

King County Youth Action Plan  
**Task Force Meeting #6**

**Date:** Thursday, Jan. 29, 2014  
**Time:** 2:00 – 4:00pm  
**Location:** WISC Building (Wilburton Instructional Service Center)  
 Rainier Room  
 12241 Main Street  
 Bellevue, WA 98005

- Objectives:**
- *Strategy Team presentations on recommendations*
  - *Age Teams meet to review recommendations drafts*
  - *Discuss next steps leading up to final draft, including Public Comment*

Attendance		
Task Force Members Present	Task Force Members Absent	Staff & Consultants Present
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Janis Avery</li> <li>• Rod Dembowski</li> <li>• Katie Hong</li> <li>• Mahnaz Eshetu</li> <li>• Mike Heinisch</li> <li>• Rochelle Clayton-Strunk</li> <li>• Adrienne Quinn</li> <li>• Darryl Cook</li> <li>• Darryck Dwelle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shomari Jones</li> <li>• Sorya Svy</li> <li>• Terry Pottmeyer</li> <li>• Terry Smith</li> <li>• Meg Pitman (delegate for Calvin Lyons)</li> <li>• Anica Stieve (delegate for Bobbe Bridge)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beratta Gomillion</li> <li>• Mark Putnam</li> <li>• Melinda Giovengo</li> <li>• Sam Whiting</li> <li>• Leesa Manion</li> <li>• Kelly Goodsell</li> <li>• Miguel Maestas</li> <li>• Deanna Dawson</li> <li>• Sheriff John Urquhart</li> <li>• Judge Wesley Saint Claire</li> <li>• Calvin Lyons (delegate present)</li> <li>• Justice Bobbe Bridge, ret. (delegate present)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristina Logsdon</li> <li>• Betsy Jones</li> <li>• Rachelle Celebrezze</li> <li>• Elizabeth Gaines</li> <li>• Liz Elwart</li> <li>• Wendy Watanabe</li> </ul>
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Public Participants Present</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nicole Yohalem</li> <li>• Sheri Hill</li> <li>• Jennifer Hill</li> <li>• Jerry DeGreick</li> <li>• AJ McClure</li> <li>• Roslyn Kagi</li> <li>• Ross Marzolf</li> <li>• Wendy Harris</li> <li>• Chloe Lepez</li> <li>• Erol Kilic</li> <li>• Jessica Knaster</li> </ul>

Agenda Item
<p><b>I. Welcome &amp; blow by blow of the final stretch</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Strategy Team Recommendations Presentation will get final input today</li> <li>B. Age Group Teams will meet to plan for final set</li> </ul>

- C. Age Group Recommendations due to consultants by February 17
- D. Consultants will take those and put into a final draft doc to bring into the Feb task force meeting.
- E. Feb task force meeting is a chance for groups to share and get feedback on their age group recs and final deliberation of any outstanding questions.
- F. Will make the Feb meeting a 3 hour meeting bc of the amount of work to do.

## II. Fleshing out the Report Outline

### III. Strategy Teams meet to finalize presentation to full group

Strategy teams met for 10 min to prioritize what they needed full group review and sign off on (especially if an explicit ordinance question). They then presented for 10 min each and took feedback on their recommendations:

