

Early Years Hub Committee
Agenda

Tuesday, March 26th, 2013

9:00 am – 10:30 am

Location:

Pathstone Mental Health (formerly NCYS)
3340 Schmon Parkway Unit 1

- Welcome

- Approval of January 29th/ February 26th, 2103 minutes

- **Early Years Hub Services Committee** Tracey
 - Committee Membership changes
 - FRP evaluations next steps
 - Inventory Charts update
 - May 10th PD Training
 - Other...
 -

- **Parent Direct Website** Lisa
 - Next Steps

- Best Start Child Reference Group / Hub Lisa/All
 - So what/Now what Discussion

- **School Readiness Task Group** Judy
 - Update

- **Other Business....**

- Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, April 23rd
(Pathstone Mental Health)

Hub Committee
March 26th, 2013 – Pathstone

Attendees: Lorrey Arial Bonilla, Kim Cole, Tracey Cosco, Donna Dagleish, Lisa DeGasperis, Darlene Edgar, Bonnie Filipchuk, Dorothy Harvey, Kelly Wilcox, Zach Dadson (recorder)
Regrets: Jeff Biletschi, Kendall Cappellazzo, Kelly McDonnell, Tammy Ferguson, Trudy Hill, Nancy Lisi, Florence Ngenzebuhoro, Sandra Noel, Janice Quinn, Judy Reid, Jeanne Schmidt, Sandy Toth, Kaarina Vogin, Jackie Van Lankveld,

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. WELCOME	- Committee members were welcomed by chair L. DeGasperis.	
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - February Hub meeting was focused on parentdirectniagara.ca - Minutes from both the January and February meetings were reviewed and approved without change. 	
3. EARLY YEARS HUB SERVICES COMMITTEE (EYHSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jeff Biletschi attended the March 18th meeting to train hub operators for the Trust Me Trust My Tummy program. There is an open invitation for a collective training session for the initiative in September. a) Committee Membership Changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The hub operator who sat on EYHSC from Centre de Santé is no longer at the agency. EYHSC is looking into having another representative sit on the committee. b) FRP Evaluations Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EYHSC had 475 participants from 5 of the 8 hubs complete FRP Evaluations in 2012. Data has been represented both as a collective whole and separated into independent hubs. A summary with quantitative data will be prepared that will include qualitative information. - EYHSC continues to meet monthly, the results from the evaluations will be shared at the April 2013 meeting. 6 hubs have committed to using the same process for completing FRP evaluations in fall 2013. - The FRP evaluation tool will be brought to the April Hub Committee meeting to share with committee members. The evaluation tool allows for hubs to customize questions as needed to ensure they are appropriate for the Niagara community. c) Inventory Charts Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EYHSC discussed how the inventory charts would be updated. There will be a September 2012 to June 2013 snapshot put together that outlines programs facilitated and developed by hub staff. This outline will be presented at the May Hub Committee meeting. d) May 10th Professional Development (PD) Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The training session will be at the Niagara Catholic District School Board (NCDSB) office. - A representative from Health Nexus will share background information on the Healthy Babies Healthy Brains program and the tool used when facilitating the program. - There will be roughly 60 people in attendance. e) Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A meeting date has been set for a June meeting. 	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
4. PARENT DIRECT WEBSITE	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Because of funding made available through the Community Integration Leaders (CIL) Project there are a series of enhancements being made to the Parent Direct website with a launch scheduled for September 2013. 	
5. BEST START CHILD AND FAMILY REFERENCE GROUP (BSCFCRG) AND HUB COMMITTEE	<p>a) So What/Now What Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Committee members took a moment to review The Power of Generative Thinking in Organizations. - With Early Years Niagara Planning Council's (EYNPC) new structure it will be important to think about the direction Hub Committee will move to going forward. - There was general consensus amongst committee members that it is a good idea to explore combining the Hub Committee with BSCFCRG. The committee decided that if the Hub Committee should choose to amalgamate with BSCFCRG that EYHSC could become a sub-committee of BSCFCRG in order to maintain the important work being done by this committee. - Committee members discussed the importance of having a systems level committee and a committee focused on an operational level. BSCFCRG and the Hub Committee would work on a systems level while EYHSC will continue to work on an operational level. - It was suggested that a sub-committee made up of members from the Hub Committee and BSCFCRG draft a framework that outlines the functionality of a newly combined committee to be brought to the Hub Committee and BSCFCRG for discussion. - Because there are a number of members of the EYHSC who do not sit on the Hub Committee or are not present at this meeting it will be important to seek their input and ensure that they are a part of this process. - A sub-committee consisting of the chair of EYNPC, the chair of the Hub Committee and the chairs of BSCFCRG will meet to prepare discussion for the April Hub Committee meeting. - Committee members recommended this sub-committee explore the inclusive child care model and the systems management that occurs in this model to ensure there is consistency in the application of services. - BSCFCRG is currently focused on the CIL Project. This project will come to a close in March 2013. April, May and June will provide an opportunity for BSCFCRG and the Hub Committee to determine their roles in order to be prepared for regular meetings in September 2013. The fact that EYNPC is also in a state of transition means that by September 2013 EYNPC and the Pillar Committees will also be more formalized in their mandates and committee members will be clear on the purpose and goals of each committee. 	
6. MEETING DATES	<p><i>There are currently no meetings scheduled after April 23rd 2013.</i></p>	

