

Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, October 27, 2011 ■ 2:00pm – 4:00pm
Call: (866) 410-9424 Code: 5721056118#

Meeting NOTES

Meeting Outcomes:

- Announce newly elected Co-Chairs and confirm current Regional Representatives
- Reach consensus on ‘Sound Bite’ language
- Update on Regional Meetings and activities
- Funding and Evaluation updates
- Update on policy action steps and overview of status of CAC 2011 policy priorities
- Initial input for January in-person meeting

Time	Topic	Lead	Notes
2:00	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions / Overview of Agenda and Meeting Outcomes 	Susan Elizabeth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steering Committee co-chair Susan Elizabeth opened the call. She thanked participants for joining and reviewed the meeting outcomes and agenda. ▪ Steering Committee co-chair Anthony Taylor introduced himself and took a roll call of participants.
2:05	Steering Committee Leadership and Membership Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Co-Chair Election Results – • Discussion and clarification Action: Determine required action based on discussion. Taylor review consensus model prior to action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Representation - Confirm current representatives from each region and process to select 2012 representatives from regions • Discussion and clarification Action: (May not be necessary)	Susan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan provided an update of the Steering Committee co-chairs elections. ▪ Susan reminded Steering Committee Members of the decision made at the August 25th Steering Committee meeting to temporarily suspend Article 5, Section 3 in the current bylaws to allow for a change in this year’s election process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Per the Bylaws, Article 5 Section 3: There are two co-chairs. Co-chairs serve for one calendar year. New co-chairs will be elected in September, three months prior to taking office, allowing for transition and mentorship by the outgoing chair(s). ○ This clause was suspended to permit at least one or both of the currently serving co-chairs to continue to serve for a second year. ▪ Susan thanked Steering Committee members for voting and announced that she and Taylor had both been re-elected, with the third candidate Allen Christensen receiving a significant number of votes as well. ▪ Susan recommended the following proposal for action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Susan will continue to serve as co-chair from 1/1/12 through 12/31/12. ○ Taylor will continue to serve as co-char from 1/1/12 through 6/30/12. ○ On 7/1/12, Allen will replace Taylor as the second co-chair and will serve through 12/31/12. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan reiterated the purpose of the election process as seeking to ensure that new co-chairs are adequately prepared and that the

			<p>operations of the Steering Committee can continue in an efficient manner. This proposed action plan would allow Susan and Taylor the opportunity to prepare Allen for the role of co-chair over a 6-month period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Taylor complimented Susan's proposition, stating his interest in transitioning his focus to developing the Bay Area Region. ▪ Susan offered an opportunity for attendees to respond to this proposal with comments or questions. None were offered. Due to the previously approved suspension of procedures outlined in the bylaws, consensus was not sought, and the proposed line of action was adopted. ▪ It was noted that the Steering Committee may want to revisit the bylaws in 2012 to ensure the smooth transition of co-chairs in the future, which may include staggered terms for co-chairs. ▪ Susan offered an opportunity for Maria Casey, Executive Director of Partnership for the Public's Health to announce her 3-month sabbatical, effective October 27, 2011. Maria stated that she is confident that the work of CA Convergence will be supported in her absence. Lisa Hershey will assume role as Director of the CA Convergence coordinating office. Maria offered her encouragement to all Convergence members and partners and extended her gratitude for their support. ▪ Susan reviewed progress around determining regional representation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Article 5, Section 2 of the CA Convergence bylaws state: The SC consists of no more than 24 voting members, including 4 members from each of the six Regional Groups. Regional groups are responsible for appointing 4 Regional Members to serve as SC members. At least one of the 4 appointed Regional Members from each Regional Group must be a community resident. SC Members agree to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attend a minimum of 4 SC meetings/teleconferences with at least one being in person. ▪ Actively participate in a minimum of four regional meetings, if the region has begun meeting. ▪ Serve on at least one SC subcommittee or workgroup. ▪ Susan prompted participants to review the current Steering Committee Members roster. For regions that are still forming, Susan stressed the importance of confirming current representatives who will continue to serve until regions are able to hold officials elections for 2012 representatives. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In some instances, it was observed that there is more than one representative
--	--	--	--

