

**King County Youth Action Plan
Task Force Meeting #7**

Date: Thursday, Feb. 26, 2015
Time: 2:00 – 4:00pm
Location: WISC Building (Wilburton Instructional Service Center)
 Rainier Room
 12241 Main Street
 Bellevue, WA 98005

- Objectives:** *Move forward on finalizing the Youth Action Plan by :*
- *reviewing recommendations based on needed perspectives to find any gaps and ensure set of recommendations are balanced.*
 - *providing input into top investment priorities at a strategy level*
 - *providing more detail into the single point of accountability structure*

| Attendance | | |
|--|--|---|
| Task Force Members Present | Guests | Staff & Consultants Present |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Heinisch • Terry Pottmeyer • Sam Whiting • Miguel Maestas • Katie Hong • Jane Ronngren (alt for Calvin Lyons) • Rochelle Clayton Strunk • Alex O'Reilly (alt for Terry Smith) • Rod Dembowski | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Putnam • Justice Bobbe Bridge • Sorya Svy • Kelly Goodsell • Shomari Jones • Beratta Gomillion • Darryl Cook • Jennifer Hill (alt for Adrienne Quinn) • Chris Eggen (alt for Deanna Dawson) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheri Hill, King County • Marcus Stubblefield, King County • Polly Davis, King County • Avreayl Jacobson, King County • Cruz Gallegos, Workforce Development Council • Lan Nguyen, Councilmember McDermott staff |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kristina Logsdon • Betsy Jones • Rachelle Celebrezze • Elizabeth Gaines • Liz Elwart • Wendy Watanabe |
| | | <p>Public Participants Present</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larry Tukes • |

| Agenda Item |
|---|
| <p>I. Welcome</p> <p>II. Reminder of Operating Guidelines and Core Principles, Vision and Outcomes Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking affirmation from Task Force members <p>III. Timeline and March meeting Reminders*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum receives edits on draft (in person on 2.26) or by email by 3.3 • Second draft to County Project Team by 3.6 • Final draft to Task Force by 3.10 |

- ~~Last YAP Task Force Meeting for final edits 3.12~~
- ~~Edits incorporated by 3.15~~
- ~~Report open for public comment 3.18 – 3.25~~
- ~~Public comments incorporated 3.25 – 4.1~~
- ~~Final Report submitted to County 4.1~~

~~Next Meeting: March 12th from 9-11 am*~~

~~Location TBD~~

***UPDATE:**

Since the February meeting of the Task Force, the timeline has changed to the following:

- Second draft to County Project Team March 13th
- Final draft to Task Force March 3.17
- Last YAP Task Force Meeting for final edits 3.20
- Edits incorporated and report open to public comment 3.25- 4.1
- Public comments incorporated 4.1
- Final Report packaged for transmittal 4.13

NEXT MEETING: March 20th from 9 am – 12 pm

Chinook Building Room 121, 401 5th Ave, Seattle

IV. Update from Age Group Teams regarding Recommendations

A. 0-8: Rochelle Clayton Strunk reported out on the 0-8 Age Group Recommendations:

1. Overarching goal of closing gaps/disparities in every outcome area
2. Collab on transitions to school, reduce expulsion, training to staff, informal system support, wide range of kids including DD and others
3. Address adverse childhood experiences (more childcare environments respond to kids w/trauma), eliminate eligibility gaps

B. 9-15: Mike Heinisch reported out on the 9-15 Age Group Recommendations:

1. Look at environment of 9-15 – focused on transitions and the environment that the children are living and going through. The overall outcomes speak to important transitions (school, physical changes, school and summer, afterschool support)
2. County should emphasize to providers the priority of working with transitions:
 - Culturally appropriate environment in contracts with common training components (to be developed)
 - Focus on navigating transitions
 - Afterschool and youth development
 - Parental support
 - Healthy – MH/SA screening of behavioral issues, e.g., state inventory, school based health clinics
 - Ongoing training on social-emotional development and transitions

C. 16-24: Terry Pottmeyer reported out on the 16-24 Age Group Recommendations:

1. Problem statements were important – worked to define our focus here so the Age Group ended up with fewer, more narrow recommendations
2. Hard to get good data, including the focus on youth voice, focus on opportunity youth

3. The default is usually 16-18 so needed to push to focus on up to 24, Family involvement
4. A priority was to reduce barriers to access to services (least difficult way)
5. County role? Young people said didn't feel safe at school

