

**Kent County**  
**Family & Children's**  
**Coordinating Council**



---

**KCFCCC Meeting Minutes**  
**January 4, 2011, 12:00pm – 1:30pm**  
**MSU Extension Offices – Room B**  
**775 Ball Avenue, NE**

---

**Members/Alternates Present:** Susan Broman, Candace Cowling, Lynne Ferrell, Judge Patti Gardner, Sandra Ghosten-Jones, Cynthia Gladyness, Jack Greenfield, Paul Ippel, Ron Koehler, Rich Liberatore, Sharon Loughridge, Nancy Marshall, Savator Selden-Johnson, Diana Sieger, Bernard Taylor, Matthew VanZetten, Patti Warmington.

**Members Absent:** Bev Drake, William Forsyth, Kristen Gietzen, Lynn Heemstra, Ron Jimmerson, Kevin Konarska, Cathy Raevsky.

**Guests:** Sally Borghese, Wayman Britt, James Edwards, Rebekah Fennell, Diane Gibbs, Paul Haan, Joann Hoganson, Nancy Koester, Carol Paine-McGovern, Jim Talen, Nancy Teat, Deb VanderMolen, Jon Wilmot, Mark Witte.

**1. Welcome & Call to Order**

Sue Broman opened the meeting with a welcome and had everyone introduce themselves.

The minutes were reviewed and Sharon Loughridge made a motion to accept the minutes, supported by Diana Sieger – **UNANIMOUS**

**2. Public Comment**

None.

**3. Operational Guideline Revisions**

Sue Broman said the Executive Committee is asking the KCFCCC Council to support the suggested Operational Guideline revisions.

Matthew VanZetten covered the major highlights. On the handout, page eight, a paragraph added public comments guidelines to mirror those of the Kent County Board of Commissioners. These guidelines provide for a maximum time per speaker. The KCFCCC selected a maximum time of 5 minutes, similar to the Standing Rules of the Board of Commissioners. As part of that, a group with a similar-type of comment, at the discretion of the chair, they can ask for one person to be assigned as a spokesperson and would be allowed up to 15 minutes of public comment.

The other major change is FIA is formalized to the Department of Human Services (DHS).

Matthew said this is part of an annual review process.

The Chair called for a motion to accept the revised guidelines. Motion was made by Diana Sieger,

seconded by Paul Ippel. The vote was **UNANIMOUS**.

#### **4. Nomination Committee for Executive Committee**

Matthew said the Nomination Committee met to make recommendations for the Executive Committee. Traditionally this is done in January for a vote in February for the operational guidelines. Matthew said there were a couple of changes this year. There can be a maximum of 9 members of the Executive Committee, where there have been eight recently. He said they decided to increase the Consumer Advocate role. He said Cynthia Gladyness has an interest in serving. She was a member of the Friend of the Court Advisory Committee and chaired that committee.

He said they traditionally rotate agency representative. There are three agencies identified by the appointments from the Board of Commissioners. Patti Warmington from Life Guidance Services, Jack Greenfield from Arbor Circle and Sharon Loughridge from DA Blodgett/St. John's Home. It was suggested that Sharon Loughridge serve in this role. Terms, if approved in February, will start in April through March 2012. A formal vote is to be taken at the next meeting.

Sue Broman said this is informational now and members have a month to provide their comments, criticism or support. Otherwise, the Council will vote in February on the slated officers.

#### **5. Community Family Partnership Update**

Terri Clark is ill, so this presentation will be moved to the February meeting.

#### **6. Community Evaluation Introduction**

Matthew said there's been a lot of discussion in the last year about community evaluation and the best way to make this happen. He added that CRI's continued growth, development and refinement in our community provides an excellent opportunity to take a look at how they can help us look at how we evaluate some of our community initiatives where evaluations are currently siloed. Moving forward, how do we put them under a broader agenda of community services. As we braid more dollars, it becomes a bit more challenging to evaluate, but more important if we want to work together to determine what's working, how we are doing and what we can improve upon together.

Matthew said Jim Edwards and Nancy Koester have started with us because many of the contracts they have are for evaluation of local efforts. Often there is an overlap in efforts.

Jim Edwards from the Community Research Institute began by saying they work with a number of parties. He said the common theme has been community-wide indicators, drawn from program-level up into the community. He said there was a group that talked about an indicator-sharehouse. He said they've done some work on it, building on and compiling these indicators for the community. When Matthew talked about his idea on how to blend this, it made sense. He said it builds on initiatives for indicators. This is a developmental process for communities as they go through this. There is improved technology, data and infrastructure. One of the things that have improved is CRI's ability to deal with data, handle and blend it and make sense of it. He said another emerging issue is the change to the census and the ACS, American Community Survey. This is going to provide more data for our community. The ACS will give us estimates at 3-year and 5-year for block group estimates for cities 20,000 and larger. He said there will be a lot more data coming into our community a lot more frequently on the impact of our work. He said it's important to be ahead of that and it's important to be able to take advantage of that data in addition to the program data. He said this affords us the ability to look at neighborhood-level information on top of our County-level information. He added this data is beginning to become available now and it will continue to get better each year the data cycles through.

Nancy Koester gave some examples of what is being done around the country. One place she highlighted was Rhode Island, who created access indicators that could be used from both individual

and multiple sources. Topics included demographics, education, health and adolescent risk and protective factors. What she liked about Rhode Island is they took the indicators and created specific stories on how to use the data, and different approaches like how researchers, policy makers or the public could use the information.

