**Equity Implementation Committee**

**Minutes of Meeting Held September 19, 2017**

**Committee EIC members participating:** Patricia Alvarado, Carmen Ellis, Sadie Feibel-Holmes, Joyce Harris,

Rashelle Hibbard, Sue Miller, Kelly Poe, Eva Rippeteau

**Staff participating:** Lillian Green, Shawna Rodrigues

**Guests participating:** Robyn Lopez-Melton and Tom Udell, both from Western Oregon University Teaching

Research Institute

Introductions and welcome

Minutes of the July 2017 meeting accepted

**Year-in-Review: *(Presenter: Lillian Green)***

Lillian highlighted some of the work the committee accomplished in 2016-2017. A few of the highlights included working with the Best Beginnings Committee, the Child Care and Education Committee, the Measuring Success Committee, and the Spark Ad Hoc Committee.

* Members stated they have really felt a sense of accomplishment in the amount and quality of work the committee has accomplished.

**Spark Presentation:** ***(Presenter: Shawna Rodrigues)***

Spark is the new QRIS for the State of Oregon. They are coming out with new improvements – a lot of which are related to equity.

Document presented: Criteria for Prioritization

1. Geographic Location of Program B. Population Served by Program
2. Special Services Provided D. Provider Professional Development Needs

* Member asked who designed the poverty hot spots? Reply: the information came from the hubs. Discussion held on the definition of “hot spots.” The definition by the US Census Bureau read and discussed.

Discussion held on the rates being paid to providers for areas A, B, & C. These are established by the average of what is paid for daycare in these communities. There is a market rate survey that happens every other year that checks what people are charging for childcare. Then DHS uses that data to set the A, B, & C rates. The A rates get paid more than B and C.

Shawna covered the population served by the program section of the document. Her committee is trying to determine how to collect the data listed in section B on the Criteria for Prioritization document (children with special needs; first language not English; attending Head Start or Relief Nurseries; in foster care; homeless or from migrant families). Discussion held on data collection.

* Member stated: they are currently working with other states on how to collect data from providers.
* Member asked: if the data questions can be added to the intake provider forms?
* Member asked: if any of this data being collected is in the Spark star levels? Response: not currently – proposal is to ask providers for additional information. Discussion held.
* Member stated: they would like to suggest prioritizing support to providers of color.
* Member asked: what about providing prioritization to small community-based organizations serving local families of color?

Discussion held on family engagement. Is it a special service or a standard? Shawna reviewed the 3, 4, and 5 star Spark requirements - which include family engagement.

* Member asked: how do you require family engagement when a provider is doing evening and weekend care?
* Member stated: they should use organizations that provide strong family engagement opportunities for families of color as a priority criteria. Family engagement plans help when children enter school – they are more prepared.

Discussion held on family engagement and the Spark star requirements. Shawna will note that EIC members are interested in continuing the family engagement discussion.

Discussion on section Special Services Provided. Shawna asked if we should incorporate culturally specific on the list? Discussion held.

* Member suggested: we define what culturally specific is. Stated there has been some good work done on this subject already.

Discussion on specific questions brought to EIC for input:

*Can we ask providers to collect race/ethnicity data from their families? If so, what is the least burdensome way?*

*How can workforce data be helpful as a marker?*

*What are some parent groups/organizations that represent communities of color and can provide feedback to this work?*

* Member stated: the best way to communicate with families is to talk in person. Next week will be a group of parents meeting in Washington County. Member will send information to Lillian to provide to Spark Committee.
* Member stated: they are bringing parents together in 12 different areas. Could set a time to reach parents on this subject.
* Member stated: in Eastern Oregon it would be better to make a one-on-one phone call to obtain this information.

Discussion on different groups that Spark Committee could reach out to.

**Work Plan: *(Presenter: Lillian)***

Our work is largely driven by the work of other committees.

Lillian reviewed the plan for the next six months. The intent is to ask some of the committees that have presented to us, how they have implemented our ideas.

Discussion on how we can create a space where other organizations and communities can come to us with their body of work.

Membership Recommendation Form reviewed. Discussion on open positions within the committee, and how finding parents to join EIC may present challenges.

* Rashelle stated: she is no longer with her organization and can now transition into one of the parent openings.
* Member stated: we need to look in other areas of the State in filling the vacancies on the committee.
* Member stated: possibly we could have a parent that represents many parents.
* Member stated: we need a document we can share to explain the various open positions we currently have.

Discussion on how to fill tribal positions. Lillian will work on recruitment during her tribal meeting this week in Canyonville.

ELD DACA statement distributed.

Committee will wait until next month to develop a recruitment strategy.

Next meeting is October 17, 2017, which will be a GoToMeeting meeting.

November 21, 2017, will be an in-person and GoToMeeting in Portland.