



MINUTES
MANSFIELD ADVOCATES FOR CHILDREN
 Wednesday, June 2, 2010
 6:00-8:00 PM
 Council Chambers- Town Hall

PRESENT: K. Grunwald (staff), S. Baxter (staff), J. Higham, T. Berthelot, J. Goldman, V. Fry, G. Bent (Chair), L. Dahn, L. Young, A. Bloom, J. Stoughton (Chair), D. McLaughlin
REGRETS: P. Braithwaite, L. Holle, MJ Newman, S. Daley, J. Greene, A. Lapsis, F. Baruzzi, K. Paulhus

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
Actions Needed	<p>-Welcome: Chair J. Stoughton called the meeting to order at 6:10 PM.</p> <p>-Adopt Minutes of May 5, 2010: J. Goldman pointed out that in the section on the Work/life Expo there should be a statement that what was learned is that there is an interest in before and after school programs.</p> <p>-Sara Lusa of DCF to talk about foster care and adoption recruitment: not present; no discussion.</p>	Minutes were accepted with that addition.
Old Business	<p>-School Building Question – G. Bent reported that the BOE recommended the 2 school option to the Town Council. The next step is that the Council will hold a public hearing on June 14 to determine whether or not there will be a referendum.</p>	
UPDATE on Ongoing Business	<p><u>Option 1:</u> Next steps: David Nee’s Letter –hand-out: S. Baxter explained that this came with the grant award spelling out some requests on the part of Graustein. There will be a meeting with Graustein and the United Way next week to clarify the role of the Collaborative Agent. Sandy explained the request in the letter to clarify the redeployed staffing to meet the requirements of the cash match.</p> <p>-<u>MAC Survey</u>-Executive Council -S. Baxter explained the decision to delay implementing the survey, suggestion for use of a consultant, focus groups before survey guided by the work that has already been done. J. Higham reported that the Community Connectedness group was frustrated by the amount of time and energy that went into this on their part, with the decision then being made to not implement the survey. Also some feeling that individuals skills and resources were not acknowledged in their contributions to the survey. J. Goldman explained some of the background work that was done in developing this survey, including research and literature searches on the topic. They felt that they had completed their initial task as they understood it; felt that the directive to the group kept changing. They also felt that the survey was at a point where it could be piloted before being released to the community. She stated that the communication to the Committee members was not clear and consistent. Also, the</p>	K. Grunwald will attend a meeting with Graustein and the Collaborative Agent.

	<p>message that was given regarding the need for experts did not acknowledge the skills of the committee members. V. Fry did not feel that the message was communicated appropriately. J. Higham also felt that the work that had been done was disregarded, having a negative impact on enthusiasm and willingness to contribute to the work of the collaborative. J. Goldman added that if they had been allowed to do this on their own we would have data now to be able to start the work. Feeling that it would be better to at least get the ball rolling with a less than perfect survey than to not do anything at all. J. Goldman added that this decision could have been discussed at the MAC meeting. T. Berthelot added that the goal was simple- to create a baseline measurement for community connectedness. J. Stoughton felt that in retrospect it was a mistake to add the other groups; felt that the Executive Committee should have clearly discussed next steps after making the decision. K. Grunwald raised concerns about the efficiency of the collaborative; A. Bloom questioned the way in which meetings are run and input is solicited; is the emphasis on inclusiveness the best way to operate? We took collective responsibility for a task that should have been delegated to one committee. Can we structure our time in the meetings differently? J. Goldman feels that there are times when it makes sense for everyone to see what the other teams are doing, but to what extent do we do this? J. Stoughton pointed out that it is also an issue of who has the final say, ultimate responsibility? We need to be clear about how decisions get made. L. Dahn questioned whether or not we are clear about the expectations when a team is given a task. J. Goldman suggested that MAC meetings can be used to talk about the larger process for making decisions and completing the work. The issue of how decisions are made continues to present itself to this group, and J. Stoughton feels that it needs to be clarified. What is the role of the Executive Committee relative to the larger group? J. Higham spoke to the urgency in hiring a consultant if we are going to proceed with this. Some discussion about what would be included in a survey if we were to implement it. A. Bloom also feels that it's important that committees are aware of what financial resources are available to them; how would they know this and how would they get access to it? J. Higham questioned what the role of the Co-Chairs is relative to S. Baxter? D. McLaughlin pointed out that this is a growing pain, as we are no longer totally directed by the requirements of the Graustein grant. Questions raised as to how to proceed: J. Higham spoke to the importance of having a consistent survey that could be tracked over time. D. McLaughlin moved that the Community Connectedness team reconvene to plan and implement their survey, including whether or not to hire a consultant with the available resources. G. Bent suggested that MAC adopt specific rules around how decisions are made.</p>	<p>J. Goldman will get feedback from the Center for Applied Research at UConn HDFS.</p> <p>Motion adopted unanimously.</p> <p>G. Bent and K. Grunwald will distribute information on a framework for decision making.</p>
	<p>Performance Measures and Accountability Institute-</p>	<p>Self Assessment</p>

	<p>S. Baxter provided an overview of System Development Measures that came out of the Performance Measures and Accountability Institute; talked about the importance of developing an internal measure of how well MAC works. This measure will examine issues of accountability, trust, and decision-making.</p> <p>“Other” J. Higham raised questions about the terms of MAC members. A. Bloom pointed out that there are certain organizations that should be represented on MAC, regardless of individual members.</p>	will give us more information about this
Assessment	<p>Complete Partnership Self-Assessment Tool: S. Baxter distributed the tool and clarified that it is a measure of how well we are working together as a collaborative. Members completed the survey during the meeting. J. Higham suggested that we look at the analysis of the self-assessment to determine what we want to do about how we make decisions. T. Berthelot emphasized that there needs to be a clear process for decision-making.</p>	Members who were not present will receive the assessment tool.
New Team Business	<p><u>Team Work</u> Align two timelines and Indicators, Strategies and Data Chart into one visual timeline for your team</p>	Teams did not meet today.
Adjournment/ Next Meeting	<p>Meeting adjourned at 8:05 PM. Next meeting: Wednesday, August 4, 2010, -Town Hall, Council Chambers-</p>	<p>Any suggestions for that agenda, send to Sandy Baxtersp@mansfieldct.org</p>

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Grunwald