry points you choose. The framing recommendations that follow apply across audiences but should be adapted using your knowledge about your audiences.

Grab and Go Language

This resource provides language you can pull off the shelf when you need words now. Adapt it to your style and type of communication.

An Adaptable Framing Strategy

Four pieces of an overall framing strategy follow: vision framing, values, problem statements, and solutions. Vision and values framing tell people why this matters; problem statements and solutions build understanding about how prevention works and what needs to be done to achieve it. While ordering matters, you can use different frames independently depending on context and the room you have.

Present a Vision

Open with one or two sentences describing the future we are working toward before providing any data, statistic, or critique. Vision-first ordering pulls audiences in.

Sample vision statements:

- A state where every child grows up in a family and a community that has what it takes to help them thrive. That's the system we're working to build together.
- All children are our children. The work is making sure every family in every neighborhood has what it takes to keep their kids safe, healthy, and thriving at home.
- We can build a country/state/community where every family has the resources and support to raise healthy, thriving children. Prevention is critical to how we get there.

Values to Lead With

Three values help move public thinking toward prevention: *Collective Caregiving*, *Fairness*, and *Community Wellbeing*. Choose one (or more), weave it through your communication, and return to it at the close.

Sample value language:

- **Collective Caregiving.** Caring for kids is a job we all share. It happens not just in homes but in community resources for families, housing policy, and paid leave laws. Prevention is how we live up to that shared responsibility.
- **Fairness.** Every family, regardless of their background or circumstances, needs opportunities and resources to thrive. What a family receives when they are under stress depends too much on race, income, and ZIP code. That is not how a fair system works.
- **Community Wellbeing.** Thriving communities are made up of thriving families. When families have what they need, neighborhoods are more connected, local economies grow, and young people grow up able to contribute. Supporting families benefits all of us.

System Design as the Problem

Explain that the problems prevention needs to address are built into all the systems that children and families interact with. Widen the lens beyond “dysfunctional” families and social welfare agencies to larger contexts and conditions. Focusing on systems design helps audiences see structures rather than blame individuals, making prevention the more logical solution.

Example problem statements

- **Social welfare system.** The systems many families rely on—public housing, public health clinics, public schools, and public benefits—are also the systems most tightly linked to mandatory reporting. When the only door to support is also the door to surveillance, families with the fewest access to resources and support are most heavily scrutinized. That’s a design problem, and it has design solutions.
- **Housing.** Housing instability is one of the most consistent predictors of child welfare involvement. Families doubled up, evicted, or living in cars are far more likely to be reported, investigated, and separated. Housing policy choices behind that instability: zoning rules that block multifamily homes, federal housing assistance that reaches only one in four eligible families, a tax code that subsidizes ownership for those who already have it. Every one of those is a state or federal lever as well as a child welfare lever.
- **Affordable child care.** A working parent without reliable child care can face an impossible problem: Take the shift and leave the kids unsupervised, or skip the shift and lose the income. Federal child care assistance reaches roughly one in seven eligible children. The gap is filled by patchwork measures that may fail. Affordable child care is a child welfare issue. It is part of a prevention infrastructure.

Naming Racism Where It Fits

When racial inequities are part of your communication, name racism as the cause and explain how it works. Disparities mentioned without explanation invite audiences to fill in the blanks with stereotypes. Pair every disparity statistic with a cause-and-effect sentence about a specific structural mechanism.

Sample

- The racial disparities in our child welfare system are not random. They are the result of racist and discriminatory practices and policies that impact families of color. For instance, *[fill in with your own problematic examples]*, such as anonymous reporting hotlines, mandated-reporter networks in places where poverty is concentrated, or vague definitions of “neglect”]. Each of those is a policy choice, and policy choices can be remade.

Tip: Make sure problems are always linked to solutions to avoid building a sense of determinism and fatalism.

Solution Framing: Concrete, Causal, and Collective

Pair every problem statement with a concrete, named preventive solution or action. Without a solution, even the best problem statement breeds *Fatalism*. Use the solutions you and your organization are advocating for, and whenever possible, offer real examples from states or localities where prevention is working.