- A. Child and Youth Outcomes and Indicators Discussion:
  - i. Outcomes and shared outcomes are very important. A set of common outcomes should focus on pre-natal to 24. WE have to look at this broadly, and look at family data.
  - ii. We identified indicators that have proxy/existing indicators. We made a chart, and wanted to make sure we keep refining the indicators and updating them. This chart is a baseline. We should use metrics to drive investment, not just collect them.
  - iii. King County should build on existing data sets and build a hub, or identify an intermediary
  - iv. add young people and parents to the partners
  - v. It is important to continue to incorporate feedback from the users and need to be really specific about how you want that feedback. Kids don't fill out surveys. Youth don't all want to engage in the same way, give them lots of options.
- B. Child and Youth Outcomes Specific Document Edits:
  - i. Recommendation 1
    - a. Final version: Move C) to D). New C): We need to refine and improve indicators, especially those that meet the communication proxy, the quality proxy, the strategy proxy.
  - ii. Recommendation 2:
    - a. Develop shared measurement processes for health and wellbeing outcomes particularly in the arena of early childhood, and align these efforts with work with Thrive WA and the DEL around metrics being identified for home visiting programs and early achievers.
    - b. We need centralized data collection for the County so that every youth program that gets money from the County is being measured against the same metrics. They should either build this system in house or get someone else to do it.
    - c. Need to define "internal" and "external" & "broader community"
  - iii. Recommendation 3
    - a. Final version: Take out "Communities Count" in intro sentence. Add D): Ensure that the data is actionable. Commit both to collecting data and actually using that data to drive investments and assess progress of our work.
  - iv. Recommendation 4
    - a. Notes: Why aren't we just deferring to the Healthy Youth Survey? Are we just making sure every district does HYS? Meet with PSES and ask them for clarification on this point. Social/emotional measures are not available in HYS. Pilot survey in Redmond that gets to these measurements. BRFS Survey?
    - b. We also need to be able to pull the data, not just collect it. In South County, this survey would miss kids who aren't in school, may not be culturally appropriate. Additional language needs to be included about how it should be administered. Should we putting the onus of this work on the school districts, when those folks aren't at this table?
  - v. Final version: Explore expansion of comprehensive youth surveys, such as [give concrete examples].
  - vi. Who are the key partners in this? Add YDEKC, other funders, young people, parents. Not all young people will participate on boards and committees, but we can reach more kids with a confidential survey.
  - vii. How can the County measure the achievement of these recommendations? A year from now, is whatever we're doing actually driven by indicators?

C. Programs, Services and Funding Discussion

- i. Decide on the outcomes we're striving for and see where the county can be a funder and supporter.
- ii. Feedback from the conversations showed that lots of smaller groups can't get involved and are pushed out by bigger groups. County should develop way get them in.
- iii. Don't start something new, build on what exists.
- iv. Betsy Jones – we have been talking about this for a while, it is part of the consideration in all of our levies, and the new proposals. We want to pull better outcomes upstream. Let's not recreate the wheel, we should be supporting existing work and looking at ongoing work.
- v. Public – I like how you said that you should have performance measures and see what's working. But it is important to make sure they are measuring the right things.
- vi. Adrienne – I would take it to a higher level. Don't just look at existing funding sources, think about new funding sources. Crim J very expensive, saving money in the long run there will free up dollars for investment down the road.
- vii. Public – Look at institutional barriers, think about how you get the money to the right place, and avoid burdensome pass through and give money directly to the smaller orgs.
- viii. It isn't just prevention, it is prevention of disproportionate outcomes. Make sure we structure our prevention so that it actually changes the outcomes. Services have to change, how we think about it has to change.
- ix. Do we add something to #5 about this?
- x. Maybe using the county's ESJ tool is a good way to evaluate things? Seems to be respected. Use it as a mechanism to look at things.
- xi. The 0-4 kids parents are still in this continuum. We have 18 year old parents and that needs to be recognized.

D. Programs, Services & Funding Edits/ Comments:

- i. Recommendation 1:
  - a. Decide on outcome, vs. movement forward
  - b. Broaden B to be more inclusive. County leadership and partnership in influencing service delivery in the County. County role as convener and partner to determine how to deliver services broadly and align its services and funding for best impact, and what particularly is the County's unique role in this.
- ii. Recommendation 2:
  - a. While we might focus services to meet certain population needs, County needs to bring all of our own agencies up to snuff in terms of providing culturally and linguistically competent services.
  - b. Regarding how the county supports organizations: The Operating principle to support small organizations that serve unique populations (support the ability to experiment). Role of county to support outcomes and as a secondary to help support the organizations to build the capacity to meet those outcomes.
  - c. Add: Providing support to communities to leverage efforts by focusing on shared outcomes across multiple sectors; and a bullet for Rewarding performance towards outcomes.
- iii. Recommendation 3:
  - i. Regarding the establishment of a position: there was a comment that this is the work of our Continuous Improvement Team and part of our focus on LEAN. Rather than establish a position or use an intermediary, we should add funding to the existing CIT to accomplish this work.
  - ii. Recommendation to keep a general statement of supporting our partners and agencies, but not go into detail about the how.
  - iii. Regarding the adoption of a quality improvement system: We already have certain quality improvement systems so let's use what we already have. No reason to reinvent wheel.
  - iv. Regarding cost effective language: Depends on the program area. Efficacy within the program area. It may vary on the type of services. Cost is one factor but not sole factor. County develop a methodology of determining efficacy as broader than cost.
  - v. Regarding performance measurement: CIT work, though I would use different language to characterize.
  - vi. Reverse B and C – flows better to reverse these.