The Power of Generative Thinking in Organizations

by, Richard P. Chait, William P. Ryan, and Barbara E. Taylor

Typically, we locate much of the power and opportunity to shape an institution in familiar organizational processes like mission setting, strategy development, and problem solving. Because they produce the purposes, strategies, and ideas that drive organizations, these are recognized as powerful processes. But a fourth process, of generative thinking, is actually more powerful. Generative thinking precedes these. More to the point, it *generates* the other processes.

To return to the paradigm shifts, imagine that a single non-profit, rather than a loose network of police officers, researchers, and policy makers, first developed the strategy of community policing. It would be natural to credit the organization's strategy-development process for the new approach to fighting crime. But how could this really be? The organization would need the *idea*, if not the label, of community policing in order to arrive at the strategy and associated tactics. Strategy development helps an organization get from here to there, from the present point A to a future, preferred point B. But, understanding point A - in this case, to conclude that the deployment of police was no longer a sufficient response to crime - must come first. And generative thinking produces a vision of point B - in this case, the idea of a different, preventive approach. Without generative thinking, we would have neither here nor there.

In fact, most of the formal planning and learning processes that appear so powerful in organizations look incomplete when one takes generative thinking into account. For example, businesses routinely invested in formal product-development processes to get an idea from the drawing board to the marketplace. The product development process was a series of engineering, manufacturing, and marketing activities. But then some product developers wondered if there was not more to the process. After all, how did ideas reach the drawing board in the first place? And what would increase the chances of developing good ideas to start with? In effect, the key question was, "What kind of generative thinking precedes product development?"

The same is true of organizational problem solving. Whether conducted through formal program development or informal trial-and-error, the important work of "problem framing" precedes problem solving. Before we solve a problem, we decide upon the nature of the problem. Similarly, the scientific method has value only *after* we find a hypothesis worth testing. Invariably, great research starts with great questions.

However compelling that logic may be, it has little influence on the way organizations usually work. In fact, judging from the amount of attention most of us give generative

thinking, it is as if we believe that goals, missions, and problems simply appear in organizations, much as seventeenth-century Europeans believed that a jar full of old rags and wheat husks, left open for a few weeks, would spontaneously generate flies. It took nearly a century for people to speculate that flies might be depositing eggs into the jars. From there, a different understanding soon became obvious: An unseen biological process, not piles of rags and wheat husks, was generating new life. The same is true of organizations. A prior, unexamined cognitive process generates the moral commitments that missions codify, the goals that strategies advance, and the diagnoses that problem solving addresses.

Below are some examples of when to potentially use a “generative thinking” approach in governance – consider these as cues or landmarks of appropriate and relevant times to have robust dialogue:

- **Ambiguity** – when there are multiple interpretations of what is really going on and what requires attention.
- **Saliency** – when the issue seems to be a big deal to everyone especially influential people or key constituents.
- **Stakes** – when the stakes are high because the discussions involved could invoke questions regarding the organization’s core values, mission and identity.
- **Strife** – when the prospects for confusion and conflict exist and the desire for consensus is high.
- **Irreversibility** – when the decision or action cannot be easily revised or reversed due more likely to psychological rather than financial factors.

If most or all of these landmarks exist – boards should consider working in the generative mode of governance.

Reprinted with permission from *Governance as Leadership: Reframing the Work of Nonprofit Boards* by Richard P. Chait, William P. Ryan, and Barbara E. Taylor, a publication of BoardSource, formerly the National Center for Nonprofit Boards.

For more information about BoardSource, call 800-883-6262 or visit www.boardsource.org. **John Wiley & Sons** and **BoardSource** © 2005. Text may not be reproduced without written permission from BoardSource.