Sample solution statement

- We know what families need to thrive instead of living in crisis, and we know what policies and programs work. Guaranteed income pilots in places like Flint, Michigan, and Cambridge, Massachusetts, have already shown that a few hundred dollars a month reduces stress, stabilizes housing, and improves child outcomes. Family resource centers in cities and towns across the country are connecting families to housing assistance, food, and child care without opening an investigation. These are proven methods of prevention, and we can replicate them here when we work together.

For more resources on promoting child wellbeing while reducing child welfare involvement, see the [State Policy Advocacy and Reform Center's \(SPARC\) Child Welfare System Prevention Toolkit](#). It features concrete guidance, issue briefs, and fact sheets to help elevate the research base on economic and concrete supports, place-based services, and home-based and mobile services.

Sound Bites and Short Templates

Use these approaches for social posts, op-ed openers, and other short-form media:

- Prevention means building systems that support every family and every child, regardless of their background or circumstances.
- When we support families and create strong community resources and networks, we are creating safe, stable, nurturing environments for every child.
- Every family and child should have what they need to thrive, but some face higher hurdles due to unfair policies. We can change that.
- Prevention is not the opposite of protecting kids. It is protecting kids, earlier, by Quick Start Reference Table preventing harm.
- Caring for kids is a job we all share. Prevention is how we do that job well.

Quick Start Reference Table

Say This	To Do This
“Every child grows up in a family and a community that has what it takes to help them thrive.”	Open with a vision before any data or critique.
“Caring for kids is a job we all share—at home, in housing policy, in paid leave laws.”	Lead with <i>Collective Caregiving</i> as the value.
“Our economy is designed in ways that make basics unaffordable for many families.”	Connect prevention to systemic causes, not individual blame.
“Prevention and protection are one goal reached two ways. They reinforce each other.”	Refuse the <i>Zero-Sum</i> frame.
“This disparity happens because [specific structural reason].”	Pair every disparity with a cause-and-effect mechanism.
“Guaranteed income pilots in [X and Y] already show this works.”	Pair every problem with a concrete proof point.

Dos and Don'ts

Scan this quick-reference cheat sheet before drafting your communication.

Do	Don't	Why
Use “we,” “us,” “our,” “all of us.”	Use “those families,” “they,” “their problems.”	“We” language makes the audience an actor. “They” language others and makes the audience a spectator.
Lead with vision.	Lead with the scale of the problem.	Vision-first ordering pulls audiences in. Problem-first ordering turns them away.
Anchor the argument in shared values: <i>Collective Caregiving, Fairness, Community Wellbeing.</i>	Anchor the argument purely in return on investment or economic outcomes.	Shared values explain why this matters to all of us. Return on investment and economic outcomes instrumentalize children: They are part of the story, not the central motivation.
Use “all families” first, then specify who needs particular support.	Lead with “vulnerable families” or “at-risk families.”	Universal-first ordering builds buy-in. Deficit language draws lines between groups.
Use targeted universalism: When our systems work for the families they have worked least well for, they work better for everyone.	Frame racial equity as zero-sum or as something taken from anyone.	Targeted universalism builds buy-in across audiences without softening the structural critique.
Talk about families and communities.	Repeat “parents” alone, over and over.	Talking only about parents pulls audiences deeper inside the <i>Family Bubble</i> .
Match “safety” with “healthy,” “thriving,” “happy,” etc.	Make keeping children safe the sole focus.	“Safety” alone can cue unproductive assumptions. Expand the vision.
Pair every problem with a named solution.	Stop at the description of the problem.	Solutions are required to head off <i>Fatalism</i> . The problem alone will not carry the message.

