

## Governance Retreat Facilitated Discussion (1/21/2011)

### GOVERNANCE RETREAT PART I FACILITATED DISCUSSION

- I. Needs
  - Clearly define the client; who is the beneficiary?
  - Assessment at birth...is the child "at-risk" (ex: low birth weight; fetal alcohol syndrome)
  - Determine economic status; look at as part of matrix we are trying to create; impact population that has these dilemmas
  - What agencies? Who is already involved and how do we create an interconnected system?
  - New programs- funding must be tied to the child; quantify net results (determine who needs more services)
  - Are we to address governance across the entire EC system, or are we to address governance at the "Advisory" level only?
- II. Pros
  - Messaging statewide...reducing child poverty, increasing HS graduation rate, etc.
  - Political will-building- split chambers, fiscal crisis... can integrate systems
  - Opportunity for collaboration
  - Governor and Commission efforts are aligned; gives us the need and ability to address issues; budget challenge can stimulate efforts
  - Money going outside of government structure
  - Listening to local childhood councils; communication from bottom up
  - Problem definition; identifying needs; learn from other states
  - Identifying difference between governance and government
- III. Cons
  - Political will-building challenges
  - Typical schools look only through an "education" lens; need a holistic view of the child; struggle to integrate may be a challenge
  - Communication within and between departments addressing all aspects of the Framework; establishing common goal
  - Funding from federal government; review of entire system and how these directives affect the state
  - Eliminate bureaucracy
  - Making sure messages that local councils are sharing don't get lost up the chain
  - Challenges with accountability and reporting outcomes; being accountable to clients
  - Capturing information; comprehensive accountability
  - Permanence- need to institutionalize within 2 years
  - Need evaluation; top down: need understanding of agencies and 23 funding streams; clear understanding of the "non-system"
  - Problem definition
  - Challenge: instituting new management style; operationalize; leverage horizontal and vertical authority

## GOVERNANCE RETREAT PART II FACILITATED DISCUSSION

- I. Generate Education and Leadership
  - Training for leadership across domains in how to work across domains
  - Funding for training
  - Excellence in educational training
- II. Shared Accountability
  - If we could get everyone who works with young children, including administrators, to really understand child development, that would be revolutionary and would support cross-domain work
  - Real accountability with real consequences is key to continue to motivate cross-domain work
  - Parents in advisory capacity; empower the parents and value their input
  - Clarify roles and responsibilities
  - Embrace shared leadership
  - Inclusion- all stakeholders must be involved
- III. Change Policy
  - Horizontal vs. vertical structure; state agencies adopt Framework; align all recipients of federal funding- same messaging about the Framework for guiding work; “embrace, embed, align”
  - Dynamic governance structure that is dynamic, responsive to new knowledge and needs (cyclical as opposed to linear)
  - Get senior level people on board early
  - Eliminate redundancies
  - At the “authority” level of governance, do we attempt to recommend a governance structure that gives consideration to the survivability of more than one administration and the inevitable changes of priorities through the years?
  - Might it be all we try and tackle and then let the government agencies design/modify the EC program delivery systems?
- IV. Fund and Invest
  - What do we want CCDF \$ to accomplish? What common standards do we want as it relates to funding? (e.g.: Medical Homes for Children Model)
  - What activities can the business community engage in? What is the business case for business investment? (Toolkit as example)
  - Consulting firm to provide us with solid proposals for Colorado
  - Identifying funding sources and understand/develop the long and short term strategies for institutionalizing the work
  - Prioritize the needs and impact those dollars can have
- V. Build Public Engagement/ Build and Support Partnerships
  - Highly integrative approach and functionality
  - Cross-cutting state and local efforts
  - Incentives to collaborate

- What challenges are faced with these partnerships
- Support the work of the Councils and learn from them
- Communication between partnerships
- Build the public will- pulling together other champions to improve the work

VI. Service Delivery

- Start with vision for service delivery model- how will it work so we can build governance structure to support this model
- ID what end service delivery system looks like
- Simplify for local communities- establish policy with how it will impact them
- If we assume form follows function, isn't it necessary to for us to assess the present EC program delivery systems presently in place?
- Do we actually determine, through research, if the delivery of the EC services and programs are being effectively carried out through the present "government structure" in place?

VII. Other

- Watch public agency bashing
- What are competing priorities?
- Would elements of governance be delegated to the three committees for discussion and actual work, or is this task assigned to the entire commission as one body?
- Would it be possible to present the ECLC with a list of well thought out, strategic question which we will answer before making a decision on how we move forward in addressing the governance issue? (Concern about adding another layer to an already cumbersome structure).