



Denise Snider, Executive Director
 P.O. Box 858 (332 Pine Street, Ste H) Red Bluff, CA 96080
 Ph.: (530) 528-1395 • FAX: (530) 528-1396
 Email: dsnider@first5tehama.com Visit Us on FaceBook!
 Web Address: www.first5tehama.com

MINUTES: Mid-Year Strategic Planning Dated: 05/18/17 @ 8am-12pm
 Location: Tehama County Department of Education – 1135 Lincoln St. (Assembly Room) Red Bluff

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
ATTENDANCE:	Commissioners: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dottie Renstrom, Chairperson <input type="checkbox"/> Kelsey King <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tony Cardenas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Valerie Lucero <input type="checkbox"/> Candy Carlson <input type="checkbox"/> Sr. Pat Manoli <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard DuVarney <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amanda Sharp (<i>entered at 3.2. agenda item</i>) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Thomas	
GUESTS:	Kathleen Shenk; Phyllis Avila	
1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND PUBLIC COMMENT	Commissioner Sharp will become Public Authority on July 1, 2017.	
2. INFORMATIONAL: Update on Early Mental Health Consultation (EMHC) Program Implementation	Commissioner DuVarney updated commission on the status of implementation. He stated that Tara, Bridges to Success Program Coordinator, had just presented to the District Superintendent and Principals and most were in favor of implementation and want to copy what Shasta County has done. Commissioner DuVarney will continue to provide status updates to the commission. Director Snider stated she reached out to Jeannie Jacobs, Bridges to Success Program Director and creator, and she would be willing to	

	<p>shepherd a Tehama County program and thinks it would be easily replicated here. Director Snider also gave the EMHC information to Karin Matray, TCDE's Associate Superintendent.</p> <p>Director Snider spoke about the connection this program would have to the 0-5 program referral system which will be effective next fiscal year and how an EMHC program could fit into this referral system.</p> <p>Commissioner DuVarney closed with stating the importance of having Tehama County's SELPA and Mental Health on board first and then getting stakeholders to agree to participate and do it well.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>3. DISCUSSION/ACTION: School Readiness (SR) as the Tehama County Prevention Net</p>	<p>a. Review Current Structure</p> <p>Kathleen presented the current SR model and Director Snider reviewed the structure, staff configuration, and 8 program elements. Melanie Wilson, SR Director, evaluated each program element and found areas that needed to be improved, discontinued, or kept the same:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents As Teachers (PAT) model fidelity has not been a priority and staff are now receiving training and implementing according to model standards. • Playgroups run Sept-May and stop during KinderCamp • Melanie recommended eliminating KinderCamp after this year as it's not evidence informed or based. Yes, they are not crying when school starts due to this service, however, she doesn't believe it is cost effective and no consistent results to evaluate. She believes the SERRF summer program is doing a better than we have. She is recommending our evidence based PAT home visitation 	

	<p>program to run 12mos a year vs. shutting down the program over the summer in order to deliver the KinderCamp program. PAT is designed as a 12-month model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool referrals and developmental screenings happen consistently. • “Nurturing Parenting” program classes is offered by TCHSA: MH Division and serves families with children 5-12 years. For the past 2 years we have not be providing child care due to lack of interest from families. • “READY! for Kindergarten” classes have not been following model fidelity. • Staff training is needed in case management. <p>b. Review Proposed Non-Sustainable and Sustainable Models</p> <p>Commission reviewed and SR Director, Melanie Wilson, discussed the detailed information on the program elements of the non-sustainable FY 17/18 model and the program elements for the sustainable FY 18/19 model that is recommended following FY 17/18 which would become a transition year. Director Snider discussed the staff turnover with the AmeriCorps program and required training for PAT curriculum delivery as the main reasons the FY 17/18 model is non-sustainable. A PAT home visitor also requires a minimum of 2 years supervised experience with children and/or families. Finding AmeriCorps members with experience has proven to be difficult. A potential idea that may make this model more feasible and sustainable would be for school districts who are interested in serving more children through an evidence based home visiting program could invest in a Home Visitor, training and travel expenses with their LCAP funds once the staff member had the required years of</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>experience and TCDE would invest in them while they gain the required years of experience.</p> <p>Because of the caseload limit with PAT model fidelity we would no longer be able to serve an unlimited number of families so we would develop priorities and prioritize families and once we met the number we could serve the rest would have access to the other program elements, but not PAT home visits.</p> <p>c. Discussion and Decisions about School Readiness Structure</p> <p>It was proposed that following the transition year (FY17/18); less experienced AmeriCorps members would do Resource Visits which consisted of resource and referral; developmental screenings, referral and follow-up; health access; case management; preschool find; playgroup connections; and PAT recruitment; More experienced and trained AmeriCorps member would do PAT home visits, playgroups and parent cafes along with TCDE FT Family Liaisons. Because of the caseload limit with PAT model fidelity we would no longer be able to serve an unlimited number of families so we would develop priorities and if school districts wanted more families served they could invest in a home visitor.</p> <p>Commissioner Thomas – asked for clarification on budget cost per home visitor. Melanie responded: \$55k for 1 home visitor closer to \$60k with travel and training serving families prenatally through K entry.</p> <p>Melanie liked this model because we have a tangible ask and evidence based service for the school district.</p> <p>Kathleen Shenk stated that since the AmeriCorps term is 11 months (first one month is for training) and sometimes they stay another year or two, but this is not typical so we should consider</p>	<p>Emailed info to Commissioner Sharp on 5/19/17</p>
--	---	--