Show prevention and protection as one goal reached two ways.	Frame them as competing for the same dollars.	“Versus” framing leads to <i>Zero-Sum</i> thinking and puts prevention on the chopping block.
Show what families, children, and communities gain with prevention.	Focus only on what lack of prevention leads to.	Gain framing combats <i>Fatalism</i> .
Emphasize building wellbeing.	Refer to a “safety net.”	“Safety net” cues failure; “building” cues active support.
Talk about how systems are designed in discriminatory ways.	Lead with “poverty” as a freestanding condition.	“Poverty” alone cues individualistic and racist mindsets. Naming the design makes systems visible.
Name specific design choices: housing costs, child care costs, wages that lag, lack of paid leave.	Portray system involvement as inevitable for some.	Specifics show the system and the design.
Connect family conditions to economic design.	Treat family difficulties as stand-alone issues.	The connection is the point. Without it, audiences default to individual blame.
Make racism, not race, the actor in the story.	Mention disparities without explaining how racism produced them.	Racism names a system that can be changed. Race names a demographic that cannot.
Use <i>Fairness Across Places</i> as an entry to structural racism.	Avoid racism completely.	People grasp—and accept—unfairness across places. Linking place to race makes racism more visible.
Pair every disparity statistic with a cause-and-effect sentence about a specific structural mechanism.	Cite disparity statistics on their own.	Unframed data invites audiences to fill in with stereotypes. Show the mechanisms.
Tell stories where programs, policies, and systems are also actors.	Tell single-villain or single-hero stories.	Individual hero and “bad apples” thinking blocks systems thinking.
Widen the lens on individual stories and lived expertise.	Spotlight individual stories of success but not the supportive systems.	Without context, individual stories lead to individualistic assumptions.

Avoid the Traps and Mind the Gaps

Use this checklist for any draft message: op-ed, social post, newsletter, etc.

Avoid the Traps flags seven mindsets your draft might be cuing without meaning to.

Each entry comes with a quick check question and a one-line move to fix it.

Mind the Gaps flags seven things a first draft is likely to be missing.

Avoid the Traps

Family Bubble

Trap signal: All the verbs in the message happen at home.

Why it backfires: The audience reads the whole message as a parenting story. Policy and conditions become invisible.

Steer around it: Add structural and community-level actors as the subjects of verbs: community members, policymakers, decision-makers.

Bad Apples

Trap signal: A single antagonist (a parent, a worker, a perpetrator) drives the story.

Why it backfires: The audience concludes that “people like that” cannot be predicted or changed, so prevention cannot work.

Steer around it: Tell a story with the system as the unit of analysis: programs, policies, rules, capacity.

Damage Done Is Damage Done

Trap signal: Phrases like “lifelong consequences” or “lasting harm” without solutions

Why it backfires: The audience concludes some kids are already lost, and support for prevention drops.

Steer around it: Use probabilistic language: “can disrupt,” “increases risk,” “in the absence of support.” Always name solutions that prevent the conditions and lead to thriving.

Fatalism

Trap signal: The message implies we would have to fix the whole economy, or all of racism, before fixing anything else. The scope of the problem feels staggering.

Why it backfires: The audience runs out of room to care. They disengage even if they agree.

Steer around it: Show a policy that has already worked somewhere.

Threat of Modernity

Trap signal: The story is about how today is broken: fraying bonds, bad neighbors, new dangers.

Why it backfires: It sparks fear and nostalgia. Both stall forward-looking policy.

Steer around it: Tell a story about building, not declining. Describe vibrant, healthy communities instead of loss of community.

Pathologizing Poverty (and Race)

Trap signal: Poverty appears as a freestanding condition. Racial and class disparities appear without an explanation.

Why it backfires: The audience reads both as character or group differences, not as the result of how systems are designed.

Steer around it: Talk about the economy as designed in ways that make basics unaffordable. Name structural racism and give specific examples of how it works.

Zero-Sum

Trap signal: The message uses phrases like “pieces of the funding pie,” “competing priorities,” or “prevention vs. intervention.”

Why it backfires: It cues Zero-Sum thinking that puts prevention on the chopping block.

Steer around it: Show interconnection, explaining how prevention and protection reinforce each other. They are one goal reached two ways.

Mind the Gaps

The Vision Gap

Problem described, future undescribed

Check: Does my opening describe what we are building toward before describing what is wrong?

Fill it: Add one sentence at the very top about the future this work creates.

The Values Gap

Making the case without naming a shared value

Check: Have I named a value (*Collective Caregiving, Fairness, Community Wellbeing*) when I make the case?

Fill it: Weave the value through your communication—open with it and return to it at the close.

The “We” Gap

Audience cast as a spectator; sentences begin with “the state,” “agencies,” “they.”

Check: How many sentences begin with “they” or a version of “the state”? How many begin with “we” or “all of us”?

