



**PLANNING STRATEGY TABLE MEETING**  
**Tuesday, January 10, 2017**  
**1:30 – 4:00pm**  
**The Common Roof (165 Ferris Lane, Barrie) Board Room**  
**MINUTES**

Attended		Regrets	
Jacquie Ferguson, Co-Chair (teleconference)	Sandra Cole, Coordinator	Gertie Beaucage	Joan Kennedy
Stefanie Smith, Co-Chair	Gisele Forrest	Pat Carney	Christine Simmons-Physick
Danette Blue	Julie McAlpine, Recorder	Lora D'Ambrosio	Sandy Thurston
Chris Brens	Elizabeth McKeeman	Jim Harris	Mary Jean Watson
John Clarke (teleconference)	Chris Wheeler	Brenda Jackson	

	Item	Minutes	Motion/Action
1.	Welcome, Roundtable Introductions	Stefanie welcomed everyone to the meeting and a roundtable introduction took place.	
2.	Approval of Consent Agenda: Minutes: November 8, 2016/December 13, 2016 Agenda: January 10, 2017	The agenda and minutes were approved with no changes.	
3.	Integrated Planning Table Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose</li> <li>Membership</li> <li>Terms of Reference</li> <li>Recommendations to Executive Committee</li> <li>Next Steps</li> </ul>	<p><b>Integrated Planning Table Implementation:</b>                      Stefanie led the Table in discussion about implementing the new Integrated Planning Table. The following is a synopsis of that discussion.</p> <p>The Planning Table Terms of Reference and Notes from the Visioning Day in relation to the new Integrated Planning Table had been sent out to members as reference material to help guide today's discussion.</p> <p>The conversations that took place at the August 2016 Coalition Visioning Day helped to lead to the recommendation of an Integrated Planning Table (IPT) as part of the new structure. One piece of feedback shared at the Visioning Day is that many of the same conversations are occurring at various meetings and Tables, from different perspectives, but does not always get shared amongst the various Tables. The vision is that having an Integrated Planning Table where there are representatives of these Tables would be a good place to talk about work that is happening and how we can work together.</p> <p><u>Purpose:</u>                      The Purpose from the current Planning Table's TOR were reviewed and discussed. It was noted the Purpose contains "soft" language that does not reflect action or direction.</p>	

Item	Minutes	Motion/Action
	<p>The previous Integrated Working Task Group (IWTG) was discussed. The vision of this work is close to that of the IPT. The Purpose of the IWTG was reviewed and its language is a bit more specific and action oriented. It was suggested using a good definition of integration in the Purpose, such as Gina Browne's. It is consistent with the MOMH and SNS initiatives as well as non-traditional Coalition members such as SCATEH, BANAC. The IWTG also used this definition.</p> <p><i>"a level of collaboration where service providers jointly plan the offering of service and actively modify service activity based on advice and input from mutual discussions for (and with) a child and family".</i></p> <p>Gina Browne's definition uses strong verbs but does not address decision making. A discussion took place around the challenges that can occur if there is no clear decision maker. The concept of collaborative governance and the rights of individual organizations was discussed. The Coalition is made up of CEOs who have a fair bit of liberty in relation to operations, but when it comes to higher level directional issues, the Coalition has struggled with individual entities vs. community integration model. The Coalition's mandate includes decision making about Coalition issues; individual member agencies remain autonomous regarding their own decision making.</p> <p>It was clear from the Visioning Day that the intent was for the IPT to be more action specific, not only information sharing. This will impact who the committee reps will be i.e. people who can take action items back to committees and leadership tables.</p> <p>The language used in the Memorandum of Association (MoA) was also reviewed and speaks to working together in an integrated way. The MoA Purpose is also more action oriented.</p> <p><u>Functions:</u> Something to be determined is if the IPT will still report the work of groups/ tables up to the Coalition.</p> <p>Sandra reviewed the Proposed Functions from the Visioning Day's recommendations. The goal talks about moving innovation into action.</p> <p>A discussion took place with regards to the size of the IPT, as there are many tables. Members could potentially represent more than one table where someone sits on more than one committee. The Function should capture that</p>	

