

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



---

**KCFCCC Meeting Minutes**  
**June 5, 2012, 12:00pm – 1:30pm**  
**MSU Extension Offices – Room A & B**  
775 Ball Avenue, NE

---

**Members/Alternates Present:** Wayman Britt, Lynne Ferrell, Judge Patti Gardner, Jack Greenfield, Ron Koehler, Gary Lemke, Rich Liberatore, Nancy Marshall, Candace Cowling, Matthew VanZetten, Patti Warmington, Sandra Ghosten-Jones, Lynn Heemstra, Paul Ippel, Cathy Raevsky, Maureen Noe.

**Members Absent:** William Forsyth, Cynthia Gladyness, Kevin Konarska, Vicki Seidl, Sylvia Hopson, Sharon Loughridge, Savator Selden-Johnson, Diana Sieger, Christopher Smith, Justin Swan

**Guests:** Rebekah Fennell, Jon Wilmot, Veneese Chandler, Dona Abbott, Rebecca Rynbrandt (City of Wyoming), Sangeeta Ghosh, Joann Hoganson, Chelsey Chmelar, Brian Hartl, Barbara Hawkins-Palmer, Rena Howath (Our Communities Children), Kathy Freberg, Betty Zylstra, David Schroeder, Sue Toman, Randy Zylstra, Andrew Brower, Nadia Brigham, Carol Paine-McGovern, Mark Witte, Sandra Ghoston-Jones, Deb VanderMolen, Marcia Rapp, John Kania, Brad Bernatek, Kevin Stotts, Nancy Koester

**1. Welcome & Call to Order**

Lynne Ferrell opened the meeting with a welcome.

Judge Gardner made a motion to accept the minutes from the April meeting as submitted, supported by Candace Cowling – UNANIMOUS

**2. Public Comment**

None.

**3. Introductions**

Lynne had everyone introduce themselves.

**4. Collective Impact Updates, Next Steps & Presentation**

A short overview of Collective Impact was provided by Matthew VanZetten. He noted that FSG recommended and the CI Interview Team and KCFCCC Executive Committee agreed that a broad, public/private committee was needed to lead the Collective Impact strategy. The Council's Executive

Committee reviewed the KCFCCC guidelines and determined that they allow for the creation of this type of committee in a time limited fashion.

To determine the Steering Committee, the KCFCCC Executive Committee created a list of 50-60 people that represented a broad range of diversity – gender, race, ethnicity, geographic location, sector, etc. From this list, approximately 20 people have been identified to serve on the CI Steering Committee. Fred Keller has agreed to co-chair the Steering Committee with Lynne Ferrell.

It was noted that if KCFCCC members feel strongly that someone should be included, please contact Lynne Ferrell or Matthew VanZetten. It is hoped that the kick-off meeting will be held by mid-July with meetings starting in September through December to roll out the planning process.

Lynne Ferrell commented that the list of Steering Committee nominations is very representative. The KCFCCC Executive Committee knows that it will not please everyone with the list of invited people.

The funding for the project was reviewed. There is a foundation that is considering a request today and it is hoped that they will agree to provide support. The CI consultants – FSG – have broken their contract into phases which will allow us to pay them as we finalize funding. CRI is also working with FSG on this project, even though funding is not finalized yet. It was noted how appreciative the KCFCCC is that FSG and CRI are working with while funding is finalized.

Ferrell asked if anyone had any questions; there were none.

John Kania and Brad Bernatek from FSG reviewed their background and FSG. John stated that they sat in on the Collective Impact discussion that took place at the Board of Commissioners' Finance Committee meeting this morning. They were impressed by the thoughtful questions from the Commissioners and leadership shown by Matthew in his response to the questions.

John noted that he was in Washington, D.C., yesterday to attend a Council for Community Solutions meeting at the White House. The Council includes members from a wide variety of sectors brought together to work on maximizing the impact of innovative community-developed solutions. The Council reported out on what they are doing and items they are examining. One idea is to create an incentive fund that will support community efforts. He also attended a meeting with the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston; they are interested in determining how cities can turn themselves around. Successful cities bring a variety of sectors together to address an issue and there usually is an entity that is responsible for keeping things moving along and active. John stated that there are many examples of success but just as many examples of failure.

John reviewed the five conditions that lead to a successful collective impact. The first condition is having a common agenda. Kent County has done some initial work but further agreement among stakeholders is needed to achieve a common vision and goals. The second condition is agreeing on how to measure efforts. Grand Valley State University CRI has assembled some indicators but agreement has not been established. John stated that creating the common agenda will help prioritize indicators. Another condition for success is participating in mutually reinforcing activities. There are many activities in Kent County supporting children and families but they are not yet working together in a coordinated manner and many players do not see the benefit to working collectively. The fourth condition involves continuous communication. In order for collective impact to be successful, there needs to be regular communication across organizations – weekly or bi-weekly contact. John noted that the number one reason that efforts fail is because there isn't one organization that pulls everything together. The last condition concerns the backbone support for any collective impact project. He related that the KCFCCC has played a coordinating role, particularly on data; however a comprehensive support function does not yet exist.