- vii. Regarding website: Do we need something new or is this already in existence? Other agencies (YDEKC) already creating something. Need linkage to the County so the County website has this info. Don't duplicate and confuse – direct people to all services, not just County programs. No wrong door. County role to promote not necessarily develop.
- iv. Recommendation 4:
  - a. Regarding new resources for early childhood: County role in early learning should be in reducing disproportionate outcomes at every age.
  - b. In 4E, change 'county play a role' to 'connecting'
- vi. Recommendation 5:
  - a. Change 5 to: When prioritizing funding for programs and services, King County should openly and transparently use the following criteria to do so to develop and support robust community partnerships. Does the program or service...
  - b. Prevention of disproportionate outcomes needs to be added to the list. We could do lots of prevention but still end up with disproportionate outcomes. Services have to change or we will end up with status quo.)
  - c. For "Prioritize the hardest to serve"- Look at institutional barriers – who is left out? How do we shift processes to make sure right programs are being funded, people actually doing the work, to get different outcomes for the youth really being effected. Also, note that "Most in need" versus "hardest to serve". We use terms interchangeably but they don't mean the same thing. Question to keep pondering. How we design the help – how do we make sure kids don't fall through the cracks?
  - d. See group notes for further specific changes/additions

E. Partnerships and Accountability Discussion:

- i. There should be a single point of accountability. However, the Children and Family Commission should NOT be revived because it had a very specific goal and programs attached to it. The new body/entity/point of accountability should be something new that reflects the goal of alignment and not be County-program focused.
- ii. What does the single point of accountability look like? Not a single person, but a body/entity.
- iii. Summary of discussion: Establish a new single point of accountability –don't revive the CFC—to provide overall strategic direction relating to aligning the programs and initiatives for children and youth in King County. Entity needs authority and recognition. As part of that, the entity should advise on funding and need shared goals that are data driven. They would advise on coordinating the implementation of strategies, outcomes, coordination of funding. [Shared goals around children and youth and well-being]. Data-driven. Members/partners include youth, parents/caregivers, the County, local government, community, nonprofits, private philanthropy, and other stakeholders. The County should be a partner, not the driver.
- iv. Model off of CCER/Roadmap model. Needs to be THE PLACE to go.
- v. A couple recommendations to make the Commission the funders:
- vi. How you get people to come: You have to break down the silos and direct all the kids funding here. Give it some say in the funding.
- vii. we think this group should direct all funding streams that impact kids. It might be controversial to move money away from one oversight board to another, but the idea is to weave together all of the kids funding stream that are out there and the new streams that may come on line.
- viii. Recommendation for organizing principle: Use geographic basis—4 areas of King County.
- ix. Regarding how the levy relates, the group agreed that it does not make sense to create a new oversight committee/body. Whatever entity is created should be the oversight committee/body for the levy.
- x. Robust staffing for the body is necessary: Change Item #6 in recommendations: Needs at least a few FTEs to make sure this gets done. A shoestring won't work.
- xi. Ideas to link youth to the decision-making entity. Meaningful engagement in things getting funded and potentially provide paid internships
- xii. Need to be able to move and change outcomes quickly.
- xiii. One important thing to think about is how do you get demographics of the county represented.
  - a. Just having leaders of the groups that exist won't improve the situation for groups that are already underserved.
  - b. Geography is important, and we need to think about that. Almost 12 regions to some degree, but 4 main ones. Worth some thought about how you balance the need for geographic balance.

F. Youth and Community Engagement Discussion

- i. Be proactive in reaching out to youth and families, they won't always come to you. Young people should be used to do that outreach. They will better integrate in a community they are from, get better feedback, and learn skills.
- ii. You have to be able to reach into the community. Reach out to the most impacted folks, be sure to find ways to strategize that youth are included in a decision all the way through, not just during a feedback.
- iii. Find ways to use youth to engage youth where they are now, and meet them there. Good way to give youth internships.
- iv. Find out what youth want in a youth bill of rights.
- v. Caregiver/parent engagement – Outreach needs to be ongoing, not just a one time event. Families change and add new members of all ages.
  - a. I think that the youth should be a part of the overarching leadership group.
  - b. We never provide childcare when we ask people to come to meetings, need to think about that. Also when engaging families with disabilities or language barriers. Need to make sure our outreach is able to include all of those folks.
  - c. We're not recommending that there must be a youth bill of rights, just saying that we need to do meaningful engagement to talk about that.