Fill it: Rewrite third-person sentences in the first person: we, us, our.

The Systems Gap

Stories that start and stop at the household door

Check: Does my message zoom out from the family to the conditions around the family?

Fill it: Add at least one sentence that names a structural condition: the cost of child care, the lack of paid leave, a reporting rule, a discriminatory policy.

The Race-Poverty Gap

Disparities mentioned without explaining how racism causes them

Check: If I cite a racial disparity, do I also explain how racism produced it?

Fill it: Add a cause-and-effect sentence: “This disparity happens because [specific structural reason].”

The Proof-Point Gap

Solutions described in the abstract, with no example anyone can picture

Check: Is there a concrete example of the solution working somewhere?

Fill it: Replace one abstract phrase with one concrete example: a program, a policy, a state or locality where it has worked.

The Unframed-Data Gap

Statistics deployed without anything to interpret them

Check: Does my biggest number arrive with a value and an explanation around it?

Fill it: Wrap the number in a sentence that tells the audience what it means and what to do about it.

Talking Points for Policymakers

These points—designed to be tailored to your bill, your rule, or your state—can be adapted freely. Each one is a sentence or two you can drop into a meeting, a memo, a hearing statement, or a written ask.

Vision-Led Opening

Use one of these approaches to open any policymaker conversation. They describe the system we are building before any critique of the system we have.

- All children are our children. The system we are building is one where every family has what it takes to keep their kids safe and healthy at home.
- Caring for kids is a job we all share. Public policy is one of the most important ways a society does that job.

The Case for Prevention

Adversity shapes outcomes; it does not determine them. The conditions families face are set by policy, not by character. Lead with that.

- When families have stable housing, reliable child care, and paid time off when a baby is born, kids do better. When those things are missing, kids show up in our system. The fastest way to keep more kids safe at home and out of the system is to make sure those things are not missing.
- The majority of cases that come into child protection are not about abuse. They are about families running out of resources we could have helped them keep. Prevention is the policy lever we have not yet used at the scale the problem calls for.

The Fairness Case

Emphasize quality of care and access to support for every family, regardless of background or circumstance. *Fairness* is the value that lets you talk about race and equity without the politicized vocabulary.

- Every family needs support when they are under stress. Right now, what a family gets—whether support, a referral, an investigation, or a removal—depends too much on race, income, and ZIP code. That is not how a fair system works.
- *Fairness* in this system means we all have access to resources before a crisis and the same chance to keep your family together during one. We don't have that now, but we can if we take action.

The Structural Case (Economy by Design)

Name the design, then name the redesign.

- Our economy is designed in ways that make housing, child care, and food unaffordable for many families. Wages have not kept pace. Corporate profits are at record highs. Child welfare cases are concentrated in exactly the places where those design choices land hardest. We can keep paying the consequences, or we can change the design.
- Redesigning our economic and policy priorities to support families is part of how we redesign the child welfare system. Cash assistance, housing supports, child care subsidies, paid leave: These are not separate from prevention. They *are* prevention.

The Racism Case

Use these when the conversation calls for direct attention to racial disparities. Name racism, explain the mechanism, and pair it with structural solutions.

- The racial disparities in our child welfare system are not a coincidence, and they are not a story about who is a good parent. They are the result of policies that funnel disproportionate scrutiny into Black, Indigenous, and Latine communities—things like anonymous reporting hotlines, vague definitions of neglect, mandated-reporter networks concentrated in places where poverty is concentrated. Each one is a policy choice. Each one can be remade.
- We do not provide care to all kids in the same way today. Building a system where we do is the work in front of us.

The Collective Caregiving Case

Use this approach to broaden audiences' sense of who is responsible and who has a role.

- Caring for kids does not happen only at home. It happens in housing policy, in paid leave laws, in the doctor's office, in the warmline a parent can call at midnight. Every one of those is *Collective Caregiving*, and every one of them is something policymakers shape.

The Community Wellbeing Case

Use these when the audience needs to see how prevention pays off beyond the family.

- When families have what they need, communities are stronger and more stable. Neighbors are more connected. More young people grow up able to contribute. Prevention is an investment in the whole community.
- Children who grow up supported become the adults who keep our communities running. Investing in their families now is how we build healthy, stable communities; strong civic life; and the neighborhoods we want a decade from now.