John highlighted the three key phases to developing a collective impact including how governance and infrastructure, strategic planning, community involvement, and education and improvement are

engaged during each phase. The first phase is initiating action, the second phase is organizing for impact, and the final phase is sustaining action and impact.

John reviewed some examples of how long other collective impact projects took to get through the different phases noting that some projects move more quickly than others. The implementation of all collective impact efforts is determined by the specific local context of each initiative. He is hoping Kent County will have a common agenda in place between late August and mid-November. It can take up to two years to complete the second and third phases. John noted that does not mean the community will not see any changes or results as the project moves forward. He reviewed how quickly results were seen at the beginning of a South Seattle project. He fully expects that small victories will be seen along the way here in Kent County. These victories will help keep participants energized and involved. The backbone support and steering committee is critical to the success of the collective impact effort. John turned the presentation over to Brad Bernatek who will discuss their work over the next six months.

Brad stated that the first phase of work will focus on a kickoff for the project, setting up the Steering Committee and reviewing issues. During the second phase, they will be researching effective collaborations from around the country, examining case studies, and looking at lessons learned from successful and not so successful efforts. The next step will be to create a baseline keeping in mind the indicators that will be used to measure progress. Brad related that during the fourth phase of the initial work, the focus will be on agreeing on a common agenda and building community buy-in. He expects that the community will become more engaged in the project at this step. The final phase will be to shift gears to concentrate on implementation planning. We will be working with Matthew VanZetten and others to firm up the timeline.

VanZetten noted that as part of the planning process, the RFP identified certain priorities for the work. Among them were prevention services, the concept of targeted universalism, and adaptive leadership. FSG has agreed to incorporate these into the work.

Lynne asked if there were any questions.

Jack Greenfield asked how this effort will engage the activities that are taking place in the same circles. John responded that the work is on-going and it is hoped that complimentary efforts and their organizations will see the benefits of joining the project. We need to work on framing the project in a way that organizations can see positive reasons to join. As the project moves along, he would expect that funding streams would start aligning themselves behind the common agenda.

Lynn Heemstra inquired about how they will engage the community and what is already being done. John replied that much of what they do is data driven but inclusive. This can be an area of tension and needs to be paid attention to. We will need to make sure that this is represented as an inclusive process. Lynn asked about other broad based initiatives that FSG is aware of. John responded that they have worked with the Forum for Youth Investment and are in touch with the Strive Initiative. FSG wants to make sure that people in Kent County understand what others are doing and take advantage of the work that is being done; John commented that we don't want to re-invent the wheel.

Sangeeta Ghosh asked what will the blue print look like. John replied that it will be a document that lays out a number of different components of the project. It will document challenges, define the common agenda, list strategies, spell out the framework, etc. It all depends on context; a critical part of the blue print is how the community will organize around this.

VanZetten commented that at the point they leave us with the blueprint, it is up to us to buy into it. We should be taking ownership of the report and implementing it. Unless we do that, we can't expect to see any changes.

Lynne related if anyone gets back to their office and has questions, please send them to Matthew. Your input is wanted. She thanked John and Brad for their presentation.

#### 5. **0–18 Prevention Funding**

VanZetten noted that this is money (approximately \$800,000) that comes through the Department of Human Services and the Children’s Trust Fund. We have had two fiduciaries providing service to our community. Unfortunately, this was pilot money and it is being cut from our budget. Our contracts will expire September 30 and it does not look like the State will be renewing the contracts. The money will still be in the State budget but it looks like it will be rolled into a line item. Matthew related that half of the money has funded Healthy Start and the other half is divided between various agencies working with at-risk families. We need to do some advocacy to have this money come back to Kent County for services.

VanZetten distributed and reviewed a draft letter to be sent to the Governor. Following discussion, it was decided that he will contact Maureen Corrigan prior to sending out the letter to double check on the issues surrounding the funding. Marcia Rapp also suggested informing the Foundation Liaison office about the funding issue.

#### 6. **Miscellaneous**

Lynne asked if anyone had issues to discuss or announcements to make; there were none.

Lynne stated that they will work hard on communicating the ideas that are coming out of the Collective Impact. If you have thoughts or suggestions on how to do that, let her or Matthew know. She challenged everyone to think about how they can assist with this process even if you aren’t on the leadership team. We need everyone to make this a successful effort.

#### 7. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

**Next Council meeting:** Tuesday, September 4, 2012 12:00pm – 1:30pm  
MSU Extension Room A & B