

**DRAFT**  
**MIDD Oversight Committee**  
**Role and Composition**  
**Facilitated Discussion Notes January 28, 2016**

**Composition**

- Need greater diversity (ethnic, cultural, and gender)
- Aim for “two-fers”: individuals who are on other Boards, Committees, etc., such as Best Starts, Veteran’s and Human Services Levy, Board of Health
- Following voices are missing from the Committee
  - Education (primary and higher ed/U of W/ Communities in Action)
  - Housing provider/low income housing developer (Seattle King County Coalition on Homelessness)
  - Faith Community
  - Managed care organization(s)
  - Suicide prevention
  - Aging (Area on Aging Agency)
  - Consumers (more than one)
  - Smaller non-profits & community groups
  - Top five language groups
  - Recovery community
  - Employment and training community
  - Children’s Administration
  - Gender expression
  - Advocacy coalitions
- Utilize Coalitions to represent larger groups/perspectives
- Members may wish to identify as person in recovery to bring recovery voice to discussions
- Too much emphasis on county/need to “rebalance” membership
- Getting too big/sub-structure/spin off

**Role**

- Expand/fulfill education role as called for in enabling legislation
- Committee members need to engage with communities and share information & reports
- Assist with community work and engagement on matters such as siting
- Build trust and credibility in communities of color
- Each member proactively sharing MIDD information with provider or other associations/larger groups/members (role/responsibility; members articulate when and how they share information report to MIDD Oversight Committee at least one time per year on how they share information with their larger group that they represent
- Concern about “special population” seats; marginalization vs. intentional inclusivity
- Create “well connectedness”

## **Process**

- More “formal” connections with other groups such as Best Starts, Veteran’s and Human Services Levy, Board of Health; consider joint meetings
- Take meetings on the road
- Publicize with local communities
- Good information provided before meetings; allows for members to engage with others to prepare for meeting
- Amount of budget information is helpful; increases transparency
- We need to get into the annual report in more depth; want to opportunity to ask harder questions
- Subcommittees work well; time limited and task focused; good balance of voices with good discussion where disagreements happen
- More information on evaluations
- Need a communications person for MIDD for tailored communications
- Infrastructure needed to support bigger group
- Convene a county boards chairs meeting
- More small discussions
- Review composition and role every two years
- Conduct board training annually

## **Other Remarks**

- People are just here to advocate for money
- The “community” distrusts this group
- It is our role to advocate for wider perspectives than our own
- There is a false veneer of collaboration
- We recognize that some are accustomed to getting resources; people are willing to engage and we have engaged in respectful conflict at times
- Need to understand how MIDD fits in with other work of the county in terms of duties and money
- Reports/evaluations don’t show effectiveness in specific communities
- Need to take “deeper dive” into annual reports