	<p>how with high staff turnover you tend to lose your families so it' may be a benefit in the long run to invest in a FT home visitor.</p> <p>Commissioner Sharp shared that there may be prevention funding for evidence based home visitation in the future with CalWORKs funding and if so the SR program would be a natural fit and a critical service for these families.</p> <p>Commissioner Sharp asked what program we were getting our AmeriCorps members through and would like some more info. Director Snider will forward her the info.</p> <p>Commissioner Thomas asked if we are proposing the non-sustainable for FY 17/18 as transition and move to the sustainable model in FY 18/19 and the answer was yes.</p> <p>Director Snider and Melanie would like to eliminate KinderCamp due to attendance drop off and READY! for Kindergarten as we have not been following model fidelity. Commissioner Lucero is not sure about removing 2 programs. They are signature programs and if you take them away, why would school districts want to buy home visits/home visitor? Director Snider clarified that we have had various parent education elements depending upon need and next year we will be implementing Parent Cafes instead of READY! which is designed to meet the Strengthening Families model outcomes in collaboration with Early Head Start, Healthy Families Tehama, and Northern Valley Catholic Social Service.</p> <p>Both Commissioners Thomas and Renstrom are in agreement with READY! going away as we haven't been doing it regularly in the past so feel not considered a signature program, however, KinderCamp is another story. This is a signature program and since we can't stop doing home visits, would like to know how much it would cost to keep KinderCamp.</p>	<p>Director Snider emailed info on 5/18/17.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Commissioner Sharp is fine with eliminating READY!, however, KinderCamp catches kids that have not had any early learning program experience.</p> <p>Melanie stated that KinderCamp may also fill a school need as SERRF only serves incoming kindergarteners not T-K students.</p> <p>Commissioner Thomas also stated that when schools have no more room for kinder kids, they are brought to KinderCamp.</p> <p>Commissioner Lucero would like to see a side by side cost comparison of how many kids are being served, where they are being served, and which kids would get nothing to determine how many kids will be impacted and where they are located (by school district).</p> <p>Director Snider stated that currently the highest need is Corning.</p> <p>Commissioner Manoli suggested not making a decision on KinderCamp this year and wait for more information.</p> <p>Director Snider suggested gathering more information including KinderCamp outcomes; what children are learning, as well as intent and content would also be helpful.</p> <p>Commissioner Manoli like the past results of developing kindergarteners to be more socially and emotionally ready.</p> <p>Commissioner Renstrom recommended adding KinderCamp back to FY 17/18 and revisit next year with information gathered.</p> <p>Kathleen verified the commission wanted more info on Kinder Camp and asked about the timeline for school district investment in SR?</p> <p>Commissioner Renstrom believes it is too late to ask school districts for money for next year, FY 17/18; and discussed the importance of creating buy-in with the school districts over this</p>	<p>Commissioner Amanda Sharp made the motion to have SR FY 17/18, year 1 plan be accepted with the addition of KinderCamp to be evaluated for outcomes and cost effectiveness.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>next year and gaining their support based on program results and asking for money beginning FY 18/19.</p> <p>Commissioner Sharp is concerned that all but one school district offered money over 4 times being asked; and is certain that that won't change if we continue to present and then pull back. We need to get it straight first and only ask them one time. She also likes the idea of having their money go towards hiring someone, like a home visitor. This way smaller school districts could split a person.</p> <p>Commissioner Renstrom wants to strengthen our SR evaluation so there is no question about supporting our services. Strong data is the key. Melanie stated that she is working with our database consultant to ensure all issues are resolved and we have the data we need to make our case.</p> <p>Commissioner Renstrom recommended that SR go back to schools and see what they would want to know in order to make a decision to fund SR.</p> <p><i>Agreement on timeline –</i></p> <p>Commissioner Sharp likes the transition plan and agrees that more information is needed. She recommends that Melanie come back to the commission at the November/December meeting with the results and would like SR to work with The Strategies Center and Kathleen Shenk to ensure we get the information and results discussed.</p> <p>Commissioner Lucero asked when are schools making decisions about LCAP funding and at what point is it too late to ask.</p> <p>Commissioner DuVarney stated that January would give them plenty of time to implement a budget decision. Commissioner Renstrom also recommended presenting our information to the various LCAP committees and feeder committees other than just</p>	<p>KinderCamp may be discontinued the following year, FY 18/19, depending upon results;</p> <p>Commissioner Sr. Manoli second, motion carried 6/0.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>to the district superintendent. She also recommended commissioner involvement.</p> <p>Commissioner DuVarney stated that Karin and Jim from TCDE take the LCAP lead with districts and meet a couple times a year looking at LCAPs and looking at how can we/TCDE can help them implement their goals. TCDE supports the districts to ensure a successful LCAP. He also recommended that Melanie attend a Linc meeting.</p>	
<p>4. Discussion/Action: Review Roles and Responsibilities of Commission and Staff</p>	<p>Commission reviewed the roles and responsibilities of commission and staff.</p> <p>Commissioner Lucero asked what was under commission assistant was not passed on to coordinator. Director Snider stated that the county auditor’s office now handles the majority of the day to day fiscal duties (#3 & 4 on the hand-out along with developing documents for reporting financial information – second sentence of #2). Everything else was transferred to the coordinator.</p>	<p>Commissioner Lucero made the motion to approve updated roles and responsibilities document as submitted; Commissioner Sharp second, motion carried 6/0.</p>
<p>5. Discussion/Action: Prioritize Target Activities and Focal Areas</p>	<p>a. Review 2017-22 Action Plan: The commission reviewed current action plan and made additions and corrections. <i>Objective 1 – School Readiness as Prevention Net</i> Strategy 1.1: Deleted #2 on Deliverables and added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend January School District Advisory Council Presentation with commissioner • Anecdotal & measurement data • Attend Linc and Principal/Admin Network meetings • Cost analysis for KinderCamp and Outcomes document 	<p>Director Snider will make the corrections and have the updated Action Plan on the June 27, 2017 commission meeting for review and approval.</p>

