

Best Start Meeting – March 2, 2017 (8:30 am to 4:00 pm)

OEYC, 30 Bell Lane, Brantford

Attendees: Michelle Connor (City of Brantford), Nicole Schween (Woodview), Luisa Pappert (Wee Watch), Laura Bergeron (FCCB), Zile Ozois (Brantford Library), Karen Bulmer (BrantFACS), Jill Esposito (BrantFACS), Barb Vanry (OEYC), Ronda Manning (Health Unit), Kim Romano (City of Brantford), Rita Stafford (Lansdowne), Kathy Dickens (City of Brantford), Jennifer MacDonald (Grand Erie), Barb Mitchell (PFLC – Grand Erie), Jane Angus (Contact Brant), Stacey Ellis (County of Brant), Ellise Paltser (City of Brantford), Jennifer Kirkham, Christina Rajsic (Health unit)

Regrets: Deanna Searle, Sharon Brooks, Karen Calligan, Melodie Spencer, Maria Timpener

Best Start Meeting (Kim Romano Chairing)

- Best start magazine to be published April 20
 - o Successful
 - o Lots of content – did not have to dig into previous
- Report circulated from Lansdowne
 - o No comments
 - o Discussion over special needs and lobbying for special needs additional funds
 - o Kathy D shared what a good news story this is, that as Service Manager we have worked closely with our provider Lansdowne to find ways to meet the needs of our SNR community. Kathy recognized the great work Lansdowne has done, and thanked them for their continued expertise and in finding unique solutions to meet the needs to serve our special needs children, especially with the continued expansion of both fee subsidy and the Before and After childcare
 - o As Service Manager we have met with Lansdowne and have reviewed their proposal and although we haven't received confirmation of our 2017 provincial allocations, we recognize this priority in our community and have committed to meet this with unconditional funds, should provincial service contract funding not be sufficient.
 - o Kathy discussed the need to continue to identify this priority at all levels, and further identified that this need will only increase as the province expands over 100k new spaces in the next five years. Kathy spoke about the need to ensure provincial funding for spaces recognizes a commitment is also needed for SNR for these spaces or there is the potential that new spaces would become unintentionally "segregated" and non-inclusive.

- Strategic Priorities
 - o Any questions or feedback
 - o Will be sending to Ministry
- Approval for December minutes
 - o Motion approved
 - o Jane seconded by Barb
- 2017 Planning requests
 - o Teleconference with those willing to sit on committee
 - o Report back on how allotting the funds will come
- Barb spoke regarding translation of Best Start materials to French
 - o At November beneficial to translate resources into French
 - o Clarify if it is a priority and what would it be?
 - o Cost to translate
 - o Possible option to work with Hamilton Network to share cost/collaboration
 - o Suggest contact Ballon Rouge
 - o Brantford not designated francophone and commitment to funding would require consistent approach moving forward
 - o Possible needs assessment
 - o Or work in kind
 - o Francophone Centre could use GOG to fund translation services
- Updates
 - o Jane – next date for Thursday 6 following Best Start Network(Note these dates have since changed Next Best Start is Tuesday May 2nd at Contact Brant)
 - o Change Best Start Meeting 9:30 start moved to 10:30 start
 - o Jane to check location availability

OEYCFC Needs Assessment

Introduction

- Jennifer sharing results of last meeting factors Preliminary results – sheets to be handed back in
- Review of factors and weighting for universal and targeted
- Jennifer MacDonald provided update from Grand Erie regarding self-identified
- Reviewed methodology
- Universal – Census Tract
- Intentional – Neighbourhood level social risk index
- Transportation how is it weighted and showing context vs quantifying
- Reviewed last meetings

Feedback on results

- Working session with small groups to get feedback and contextual information from the participants:
 - 1) Do the weightings make sense?
 - 2) What else do we need to know?
 - 3) What do you know about each of these areas?
- Break into small groups and record information in handouts
- Discussion regarding universal vs intentional sites
- Highlights of group thoughts:
 - Surprised Holmedale-William Neighbourhood was not in top ranking
 - Lower number of kids – biggest weight
 - 2011 Census Data
 - Once locations are decided more factors more variables can be looked at
 - Looking at growth
 - Burford is underserved, consistent
 - Surprised that West Brant 1 has high child population
 - Housing affordability – neighborhood changes and cycles
 - Recommendations to reassess on ongoing basis e.g. every 5 years or as per Census release. See if rankings change.
 - Make sure service delivery model is flexible to respond to changing needs as data is reassessed
 - School Board has enrolment projections to see where children are coming from and where they are going
 - Potential Locations
 - Eagle Place
 - Some neighbourhoods where parents don't have comfort level, schools may not be best delivery
 - There can be a line between families who will come to housing unit but people outside housing unit will not come
 - 2 different locations for Eagle Place
 - e.g. Fairview, Riverside, Northland Gardens
 - Multiple kinds of sites universal vs intentional. If things work, could study to see why people go to different locations
 - Ensure connectivity to each other and community to help bridge gaps
 - Role of CMSM to ensure consistency and collaboration between programs
 - Discussion of mobile sites, not physical location
 - Think beyond geographic boundaries e.g. St. George residents go to Cambridge
 - Specialized services are dictated by home address
 - Consistent services to meet the family's needs - "Consistency isn't the same as the same"
 - Indigenous Needs Assessment integration within
 - Interest from survey
 - Thunder Bay hired Indigenous Learning Facilitator – built capacity
 - Look to future to tie to City initiatives and new development and redevelopment for opportunities

