

Early Learning Hub of Linn, Benton & Lincoln Counties

Early Childhood Coordinating Council Work Group

Meeting Minutes

MEETING COMMENCED	9:00am, May 12, 2016 LBCC Mt. Jefferson Room, Albany
MEETING CALLED BY	Kristi May
WORK GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT	Autumn Belloni, Debbie McPheeters, Cindy Bond, Cyrel Gable, Jerri Wolfe, Carol Dinges, Paul Adent, Nina Petrovich, Paul Adent, Renee Smith, Nina Roll (remotely)
VERSION	Final
RECORDED?	No

Agenda topics

DISCUSSION ITEM	Update on QRIS (Jerri Wolfe)
<p>Jerri provided a hand-out giving numbers of those participating in each of the three counties, and where they are in the QRIS process. If you look at Benton County, 27 of the 69 licensed programs (39%) are participating in QRIS. In Linn County, there are 92 programs and 37 are licensed (40%), 9 of the 23 licensed programs are participating in QRIS. We also have a .5 FTE staff person who is working with these programs (Hub funded) who is working with these rural providers through a Focused Network Group.</p> <p>We applied for and were awarded additional funding for a second Focused Network Group, focusing on Spanish-speaking providers, to move them towards QRIS.</p> <p>Lincoln County also has money for working on quality improvement with providers. The Hub also provided some funding for this as well. Will be planning training and working with these providers as soon as possible.</p> <p>The goal of everyone participating in QRIS right now is to get a portfolio turned in before the December shut-down date, when QRIS 2.0 is expected to be rolled-out.</p> <p>The "Race to the Top Money" that funded the initial QRIS program is running out on 12/31/2016.</p> <p>The training pieces appear to be a major stumbling block for a lot of centers and providers, and the Hub included an additional \$10,000 in funding for trainings in the region over the next year.</p> <p>The credential portion of the QRIS process is a huge stumbling block, and it is becoming problematic to find new employees who have the educational requirements.</p>	
CONCLUSION	
<p>Post the CI Quarterly Report (March 2016) on Basecamp so that everyone can review it.</p> <p>Post the County Data Fact sheets on Basecamp so that everyone can review them.</p>	

DISCUSSION ITEM	Review ECCC Charter
<p>It has been a year since the Charter was established for this Work Group, and in Article IV – Leadership Structure, chairs are in place for one year. We currently have two chairs who have been in for more than one year, so we need to address that. Also, we said that we would review the Charter annually, so, let's review.</p>	

One of the chairs felt that the year went by quickly and it's been very fluid. We're still trying to figure out what we're doing. It's not a hard job, but having a term of longer than a year might be a deterrent to some people. Maybe we should revise it so that our roll-overs are staggered so that the whole group isn't brand new.
Our Lincoln County Chair is currently empty, so if we add a chair that would automatically create a stagger.
We also had a lot of discussion initially about membership and who could participate in a super-majority vote.
Need to rephrase the term of participation as "4 of the last 6 meetings" instead of "at least 4 in a 6 month period".
We could consider printing this little piece of how we vote by consensus on the bottom of our agenda, so that it is clearly set forth to anyone attending. Or we could have charters available at every meeting so that new people could review it.
The bullet points in Section 3 could be rearranged to make race the lead bullet.
CONCLUSION
Make cosmetic clerical changes to Charter.
Changing the term of chair to two years, and keeping the two term limit included.
When we bring in a Lincoln County tri-chair, it will automatically create a stagger in leadership. Include a comment that our goal is to create a stagger.
Make the updates requested and then have Kristi bring it for us to review again and approve next month.
Rephrase the term of participation as "4 of the last 6 meetings" instead of "at least 4 in a 6 month period".

DISCUSSION ITEM	Work Group Purpose
It was never the intent of the Hub to use the RFA process in allocating funds; however, because of a time crunch, the Governing Board voted to hold an RFA process so that the funding wouldn't have to be given back to the State. We did not want to create an air of competition. Five members of the Governing Board stepped up to form an additional task force to review our funding processes and come up with a new and better way to allocate funding.	
We have to have a fair process for disbursing Hub funds, and we would prefer to use the Work Groups to get recommendations of how we can handle this sole source procurement.	
Do the people who received funding through the RFA process realize that this is a one-time award, and we will not be holding additional RFAs (if we can avoid it)?	
Some of the people who received funding will begin attending work group meetings (as part of their funding requirement), so we will have new faces at the table who will need mentoring in our processes. We will also be holding a required contract orientation with the awarded agencies, and we can review some of these steps with them there.	
Kristi has discussed with the state the need for an "Award Letter" stating that funding is in place so that the Hub can continue to contract for services during that "lag period" following a biennium.	

DISCUSSION ITEM	Metric 2-2.A Brainstorming
"Increasing the number of children served by Early Head Start, Head Start, OPK, Relief Nurseries, Healthy Families, and/or other waiting lists served by Hub programs".	
The state has given us this metric, but there is no common data collection method and no baseline or way to measure it, at this point.	
When someone comes to Head Start and is wait listed, how is that information referred to another agency? Is there a "warm hand-off system"? There currently is no warm hand-off system.	
Benton County has a "Healthy Start Collaborative" that meets once a month of agencies serving 0-5 year olds. The idea is to discuss common families and share resources.	
We are hoping that the new Family Connections Project will give agencies the ability to refer people to the system so that they can find out what services are available and get handed off to them.	

A universal referral form might also help. We used to have one, and it had about 10 questions for families to fill out, plus we got permission from the families to share their information with other agencies as you forwarded it on.
Head Start “locks up” a lot of families until they know how they will be serving a particular family, and families are stuck until Head Start makes a decision. We need Head Start at the table with us as we try to solve this problem.
We are also going to need the individual families engage with us.
We also need to figure out where the gaps are and where services are lacking.
Some agencies have a federally mandated wait list, but those families can still apply for other services with other agencies.
A single point of entry for a family would be ideal, but we would also like to see a “no wrong door” way of bringing in families.
This needs to be a “do no harm” process, serving families in a better way. Multi-level, aligned, do no harm services.
When some families go in crisis, they withdraw from services and don’t want anyone else involved. It’s counter-intuitive to what we know that they need.
We also have families that don’t qualify for services, so where do they go?
We also need to involve child care centers for openings and gaps. They tend to work with our target populations.
Maybe at another time we could have a conversation about waiting lists, with Head Start and some other groups at the table, because they are central to the conversation, but the term “waiting list” is defined differently by each agency.
We also have people who are “not a fit” for you, who are they and what do we do with them?
Would like to have a tri-county meeting with everybody at the table so that we can figure out what to do about these wait lists and distribution of services.
We could hold a meeting and intentional invite: The Tribe, Head Start, Child Care Centers, Health Care Navigators, Maternal Child Navigators (Cocoon and Babies First), Early Childhood Mental Health, DHS, Family Support & Connections, CCR&Rs, Health Care – anybody who has a wait list. If this was working, what would it look like for families? It would need to be a very targeted meeting with a clear agenda.
We’ve got “users” and we’ve got “providers”. Do we want both at this meeting, or just providers?
We need to get to Head Start, first and foremost.

NEXT MEETING	Basecamp shows the next meeting is on 6/9, but that will not work.
	Could we meet after the 17 th ? We will figure it out.
MEETING ADJOURNED	11:01am