	<p>Strategy 1.2 : update objective to “Sustainability model” not “Fee for Service” and add to deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit and update SR logic models • Identify database protocols and processes <p>1.3: Discussed if First 5 Shasta could come to the June meeting to present their tool in order to determine if the county is still interested in using. Commissioner DuVarney agreed it would be good to have them come to the next meeting. Commissioner DuVarney stated that it would also be good to have Renee Davis included from State Preschool to meetings. Director Snider would like her to be at the QRIS steering committee meetings as well because QRIS funding is for State Preschool.</p> <p><i>Objective 2 – Strengthening Families Framework</i> New coordinator position will now be more responsible for this objective. Director Snider discussed the strategies and deliverables within objective 2 along with the 5 protective factors. Commissioner Lucero asked for a more tangible resource that puts all the deliverables in the first strategy together. She also would like to have a report to use that’s easily explainable. Looking for a tool kit type of resource and/or some kind of report that explains what the end product is. Director Snider will add to these to the deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tool Kit for each level of implementation • Summary Report <p><i>Objective 3 – Early Intervention System of Care</i> Remains the same</p> <p><i>Objective 4 – Maximize Funding & Sustainable Services</i></p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Add resources in 4.1 deliverable #4: CCP; AB109; Prop 47; and CalWORKS funding to keep on our radar.</p> <p><i>Objective 5 – Collaborative Efforts in Support of all Objectives</i> Remains the same</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Discuss and choose 2-3 areas on which to focus c. Focused areas for executive director d. Focused areas for community capacity coordinator <p>Referencing b-d above, Kathleen asked if there were any ways to simplify the action plan. Or leave as is?</p> <p>Commissioner Sharp recommended leaving as is and recommends no changes.</p> <p>Kathleen asked if there are priorities activities on the plan you would like to prioritize. Commissioner Sharp recommended more of an emphasis on effective evaluation, what are the results and data collection, as it ties back into our conversations today.</p> <p>Commissioner Renstrom would like to see status reports on the early mental health consultation program and Tehama County implementation to ensure the county continues to investigate and implement. Director Snider will add it as an action plan strategy under <i>Objective 3, Early Intervention System of Care</i>: Monitor progress and inform commission of Early Mental Health Consultation program implementation by Commissioner DuVarney.</p> <p>Kathleen also asked if anything on action plan that need to be a lower priority?</p>	
--	--	--

	The consensus was that everything was equally important, however, to implement with staggered timelines.	
6. Discussion/Action: Structure of the Strategic Plan	<p>The structure of the strategic plan was discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review current draft strategic plan: Plan reviewed. Director Snider will add addition KinderCamp to School Readiness program elements. A few minor updates to commissioners' job titles was all that was noted. b. Areas to simplify/eliminate Director Snider suggested that advocating for Path I funding was a possible area to eliminate as lots of energy is devoted to this effort, however, no funding is available. No other comments were noted. c. Final approval of Strategic Plan will be at the June 27, 2017 Commission meeting. 	
7. Discussion: Next Steps	<p>Next Steps were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost Analysis for Kinder Camp - Update to Action Plan - School Presentations and meetings - Focus on Evaluation (KinderCamp this year and others) - Develop Strengthening Families tool kit/road map - Replicate Shasta County's early mental health consultation program - Continue blending funding awareness 	

8. Informational: What worked well and what could be improved	Any suggested improvements for the facilitator? Nothing was noted.	
9. Adjourn:	Meeting was adjourned at 12:01	

- ☆ **PERSONNEL COMMITTEE COMPLETES DRAFT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EVALUATION PRIOR TO JUNE MEETING**
- ☆ **FULL COMMISSION MEETING MEETS IN CLOSE SESSION AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE JUNE 27, 2017 COMMISSION MEETING TO FINALIZE DRAFT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EVALUATION**