

## Best Start Network Meeting

January 26, 2017

### In attendance:

Jenn Kirkham, Mischevious Cat  
Sarah Robertson, BFACS  
Flora Ennis, Woodview  
Ellise Paltser, City of Brantford, Data and Program Analyst  
Melodie Spencer, BSN  
Kim Romano, City of Brantford, Child Care  
Stacey Ellins, County of Brant  
Maria Timpener, YMCA  
Karen Calligan, Ministry of Education  
Laura Bergeron, Family Counselling Centre  
Christina Rajsic, BCHU  
Rita Stratford, Lansdowne  
Lisa Pappart, Wee Watch  
Kathy Dickens, City of Brantford  
Barb Vanry, OEYC  
Barb Mitchell, PFLC  
Jennifer McDonald, GEDSB  
Connie McAllister, BHNCDSD  
Jill Esposito, BFACS (replacing Marg Barr) (Jill.Esposito@BrantFACS.ca)  
Karen Bulmer, BFACS, new Manager of Child Development Unit (Karen.Bulmer@BrantFACS.ca)  
Zile Ozolos, Brantford Public Library (ZOzols@brantford.library.on.ca)  
Michelle Connor, City of Brantford, Strategic Planning

### Purpose of Meeting

To provide input into the early learning transformation process.

Hosted by Jenn Kirkham and Michelle Connor.

### Minutes

#### Introduction

- Parent survey update – 434 responses!
- Jennifer would like anyone to pass questions or ideas along as you think of them

#### Introductions around the table

#### 1. Neighbourhood and Community Profiles (Overview by Jennifer)

- Developing profiles at neighborhood level since some data is only available at that level eg. EDI, kindergarten survey, risk index
- Collected stats can data at Census Tract level to dig deeper into the neighborhoods
- Parents to identify school in their neighbourhood
- School enrolment projections by school
- Split data by level of data geography

- Roll schools into Census Tract level – if school responses are too low
- Some Census Tracts will require data suppression due to response rate
- Various other data indicators:
  - o EDI survey captures child attendance
  - o OEYC attendance and where they live
  - o Income – low income and median
  - o Median age
  - o Current neighbourhood services (schools, community centres, services)
- Helpful info for current and future planning

## 2. Factors to Select OEYCFC locations

- Jennifer instructed participants to break into small groups and brainstorm criteria and indicators regarding the selection of future OEYCFC program delivery sites
  - o How do you think we should be making decisions based on data/evidence/research/resources?
- Karen Calligan from Ministry of Education reminded the group of some key objectives:
  - o Access for all children
  - o Parent engagement
  - o Access to information
  - o Play based learning
  - o Times – drop-in – no registration
  - o Knowledge about early development
  - o Experiential learning
- Stand alone or co-locating? Could be part of what does it look like? “Schools First”
  - o Parents, / caregiver engagement, children and service integration (licensed child care, school transition)
- Input/indicators/feedback from the group break-out sessions shared:
  - o Demographics
  - o Lack of transit
  - o Universal - service mapping
  - o Engagement – isolation – trust level
  - o Social determinants – social risk index compared to provincial average
  - o Find out where parents are going now? – walking distance universal access
  - o Use data from survey
  - o Schools aren’t always safe places for parents – EDI data
  - o How to consider where low responses but high children
  - o City of London free bus fare for children under 12
  - o Consider prenatal
  - o What already works – existing infrastructure
  - o Timing regularly with flexible schedules – part-time vs full time, evening and weekends – survey comments reflect
  - o Asked people if they are aware of programs vs utilization
  - o Census data
  - o Unemployment rate
  - o Labour force participation rate
  - o Child care by program mapping – who is in day care during the day????

- How many locations can we afford? What are our priorities – RANK
  - o Jennifer referenced City of London example
  - o Concerns from group regarding eliminating and ranking variables since there may be populations eliminated from scope which led to discussion:
    - o Point of inclusion vs exclusion
    - o Universal access vs intentional (targeted) locations
  - o Discussion as to which variables are indicators vs data to overlay
  - o Michelle suggested looking at indicators separately from “Universal” and “Intentional” and group moved forward on ranking process
  - o Overlay:
    - o Social Housing – City to provide list (Ellise)
    - o Overlay what is currently available (services)
    - o Children in child – overlay for service with parent caregiver engagement
    - o Transportation as an overlay data city (Ellise)
  - o Ranked indicators for universal access:
    - o Where do children live?
    - o 0 -6 more related to program delivery and impact
    - o Indicators ranked and weighted:
      1. Number of Children 0 – 12 **(60%)**
        - i. Children aged 0-4 (70%)
        - ii. Children aged 5-12 (30%)
      2. Number of families (does not show children’s age) **(20%)**
        - i. Lone parent families (50%)
        - ii. Number of dwellings with children at home (50%)
      3. Indigenous Population **(10%)**
        - i. Number of aboriginal population (50%)
        - ii. Number of SK who identify (50%)

Note: City indigenous part of registration form – Karen sent to City (self-identify) – more inclusive – each school board has a indigenous contact 50
      4. Francophone **(10%)**
        - i. Identify primary language as French

Note: French language service act – must identify through the planning process
  - o Ranked indicators for intentional locations:
    1. Social Risk Index (Poverty included/adult data at neighborhood level) **(35%)**
    2. EDI – **(35%)**
      - i. % vulnerable on one or more domain
    3. Children with special needs **(5%)**
      - i. Lansdowne has data by postal code for mapping 4 geographic areas in combination with data (Ellise to contact)

- ii. If a child is identified and in a separate dataset
- 4. Indigenous **(15%)** – related to study in both intentional and universal
- 5. Francophone **(5%)** – related to study in both intentional and universal
- 6. Transportation – availability of public transportation map City transportation master plan **(5%)** (existing and future) Ellise
  - Discussion regarding EDI
    - Observation and can be subjective due to implementation
    - Provincially link EDI and EQAO – EDI is a good predictor of EQAO
  - County will not be excluded from analysis overlays will help and it will be used to pick - if county still wants sites it will not be overlooked based on above indicators and ranking
  - Jennifer to put together indicators for next meeting and group can review
  - Discussion related to age group – funding vs holistic (HOW) service integration
- 3. Overall parent survey responses (Moved to March 2 Meeting)
- 4. Service provider survey results (Moved to March 2 Meeting)
- 5. Communications strategy (Moved to March 2 Meeting)

....

Parking Lot of ideas to have as we have the conversation about “how” services will be delivered:  
 Working families  
 Pedagogy  
 French Language  
 Social Housing Complexes  
 EQOA

Next Meeting  
 March 2<sup>nd</sup> 8:30 am start, all day  
 Lunch will be provided.  
 Please RSVP to Cathy Medway