Item	Minutes	Motion/Action
	<p>members attending the IPT are to report back to their committee, for the greatest distribution of information.</p> <p>Chris Brens described the LHIN's Coordinating Council model and noted only a few goals or outcomes are identified to be achieved annually.</p> <p>The challenge for the IPT is to be aware of what work is going on and to link it in a way that makes practical sense i.e. outcomes to Council.</p> <p>A function of the table includes an evaluation piece. With only one meeting/month we need to look at the way work is submitted; it does not have to be complicated. TAYSoS uses a reporting template that is completed at the end of the meeting and is shared back. Consider ways to help the sharing of information/work become easier.</p> <p>When a table decides what it wants to do, or makes a change, there is no way to evaluate how it fits with the system or with the Coalition's strategic direction of resilience, it is more of an FYI.</p> <p>If the IPT has to evaluate the pieces of working being done, package it and send up to Council, and also identify areas for collaboration, create a plan and send to council, is this too much work for this group? It makes it difficult to create something that is a meaningful piece of information flowing from the great work being done; hard to roll up.</p> <p>We heard from committees that they want the opportunity to come together if more than one group is working on something, to have one plan each can contribute to; a collective way to impact the system. This holds value for people at the Table level. United Way does a lot of work on collective impact, intended to support high level systems work with multiple needs/audiences across a community. When big initiatives arise it would be beneficial to come to the IPT to talk about what can be done to collectively support it.</p> <p>Committee work does not move quickly. Staff has other work going on which can limit how much time they are able to dedicate. When there are specific deliverables, for a shared purpose, tables move in the same direction.</p> <p>What worked well with the IWTG was that people were having discussions, making decisions, and sharing resources as a community wide initiative. Work was being done.</p> <p>The Visioning Day notes indicate a process is required to monitor projects. Every year groups are asked to come up with a plan with new initiatives; this</p>	

Item	Minutes	Motion/Action
	<p>adds on to existing work. Only so much time can be provided to a project. A discussion ensued regarding supporting and nurturing initiatives to which significant investments, financially and time/learning have been made. The IPT may also be a good resource when Tables are struggling.</p> <p>New initiatives/ventures in the County eg. RVH 3.2 million, also needs to be addressed. The Visioning Notes speak to how work gets reported on, resources, priorities. How information gets shared and communicated needs to be considered; it may be a function of this Table. With a tight Purpose, it might make sense for presentations to come here first to determine how it fits in with an overall community plan. This will need to be addressed with the Executive Committee.</p> <p>We heard from the Visioning day that we need to be efficient but we want to ensure we do not lose effectiveness and important processes. If we are going to be a planning body, does it fit in an overall plan, can we ask for modifications if it doesn't fit?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Have to know where the planning is going; the goal is clearly identified</li> <li>2) Do we have the ability to say no, ie not support whether or not it fits with strategic plan</li> </ol> <p>If doing planning, we need to be able to do both of the above or at least make recommendations to Council.</p> <p>The Functions outlined in the IWTG planning TOR were very specific. A dedicated focus is needed to move the work ahead. This is a function of the Coordinator when new things come up but the Coordinator cannot get out to every meeting, every month. Part of the discussion is setting priorities, streamlining, prioritizing. If we can identify some specific areas of focus it might help define if we have the right Tables. Many of the points indicated in the MoA under the Planning Table's Decision Making, Scope of Authority are relevant functions of the IPT.</p> <p>An annual work plan talking about priorities for a specific period i.e. investment in Access mechanisms, RVH, MOMH, SNS could be developed.</p> <p>The ideal size of the table was discussed. It may be too unwieldy to have every table represented at the IPT. Could the Coalition, with endorsement from Council, identify the priority functions of table? Sandra suggested the Coordinator, in the role of liaison, could be the link for some committees; they would not necessarily need a rep at IPT, Sandra could share information to and from the committee.</p>	

Item	Minutes	Motion/Action
	<p>In summary, today's conversation generated a few key points to be considered in the development of the TOR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System planning</li> <li>• Collective Impact</li> <li>• Gina Browne's definition</li> <li>• Use language from the Memorandum of Association, Integrated Working Task Group</li> <li>• Identify membership i.e. RVH new money, and the planning there</li> <li>• Ensure community involvement. How do we look at who the key partners are?</li> </ul> <p><u>Next Steps:</u> Using the information from the background material and today's conversation, Sandra will prepare a draft Purpose and Function to send to Jacquie and Stefanie for initial review. From this, the rest of the Terms of Reference may flow.</p> <p>The proposed TOR would go to Executive Committee for approval, then potentially to Council in March.</p> <p>A question was raised regarding the timeline for implementation of the IPT. Sandra provided an overview of the Implementation Plan. The Executive Committee has been formed and is meeting this month. The IPT will take a bit more time. The structure change will be implemented over the course of this year. Changes to the Planning Table agendas may be made in order to address the work being done on the implementation.</p> <p>The work on the TOR Purpose and Function will continue at the February meeting. The scheduled presentations will be postponed. A communication had been sent out to co-chairs of committees regarding the implementation. If there is something pressing or challenging in the community, a conversation may be needed but we will hold off on any groups coming in to do an update. If a particular group requires support, or is experiencing system struggles that impact its work, this should be reported. Some of the disconnect that was experienced as a result from missing updates during the year RBA was implemented, was discussed.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 3:15pm:</p>	<p>Sandra to send draft IPT Purpose and Function to Jacquie and Stefanie.</p> <p>Postpone February presentations.</p> <p>Add IPT TOR to February agenda.</p>

**Next Meeting: Tues. February 14, 2016 - 1:30 – 4:00 p.m., Barrie Common Roof (165 Ferris Lane, Barrie) – Board Room**