G. Youth and Community Engagement Edits/Comments

- i. #1 is approved
  - a. And include regular check-in with youth is important
  - b. Create environment so youth feel comfortable to give input - need time and consistency to build trust so they feel willing to, engagement is ongoing not one time
  - c. Go out to kids/be proactive about reaching out to them (vs. expecting them to come to County)
  - d. Support youth involvement and help them build critical thinking skills via paid internships for involvement in discussions and decision-making
    - 1. Ensures equitable access for low income youth/youth of color/those not able to easily participate
    - 2. Allows for regular check-in,
    - 3. Supports youth to develop needed skills/readiness to engage in various roles for positive youth development (*referencing 6 main functions of youth engagement in combo paper on youth engagement best practices: roles in governance and policymaking, training and outreach, organizing and activism, communication and media, service and philanthropy, research and evaluation*)
- ii. #1 b:
  - a. County should avoid duplicating local efforts and support local efforts to do engagement!
  - b. Don't start new efforts - Figure out who's doing things well and support them. They have existing relationships so let them host engagement efforts. Invest in them.
  - c. Need dedicated person to serve as liaison with community – ensures linkage but doesn't need to be county staff. Could be subcontracted out to someone that knows county
- iii. #2 approved and...
  - a. Add another group to the list of existing youth leadership groups (listed in youth engagement best practice background info) – Teens for Tukwila
  - b. 2b is critical for equitable access – see bullet point under 1c above , provide ways for families to engage, e.g., childcare provided (including kind of care that can support autistic kids), physical accessibility for meetings, etc.
- iv. #3 Change wording
  - a. Current wording of statement needs to be broadened to reflect goals that address institutional discrimination – need to change terminology to be more inclusive of others (e.g., disabled, deaf community, LGBTQ, those experiencing bullying) vs. what seems to be focused on racial discrimination. Addressing race is included but it shouldn't be limited to that.
  - b. Change wording from “youth with special needs” to youth with disabilities if that is what's meant
- v. Key principles:

- a. Ensure that the youth most impacted are helping to make decisions
- b. Incentivize youth to be involved and get them to help strategize how to get youth engaged – youth need ongoing and paid opportunities for equity, e.g., Mockingbird’s youth homelessness
- c. YAP recommendation to take more time to prepare for developing a youth of bill rights - Have a plan for outreach first and to ensure youth engagement
- d. Engagement process include parents and families – think of age groups as a circle (vs. continuum of separate groups, youth can be parents)
- vi. Other comments from Task Force:
  - a. YE recommendations should be tied to the decision making entity identified by Partnership group
  - b. Youth Bill of Rights
    - Honor youth voice – they want meaningful discussion about issues they care about prior to working on creating a Youth Bill of Rights

**e. Age Group Teams**

- Teams met and planned for completion of this work
- See below for next meeting dates and times

**f. Wrap-Up**

- a. Next steps –Task Force meeting on February 26. See below for details.
- b. Q&A
- c. Announcements

**g. Public Comment** (5 minutes reserved)

- Specify that people most in need should be prioritized over hardest to reach.
- A question regarding - How do these things overlap? How does this approach improve what’s going on now?

**h. Adjourn**

**UPCOMING MEETINGS**

<p><b>Next YAP Task Force Meeting</b>          February 26, 2015, 2- 5pm          Thrive by Five Washington,          23<sup>rd</sup> floor conference room          1111 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Seattle, WA          98101</p>	<p><b>0-8 year old outcomes group</b>          February 17, 2015, 1-3 pm          Conference Line 559-726-1300          Participant PIN 366351</p>	<p><b>9-15 year old outcomes group</b>          February 4, 2015, 4:30-5:30 pm          Chinook Building, 401 Fifth Avenue,          RR, Chinook Conf Center Rm 120-          capacity 10</p>	<p><b>16-24 year old outcomes group</b>          February 9, 2015, 10 am-12 pm          Chinook Bldg, 1st flr, Room 126          401 5th Ave, Seattle 98104          559-726-1300 PIN: 513654</p>
---	--	---	---