			<p>from a single agency, organization, or county; and that some regions have incomplete membership and lack resident members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was recommended that each region keep their current representatives until regional structures are more established and formal elections can be held → prospect to transition into a more formal adoption of the bylaws in the future. ▪ The proposal was adopted ▪ Action: PPH staff will hold calls with each regional lead to determine the process that each region will use to elect representatives for 2012 and beyond.
2:15	<p>Sound Bite Competition: New Suggested Language</p> <p>Action: Consensus Taken</p>	Susan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan re-presented new mission and goals language to describe California Convergence: Proposed Mission Statement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>What is the CA Convergence?</u> – A network of community leaders and advocates from across California that seek to advance policy and environmental change at local, regional and state levels to create health equity in communities through improved food and physical activity environments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was noted that the Steering Committee will likely revisit the wording in this statement in 2012 to perhaps broaden the focus beyond food and physical activity environments. ○ Taylor provided additional background around this issue. He stated that the goal of Steering Committee members is to work on the ground and engage with community leaders and residents. Currently, it is difficult to convey exactly who and what we are. This mission statement, paired with these few goals, is an attempt to ease this process and can serve as sound bites for what Convergence is. ○ Attendees were given the opportunity to ask questions and express concerns around this proposed language. No objections or questions were raised. ○ The proposed mission statement was adopted through 2012 with the intention to re-address it next year. Proposed Goals Language: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>What are CA Convergence's main goals for 2011-2012?</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formation of six regional groups, networked within California Convergence, to advance policy change. 2. Create a statewide policy system that makes it easier for community partners to connect, to learn from each other, and to advocate for change at the local, regional, and state level. 3. Create local/regional/statewide movement around current California Convergence state-level policy priorities: soda tax (AB 669), healthy food financing (AB 581), and safe routes to school (AB 516). ○ Susan acknowledged policy wins with the passing of AB581 and AB516

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan opened the call for feedback from participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jen Rice urged the group to consider the audience when language of this type is presented – the language used needs to make sense to residents and people who are not familiar with policy/public health/CA Convergence terminology. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan Stuart sought to clarify this issue as well, asking if the audience for these sound bites is intended to be residents or partners currently engaged in this work. Susan responded, clarifying that to date, the audience has tended to be the latter, but that it is important to consider how accessible CA Convergence language is to residents and community members. She further noted that in either case, simple language is preferable and necessary. Taylor also noted that this language can be modified on a case by case basis, but is intended serve as a format to present what CA Convergence is and does. ○ Jen also added the desire to include “advocacy” into goal #2. ○ Barbara Jackson raised the consideration of the number of regional groups stated in goal #1. She asked about the status of the Gold Country counties and if 6 is the correct number of CA Convergence regions. Susan responded that the number of CA Convergence regions is an evolving aspect of our work. It was therefore proposed to add “at least six regions” to the goals language, so the language reflects accurately what is stated in the bylaws but also leaves the option to include additional regions as they emerge. ○ Emily Bourcier noted that for outsiders, the first two goals seem rooted in nurturing grassroots work and capacity. With the term “movement” in goal #3, however, the language seems to imply that CA Convergence will do all the work. She suggested Convergence consider a policy example and how residents and partners would know this system if they saw it and what the components would be. Susan stated that this is something that the CA Convergence Policy Subcommittee will be addressing, as the system has to be defined. ▪ Given the proposed changes to the language: the inclusion of “at least six” regions and the insertion of “statewide advocacy system”, attendees were asked if the proposed language was acceptable to adopt. The call did not have enough members present to form a quorum, however, and it was agreed to present the final language via email to representatives unable to attend the call. <p>Revised ACTION: consensus process to occur via email following the meeting.</p>
2:25	<p>Regionalization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CCROPP TA Update (provided to regions) 	<p>Taylor Genoveva Islas Hooker</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Taylor opened the call for updates on regional meetings: ▪ Belinda Campos with CCHE provided an update on the Los Angeles regional meeting held in Baldwin Park, CA on September 23rd: She shared that the meeting was great