The Holistic Policy Case

Refuse the intervention versus prevention choice. Point to what other states have already accomplished.

- We do not have to choose between protecting children in crisis and preventing the next crisis. Other states are doing both. The next concrete step here is [policy/appropriation/rule]. It is within reach. Let's take it.

Bridge and Pivot Guide

This tool explains how to handle the unproductive mindsets that derail prevention conversations.

What “Bridge and Pivot” Means

Bridge and pivot is a way to respond to a question or comment without “honoring” its premise. It is especially useful when the comment reflects an unproductive mindset about prevention, families, or the system.

The technique has three steps:

1. **Analyze.** Identify the mindset at work in the question or comment. Recognizing what you are dealing with guides you in choosing your response.
2. **Bridge.** Use a neutral redirecting phrase to create space for the frame you want to introduce. Restating an unproductive frame, even to disagree with it, makes it stronger in the listener’s mind. The bridge does not agree with the comment, concede the premise, or restate the problematic claim. Stay away from bridging phrases that restate or validate unproductive thinking. Ordering matters: If and when you do need to acknowledge their argument, do so after you’ve made your case.
3. **Pivot.** Move to the frame element that addresses the mindset: a value, a structural explanation, a concrete solution, a vision.

Bridging Statements That Work

Neutral redirects that open a path without agreeing with what was said include:

- “What’s most important to understand is ...”
- “The one thing that is important to remember is ...”
- “Another thing to remember is ...”
- “A question I get asked a lot is ...”
- “Let me put that in perspective. ...”
- “Let me answer you by saying ...”
- “Here’s the real issue. ...”
- “Another way to look at this is ...”
- “The question you raise is really about ...”
- “The key thing is ...”
- “It’s interesting you ask that. What we know is ...”
- “It’s important that we keep in mind what the research is telling us. ...”

Example 1: Fatalism

“Prevention won’t solve this. It’s too big. Children are dying every year. The system is broken.”

Analyze

First, *Fatalism* about the social welfare system is particularly strong, which makes any new fix feel like it is coming too late. Second, we can picture the child who died, but it’s much harder to picture the child who never met a caseworker because prevention worked. Third, awareness is not understanding, meaning people stay focused on problems, not solutions.

Bridge and Pivot

- “Let me put that in perspective. If we had not only better social welfare services but policies and systems that served all families and supported those that needed it most, we would prevent children from needing the social welfare system in the first place. Prevention means *[fill in the programs, policies, or system redesigns you are advocating for]* ...
- “The one thing that is important to remember is that those losses are not a verdict on prevention. They are the strongest argument for it. This is how better policies and system design would have prevented this. ...”
- “It’s important that we keep in mind what the research is telling us about how those tragedies happen and what reduces them. This is what we know. ...”

Example 2: Zero-Sum (Prevention vs. Protection)

“Every dollar for prevention is a dollar away from the kids who already need protection.”

Analyze

Zero-Sum thinking is the default in budget conversations. The “pieces of the pie” metaphor dominates. The existing federal funding architecture reinforces the mindset: roughly \$5 billion for foster care in fiscal year 2023, less than \$200 million for prevention services. When the audience sees that ratio, they read it as a finding about what works, not as a policy decision that may be poorly designed.

Bridge and Pivot

Open the path without agreeing that prevention and protection are competitors.

- “Here’s the real issue: Prevention and intervention are one goal reached two ways. They reinforce each other. This is how prevention works to do that. ...”
- “Safety and support are not a trade-off. A family that has stable housing today is the family that does not enter the foster care system tomorrow. Strengthening prevention strengthens protection. ...”

- “The question you raise is really about how we organize a system so that fewer families ever need to choose between scrutiny and support. Here is how we do that. ...”

Example 3: Family Bubble

“What happens at home is what makes the difference. You can’t legislate good parents.”

Analyze

The *Family Bubble* is the strongest mindset Americans hold about kids. It says that what happens at home is what matters, and outside influences are background noise. The mindset gets reinforced every day by everyday phrases (“parents are children’s first teachers,” “it takes good parents”) and by deep cultural beliefs about family privacy. When advocates lead with “parents,” “parenting,” or “the home,” they activate the bubble even when the policy point is structural. The move is to widen the frame, not argue against parental responsibility.