- Health unit projection of birth rates by neighbourhood 1400 per year can be multiplied. Where new families are living is changing.
- New housing starts, development units
- Review of Survey Data
 - Great response rate – 434 (4.66 confidence interval)
 - Review parent survey results
 - Parent survey responses to be summarized by census tract
 - Service provider surveys
 - Children’s Activity Sheets – 108
 - Discussion:
 - Neighbourhoods accessing services located in neighbourhood or going elsewhere
 - What else do we need to know from parents?
 - Parents could tell us more about what the outdoor program would look like?
 - Link between Parks and Rec and children’s services 0 – 12 are parents accessing city rec services? OEYCFC engages other services e.g. Library Staff at OEYC
 - Where do they see themselves as far as engagement? Age groups, participation in programs with children, parent learning, parents child interaction
 - What would the program look like for older parents? Vs younger parents?
 - Weekend care and hours gauge demand and type of program and location?
 - What were parents thinking about STEM side from 0 – 6? What does the learning look like?
 - How can programming be provided for children of different age ranges? Does it vary from different time periods (e.g. older children in evenings)
 - What would indigenous programming look like?
 - What their vision and what the facility would look like?
 - What does this mean as we begin to plan for OEYCFC?
 - Having parent engagement within the community (focus groups, town halls)
 - Ongoing parent engagement - Parent groups change from year to year and in age groups
 - Parent perspective: What does success look like for them? Need to be considered when looking at measures/indicators. Who are we missing?
 - How are you going to staff the facility with different program needs?
 - What other services need to be involved? Integration of services

- Marketing and communication plan / awareness campaign / annual process
- Unstructured drop-in play

Lunch Break

Core Functions and Services

- What core functions/services should be provided in every OEYCFC in Brantford-Brant
 - Those that fall within the three mandatory core services
 - Those “extras”
- Review of Service Provider Surveys – themes
- Break into smaller groups to complete handout
- 3 mandatory core services are physical locations
- Highlights from group discussions:
 - Engaging Parents and Caregivers
 - Skilled staff – knowledgeable/ share info/ referrals/ training
 - Consistent messaging
 - Marketing and communication tools – increase awareness for parents and caregivers
 - Work collaboratively with community partners who are experts in prenatal and newborn
 - Evaluations – important that all programs evaluate what they are doing in a similar way. Use feedback and measures to help with future planning
 - Supporting Early Learning and Development
 - How
 - Nutrition
 - Outdoor learning space for gross-motor
 - Encourage children’s exploration and enquiry
 - Role modelling
 - Reflect each community
 - Drop-in programs
 - Play-based learning
 - Making Connections for Families
 - Updated list of professional services for developmental services for kids, parents
 - Access to common evidence based screening
 - Facilitator knowledgeable
 - Feedback opportunities for families
 - Common experiences binder (e.g. London) there is a binder of how everyone should be interacted with = consistent experience
 - Extras
 - Access to computer
 - Child minding
 - Multi-generational activities

- Volunteers
- Transportation
- Arts and music for older children
- “Community Connector” consistent staff person

Service Delivery Model

- OEYCFC – Optional Services /Aspects of Service Delivery: Mobile (81%) vs virtual (50%)
- Physical spaces / virtual / phone line /
- Ensure provision of service delivery across different locations and modes
- Looking at universal vs intentional
- Broke into smaller groups to review locations on maps and propose locations
- Feedback from group discussions:
 - o Main physical locations:
- Discussion:
 - o Size limitations / smaller scope
 - o Existing purpose-built school spaces
 - o Renovated RV seasonally and partner with Parks and Rec: Random Acts of Play
 - o Mobile – going to where the families gather e.g. Harmony Square (toys, information) can be tied into events e.g. Best Start Fair and other outreach

Next Steps:

- Development of a draft model
- Engagement session to review and provide feedback on the model
- Next meeting set for April 3 from 12:00 to 4:30 at OEYC (lunch will be provided)