	<p>to stimulate and support regional organizing for policy action) (5 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update on Regional Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LA regional convening on September 23, 2011 (5 min) ○ Far North convening on October 26, 2011 (3 min) ○ CCROPP convening (3 min) ○ Central Coast (3 min) ○ Bay Area (3 min) 	<p>Belinda Campos Barbara Jackson Genoveva Robin Dean Coire Reilly</p>	<p>success with 29 participants. She extended her gratitude to Maria Casey, Susan Elizabeth, Dana Richardson, and other Steering Committee members who attended. Belinda stated that she felt proud to have the opportunity to share information about California Convergence and what it is. There were many cities, collaboratives, departments, and organizations represented and Belinda took the opportunity to speak to participants to determine what they would like to see established for LA and how best to connect these representatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Barbara Jackson with the Anderson Partnership for Healthy Children provided an update of the Far North regional meeting held in Anderson, CA on October 26th: The meeting proved very successful with 41 attendees, presenters and staff with 8 Far North counties represented. She stated that the Far North team had invited wonderful presenters that shared valuable information around policy and advocacy. Participants spoke about commonalities in region, next steps to move forward, and saw many people respond with interest in the CA Convergence Steering Committee and workgroups. Consensus was reached that members want to move forward as a region and look into the development of a regional coordinator position to support these efforts. ▪ Robin Dean with the CA Convergence Coordinating Office presented on behalf of the Central Valley: Robin and the CCROPP team are still in the process of determining a time to hold the meeting. Susan relayed that CCROPP leads met today and in January hope to look at what the future holds for them, the possible impact of funding opportunities, and how CCROPP can work with CAC to maximize resources and opportunities for hosting a meeting for the region. ▪ Robin also provided an update on progress in the Central Coast: Robin has been working with Megan Joseph with United Way of Santa Cruz to organize a meeting that they are hoping to hold in February. ▪ Coire Reilly with Contra Costa Health Services provided an update on progress in the Bay Area: Coire invited Taylor to share that he is in the process of working with Kaiser to find possible resources to fund a Regional Coordinator position to support the region. They are currently seeing what is available and what kind of assistance CA Convergence can get to fund a part-time position for the Bay Area. Coire is creating a list of potential members to do outreach with but will wait to hear about this position before moving forward. ▪ Susan asked a question: Is LA currently working as a separate region from the South? A: CA Convergence Coordinating Office Staff and Genoveva Islas-Hooker are still holding talks with Rosa Soto and Dana Richardson. They will report on status later. ▪ Barbara Jackson asked about the approved process for changing regions and borders: do they have to be approved by the Steering Committee, or just the regions? Susan responded emphasizing the importance of regions (i.e. the South) to hold dialogues with
--	---	--	--