Bridge and Pivot

Open the path without agreeing that public policy is irrelevant to family life.

- “What’s most important to understand is that parenting happens within larger contexts, not in isolation. Parenting choices depend on whether they have a job, whether the rent is paid, whether there is somewhere safe to take the kids on a Saturday, whether wages stretch enough to help with child care. We can’t talk about parents and pretend the rest of the picture is not there.”
- “Another way to look at this is that what every family needs is what some families already have. What every family needs is paid time off when a baby is born, a pediatrician within reach, a stable place to live, and a supportive community that knows their kids. Some families don’t have that and making sure they do is the real priority.
- “The key here is that caring for kids is a job we all share, not just parents. Other family members, neighbors, teachers, pediatricians, and policymakers are all part of the picture, too. *Collective Caregiving* needs to be at the heart of all our policies.”

Example 4: Pathologizing Poverty (and Race)

“The problem is the values some people grow up with, especially if they are poor and live in the inner city or rural areas. In certain communities they just don’t know any better, right?”

Analyze

Family Bubble blinds people to context. The same blind spot applies to race and class: Many people view differences in parenting and system involvement as dysfunctional values. They do not have a strong picture of how policies and systems produce racial and class disparities. When these disparities show up without an explanation, the audience reaches for the explanation they already have: group difference, character, or culture.

Bridge and Pivot

Open the path to a more productive discussion without agreeing with the premise that families’ difficulties are character problems or that disparities are due to a so-called “culture of poverty.” Instead, lift up the causal role of economic inequality and structural racism and move the conversation toward solutions.

- “The question you raise is really about what kinds of opportunities and resources families and communities have access to, not values. We know that when families have access to [XYZ], they are more stable and less likely to become involved with child welfare systems. Here’s how we make sure every family has those things no matter where they live. ...”
- “Here’s the real issue: Our economic and policy priorities are designed in ways that make critical things like safe housing, affordable child care, and transportation inaccessible for many families. Addressing those problems is critical because when families have the resources they need, they are much less likely to become involved in the social welfare system.”
- “What’s most important to understand is that racial disparities in this system are about how systems are designed. Black children are much more likely than white children to experience a child welfare investigation because of racism built into the system. Reporting rules in many states are vague, definitions of “neglect” are loose, and black families are more closely surveilled. When an institution operates that way, racist stereotypes have an easy path into investigation outcomes. That is structural racism: not personal hatred, not group difference, but architecture. And architecture can be redesigned.”

Closing Note for Advocates

A frame is not a script. The most effective communicators are the ones who internalize the logic of these tools—present the vision first, mechanism in the middle, named solution at the end; widen the cast; name the design; make racism, not race, the actor—and then sound like themselves. Use these resources as a baseline. Adapt freely. Trade what works at your statehouse back to fellow advocates in your network so we keep sharpening together.

The narrative ground we have gained is real. So is the contest over what comes next. The good news is that the research, the lived expertise, and the working programs are all on the side of prevention. Our job is to make sure the framing is, too.

About FrameWorks

The FrameWorks Institute is a non-profit think tank that advances the mission-driven sector's capacity to frame the public discourse about social and scientific issues. The organization's signature approach, Strategic Frame Analysis®, offers empirical guidance on what to say, how to say it, and what to leave unsaid. FrameWorks designs, conducts, and publishes multi-method, multi-disciplinary framing research to prepare experts and advocates to expand their constituencies, to build public will, and to further public understanding. To make sure this research drives social change, FrameWorks supports partners in reframing, through strategic consultation, campaign design, FrameChecks®, toolkits, online courses, and in-depth learning engagements known as FrameLabs. In 2015, FrameWorks was named one of nine organizations worldwide to receive the MacArthur Award for Creative and Effective Institutions.

Learn more at www.frameworksinstitute.org

Talking about Prevention

A Communications Toolkit for
the SPARC Network



All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the FrameWorks Institute.

FrameWorks Institute. (2026). *Talking about Prevention: A Communications Toolkit for the SPARC Network*. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.

Designed by Constructive · © FrameWorks Institute 2026