## Early Learning Hub of Clackamas County Governance Council

January 8, 2019

Clackamas County DSB, 150 Beavercreek Rd, Room # 118



PURPOSE: The Clackamas County Early Learning Hub Council (CCELHC) purpose is to convene partners and engage families in early childhood care and education to create a more coordinated system of services that will improve outcomes for Clackamas County's most at risk families. As the governance body for the Clackamas County Early Learning Hub, the council shall make all decisions of where to focus the work of the hub and the investments it makes. Its overarching goals are to ensure kindergarten readiness, stable and attached families and early learning system coordination in Clackamas County.

Time	Topic	Notes
8:30-8:45	Welcome and Introductions	Called to order 8:06 In Attendance: Jessica Amaya, Donalda Dodson, Denise Glascock, Bridget Dazey, Annette Dieker, Carol Moore, Amy Corbett, Chelsea Hamilton, Candice Henkin, Sophia Butler, Mary Rumbaugh, Kaylin Noblin, Beth Kersens, Pat Duke, Brenda Durbin, Peg King, Rod Cook
8:45-9:15	Early Learning Division Monitoring Review 2019- Narrative Question input	Monitoring Review March 12th (also have governance meeting that day). Pre assignments due before review - Partner Survey, upload documents, submit responses to narrative questions. (See Chart Pack)  Quick Insights/Reflections:
		<ul> <li>More FTE needed to do system change work - this is a common theme among hubs</li> <li>We have done quite a bit! Good to review</li> <li>Great launching point for retreat coming up to reflect on what we have done</li> <li>Good to check in on what Council sees themselves doing and what Hub staff sees being done - able to work on any communication gaps</li> </ul>
9:15-9:45	Equity cohort follow up	Background: At the last meeting, members of the current equity cohort gave presentation on what they have done and why they would like to continue, and requested additional funding.  Is this something the Hub wants to continue to support?  What outcomes do we expect from the group?  Should the Governance Council have a cohort of their own?  Discussion Points
		Lots of training on equity provided to this group

		<ul> <li>They are looking at change at a county level</li> <li>How is the knowledge they have, spread among other organizations? Can we look at a train the trainer type model?</li> <li>Those interested in trainings are not always those that could benefit most from training- how do we get training to them?</li> <li>This work is important whether they were funded or not. To have two separate groups does not seem as beneficial. Maybe fund something for the governance and then include the original group.</li> <li>12 People raised their hands and said yes they would be interested in being a part of a cohort from governance council</li> <li>Plan is to come up with a proposal for original cohort regarding expectations and what the Council would like to see come out of it and utilize their enthusiasm, knowledge and interest to encourage our own cohort</li> <li>Any more input can be emailed to Annette, Carol or Bridget</li> <li>Will develop proposal and send out for review</li> </ul>
9:45-10:15	• Funds request process draft #2	Request was to simplify form, however the less information we have at first, the more work it is on the back end.  Other Questions/Concerns:  • What are our "Priority populations"? - are we prepared to do this? Do we know who they are?  • We need a rubric to score many things on the application  • Pull out the equity bullet and make it its own question again, but be sure to define what equity is to us.  • This could be a N/A for some depending on the use of the funds, how do we score that on the rubric?  • Move the question - "What will the target population be?" move up higher and have them address is this population underserved or overserved. Who will benefit?  • Timeline - are their implications of this? Use of funds deadlines considered.  • Reword "Why do you need these funds?" or include what is the purpose? Why do you not have the money?  • Consider placing a "bottom floor" amount so that the council itself doesn't have to vote on every application  • Have subcommittee to vote on smaller amounts  • Many logistical things to figure out - evaluations, rubric, subcommittee, etc.  • Where is the money coming from?  • Set review dates so it's not a constant flow of applications being sent to everyone

10:15-10:30	<ul> <li>County/ Regional/ State Updates-Rod, Chelsea, Annette</li> <li>Partner updates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Start with a soft launch, work out some bugs as needed</li> <li>Next step is to take it to procurement and get it Okayed then begin the soft launch. Plan is to have this done by next meeting</li> <li>Consensus: Make it simpler around what will the funds be used for, who will benefit and is this an underserved population, timeline more specific, equity as separate question but we need to define equity.</li> <li>Chelsea -         Training opportunities: Jan16- Coffee Talk for January is on Self Care for the Caregiver.         February 13th Compassionate Kids/Emotions Matter Training- great speaker.         Rod - There is a Federal grant to work on opiates with youth. Legislative session starting - need to determine where we will align.     </li> <li>Mary - CCO 2.0 is out for public comment. There may be other interested in CCO's interested in applying for Tri county market. It could be a challenge to engage with 2-3 CCO's and get them see our value and fund us.     </li> </ul>
	Next meeting February 12- FACT  Governance Council Retreat- Feb 21, Everett Hall, Hopkins Demonstration Forest in Oregon City	<ul> <li>Next Meeting - topics</li> <li>Equity cohort proposal,</li> <li>fiscal update from Scott</li> <li>Presentation on the new public health</li> </ul>