V. Lens Exercise

- A. Vulnerable Populations (Sam, Sorya, Miguel, Kristina, Larry Tukes)
 1. Liked the overarching goal - Ability and sex orientation missing
 2. It is important to disaggregate data to be able to target services, e.g., disprop impact on health
 3. Missing high risk and gang youth are vulnerable across the board – Need programs and services targeted to prevention and reconnection – Sorya Svy
 4. Increasing access – gap widening in south King with pop growth and services
 5. I/R pop need targeted services and LGBTQ youth disproportionately impacted
- B. Geography (Rochelle, Beratta, Terry Smith (Alex as delegate: Aoreilly@bellevuewa.gov)
 1. Change wording of “neighborhood” to community so not Seattle-centric
 2. Look at where new centers are placed (not just urban)
 3. Transition points in summer and with afterschool programs– need to recognize that access, availability and preference varies among urban, sub, rural communities
 4. Called out where language was not broadly county-wide and inadvertently focused on a particular area
 5. Risk looks different in different places - at risk youth are throughout county
- C. Right role for County (Rod, Jennifer Hill, Rachelle, Lan Nguyen, Avreayl Jacobson, Polly Davis)
 1. Yes has role to play in all of the recommendations, with all except education –in that case, the role is to support education
 2. Has role in direct services provision, contracting, working with others who are doing the work
- D. High Impact/Early Wins (Terry P, Shomari, Calvin (Jane as delegate: Jronngren@positiveplace.org)
 1. Identified a high impact and early win for each solution but couldn't find an Early Win for “I” Increase Access to Services
- E. Range of Systems (Mike, Sheri Hill, Deanna Dawson (Chris Eggen as delegate, c.eggen@shorelinewa.gov)
 1. Underrepresented: child welfare, formal K-12 education system, health care integration planning
 2. Trauma informed care – put as overarching principle
- F. Range of Types of Strategies (Katie, Mark, Bobbe)
 1. Reviewed the recommendations in light of the 10 types of Strategies: e.g. provide info, build skills, reduce barriers, modify policy, align resources)
 2. Most in build skills and providing support, reducing barriers and modifying policies
 3. Least – engage young people and families in solutions, increase community demand (concrete actions for public and private solutions)
- G. Hi cost/Medium cost/No cost (Kelly G, Darryl, Marcus Stubblefield)
 1. Of the number reviewed, there was a range from Low-High cost
 2. Only 1/3 reviewed – tough to gauge

VI. Investment Priorities: For the cross-cutting recommendations, Task Force members selected their top areas of focus for prioritization and placed a sticker on their high priority areas. The Task Force completed this exercise twice.

A. Discussion:

1. Gold stars – recommend not using this
2. Prioritize methodology/type of strategy vs. naming program ,e.g., prioritize dual generation work

B. Voting (First Round)

1. Address high mobility and homelessness (14)
2. Increase Access to Services, (10)
3. Improve quality via training and coaching (10)
4. Key transition points (9)
5. College & career
6. Physical and Behavioral Health
7. Prison pipeline

C. Voting (Second Round)

1. Address high mobility and homelessness
2. Key Transition Points
3. School to Prison Pipeline
4. Physical and Behavioral Health

VII. Point of Accountability (use structural assessment worksheet)

The Task Force reviewed criteria for decision-making and then considered, step by step in the order below, what they would like to recommend:

A. Scope

1. Coordinate & align systems, policies & practices funded by King County and in the region.
2. Communicate, convene and coordinate with “outside” folks & contract folks & the people inside the county umbrella.
3. Support data coordinator/information center role. (Play data coordinator role? Empower group to do it? Find common approach among parties dealing with data).
4. (related to above) King County should support existing consumer-friendly access points (e.g., efforts underway include 211), but should not recreate existing public lists.

B. Housed

1. County Executive Office; Direct Reporting to the County Executive
2. Some places – gov appts exec level person to chair cabinet, small cabinet with shared agency heads, chair (high level govt person)
3. Also discussed: or MIDD & Vet Svs – regional policy committee (county & city officials)

C. Accountability

1. Who is held accountable for this work? There should be a clear single point of accountability
2. Accountable for what? Coordination is different than outcomes - Is this body held to coordination & alignment but different outcomes?

D. Functionality

1. Keep things moving
 2. Dual levels - Ensure things are working and executive function, Separate point of acct for \$ - e.g., go to elected
 3. Connections – break out into sub groups to get work done; intentionally link to existing local groups
- E. Membership
1. Leadership: Agency heads (internal coordination in King Co.), youth, families (external coordination of key stakeholders)
 2. Group representation and individuals?
- F. Staffing
1. Communication is at the staff level
- G. Other considerations?
1. Funding for staffing this – needs to be addressed
 2. Naming: Don't call it a Children's Commission – prior one funded specific programs so needs to be a new nomenclature

VIII. Outstanding Ordinance Questions

- A. Updates to Other County Strategic Plans
1. Needs Alignment with King County Strategic Plan and ESJ
 2. Need to acknowledge principles and practices in YAP
- B. Evaluation and Implementation
1. To be discussed in March

IX. Wrap-Up

- A. Next steps – Task Force meeting on March 12. Details will be sent separately.
- B. Q&A
- C. Announcements

X. Public Comment (5 minutes reserved)

XI. Adjourn

UPCOMING MEETINGS

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Next YAP Task Force Meeting March 12, 2015 9-11 AM Location TBA</p> | <p>Next YAP Task Force Meeting March 20, 2015 9AM-12 PM Chinook Building Room 121</p> |
|---|---|