The other example used in the presentation was Cincinnati. Nancy said she liked that they identified five common goals they were working toward. Then they used the data to measure their achievement towards those goals. Their illustrations were easy to understand. The Strive Together program in Cincinnati pulled together hundreds of organizations with different goals and different agendas to find common ground for identifying shared indicators. Nancy said it was a massive effort. Their work is well documented and could be a model we could learn from if we are interested.

Jim then talked about the data from Detroit Kids. He said he used this example because it was in Michigan, but also because it didn't work and they are trying to fix it and are consulting with CRI to accomplish it.

He continued saying this site was pulled together by Wayne State University and some of the Detroit system hospitals. They looked at indicators for kids in Detroit and Wayne County. The problem with this was that there wasn't a driver for the data, so no one entity took responsibility to pull this together and do something about the data. When they saw disparities in health care and various issues, there wasn't a group to tackle it. It only showed the data, but it wasn't used. Now they are trying to figure out how to use it.

Jim added that one thing that intrigued him was Matthew's idea to use the KCFCCC as a driver for Kent County's efforts.

Nancy then talked about the things that are currently in place in Kent County. She looked to find common outcomes or goals or indicators. Across those programs, there are some common indicators.

When asked if this would become the sharehouse for our community's programs, Jim said yes it would. He added this is the development of it and the next step, the utilization.

Dr. Taylor asked how much of this is already available and also asked how would we deal with the issue of Federal requirements around educational privacy. Jim said they could take data from systems and de-identify it and are able to use it in a way that is appropriate in the community. He said it is an issue and would probably require a group dedicated to just look at data issues, data exchange, privacy and protecting of information.

When asked if this would program evaluation, Matthew VanZetten said that was another layer of this that needs to be discussed. He said we need to get smarter about how we measure the progress we are making. While the County has made a strong commitment to the Prevention Initiative of the programs, it is really only Bright Beginnings and Healthy Start. It's not the whole plethora of home visiting programs in our community. How do you bring it all together as a community to determine the benefit to all of us for children to be better prepared for Kindergarten and life. He said unless we do more work there, we are only scratching the surface of the potential. He added if we are really serious about braiding the money through Medicaid and the MIHP program, it is important to understand it. He said if the Medicaid dollars could be used in different service provision, and as a public policy piece, we would like to inform the State of that and others to make options available for communities to use the funding in more creative ways instead of just being mandated to provide the service the MDCH says we have to with this money and could we have more flexibility.

Paul Ippel wanted to know about the Rhode Island and Cincinnati experience. He wanted to know if there were common indicators identified that are being used for evaluation and funding.

Nancy Koester said Cincinnati brought together hundreds of organizations and stakeholders and worked hard over a period of years to identify their common indicators. They were really focused on

youth and were looking at the cradle to career progression and the factors that contribute to success along the way. They've put together 53 common indicators.

Mr. Edwards said that we are part of 34 other cities that are part of the National Neighborhood Indicator Partnership, sponsored by the Urban Institute. All 34 cities are trying the same thing, but we are farther ahead than most communities. He said the Urban Institute has a list of hundreds of community indicators that we use as templates. We used them for the Great Start Collaborative as templates for potential frameworks. In the end, they need to be things that are meaningful.

Judge Gardner asked if it was average for cities to look at about 50 indicators within about 200 communities. He said it varied depending on how you want to do it. He also agreed with Judge Gardner that it was important not to follow the Detroit model and to not try to do a one-size-fits-all. It's important to have dialogue about them and go back and revisit them.

Wayman asked Jim and Nancy if they could talk a little about their capacity and where they have come from over the last 2 years.

Jim said when he started 1.5 years ago, there were 7 staff members and only 1 Part-time PhD. Now they have 4 PhD staff. He added they have upgraded their capabilities and analysis skill level. They have upgraded their technical systems. They moved to an Oracle Database provided by the University. This has allowed them to take large datasets and blend them. He said their production level has increased and now allows them to take on community initiatives, complete them and provide high-quality reports. They are in the process of adding two more programmers to help with data processing and have added a database administrator. He added that CRI has been able to attract the attention of Boston Foundation, MIT, University of Massachusetts and about eight other providers around the country that are attracted to the work done by them and have invited them to join their partnership. He added that CRI has come a long way in 1.5 years. He said they are really on a national stage now, but their base is local.

Matthew VanZetten said the next steps should be for the Executive Committee to discuss a process and a proposal on how to move forward with a timeline, defining a budget, figure out what it would cost to do the planning process. Privacy issues and student records need to be considered. Planning a process is the next step in moving this forward. We also need to show the value.

Susan Broman said they wanted to get the Committee's feedback on this because it's a big deal. She said this is a huge task that is going to take some time and the cooperation of a number of entities. She said this will be the Committee's number one thing for the next year. She added there are about 200 groups in our community that will have a hand in this effort.

Discussion continued on the challenges to be faced in this effort.

7. **Miscellaneous**

None.

8. **Adjournment**

Diana Sieger made a motion for adjournment, seconded by Paul Ippel, Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

**Next Council meeting:** Tuesday, February 1, 2011 12:00pm – 1:30pm  
MSU Extension Room A & B