			<p>regional participants and stakeholders to determine what makes most sense to them. Once this is determined, the Steering Committee would review any changes for approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to the bylaws (Article 4, Section 3): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1. CAC has six regional groups in different stages of formation – Far North, Bay Area, Central Coast, CCROPP, Los Angeles and Southern California. Current Configuration does not include Central Mountain area or Sacramento. (See Addendum for background on regional group formation.) ▪ 2. <u>Annual Review</u>: A review of regional boundaries by all Regional Groups is recommended annually. Regional groups will recommend to the SC every December whether and how to redraw the boundaries in their respective regions. Regional Groups may take into account the following factors when determining whether and how to redraw regional boundaries: need, population, number of counties in a proposed region, geographic area (sq miles) of a proposed region, density of coalitions and/or partners within each county, local policy advocacy efforts, changes in local efforts to implement state policy, political will, existing resources, and other factors as identified by the regions. ○ Taylor reviewed this process and stated that regions should present something in writing by December 2011 for review and approval at the January 26th Steering Committee meeting. Proposals will go to the SC for a vote. If a neighboring region will be affected, it is recommended regional representatives work together and submit something jointly. Membership and representation would apply uniformly across all regions. If the number of regions, and consequently SC membership, increases, this may be something to reconsider. <p>ACTION: AGENDA ITEM – JAN MEETING address regional borders</p>
2:50	<p>Funding Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California’s Community Transformation grant recipients ▪ Resource Development/Sustainability Committee next steps ▪ California’s Funder Consortium Development ▪ National Convergence Partnership proposal 	Robin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robin Dean provided an update of Resource Development and funding: ▪ The Resource Development Subcommittee was convened via teleconference on October 20th. Members discussed the current funding landscape and next steps to ensure the sustainability of CA Convergence; its mission and goals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CA Convergence is currently funded by The California Endowment and Kaiser Permanente with a small CDPH grant that supported the assessment and organization of regional meetings. ○ Current grants re due to end in February of next year, with possible bridge funding from TCE for the month of March. Consequently, this is the time to work on proposals for new funding to continue CA Convergence work.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To date, there has been no update from the National Convergence Partnership regarding funds to support Convergence regions. ○ Community Transformation Grantees were announced, with the Public Health Institute receiving close to \$6million to support California counties. Marion Standish will be assuming the responsibility of overseeing this program at PHI. CA Convergence was written into the proposed grant but Coordinating staff is unsure what this funding will look like and is currently awaiting word on the status of resources available through CTG. ○ The Funder Consortium is currently focused on broader issues beyond just CA Convergence and is seeking to determine how Convergence can play a role in these efforts. The CA Convergence Coordinating Team is working to stay on top of developments with this group and to ensure our work is available to the members of the consortium so CA Convergence can be considered. ○ The future of CA Convergence looks bright, as coordinating staff explores the possibility of pursuing a 2-year grant application with TCE, as opposed to typical annual funding awards. Proposal development is expected to be underway soon, but nothing will be certain until evaluation results are reviewed by current funders and prospective deliverables are determined. It also has to be determined what funding will be made available for centralized work through the coordinating office, and what will go to address regional needs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coire Reilly noted the importance of keeping a strong policy focus during this process. ▪ Robin presented next steps, centered around the development of a two-year strategic plan to determine: goals, outcomes, proposed activities, desired outcomes, future evaluation methods, a timeline, regional and funding needs to enable CA Convergence to build off of what work has proved successful and is already underway. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The goal will be to develop the strategic plan to present clear and actionable recommendations at the next Steering Committee meeting in January. ○ The first step will be to convene the Resource Development Subcommittee with additional members. Current members are willing to commit to supporting this process, but will require additional participation from across the Steering Committee. Robin pointed out that all CA Convergence members have a stake in the success of the Strategic Planning process. This sentiment was seconded by Susan Elizabeth, who recommended each region nominate one representative to serve on this (and all) committee(s). <p>ACTION: each region will attempt to ensure they have at least one rep on each workgroup/sub committee.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>3:00</p>	<p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update on Strategic Learning Process (Aspen Institute) (3 min) ▪ Update on Case Stories (Center for Community Health and Evaluation) (5 min) ▪ Findings from Samuels and Associates 2010 Policy Survey (Samuels and Associates) (8 min) ▪ Quick Look at Key Findings from the 2011 CA Convergence E-Profile Assessment (3 min) 	<p>Shené Bowie</p> <p>David Devlin-Foltz Emily Bourcier Liz Schwarte</p> <p>Robin</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan introduced Shené Bowie, CA Convergence Steering Committee member, to provide an update on Evaluation. ▪ Shené introduced evaluation, noting that ongoing efforts seek to capture the benefits of CA Convergence: what is being done, how this benefits our local communities, and the role it can play in the future. ▪ David Devlin-Foltz with the Aspen Institute shared that he and his colleagues have collected many comments and suggestions from two strategic learning dialogues and interviews to be conducted. David stated that he and his colleagues now believe they have enough information to put forward recommendations and suggestions to support action. These findings should help determine what portions of CA Convergence need to be funded, what changes need to be made and what resources may need to be added to ensure the CA Convergence system works even better than it currently does. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ David noted that funders will have to meet face-to-face to be clear about what they are seeking to fund and how to move forward. David added encouragement to hold this funders meeting ASAP to provide CA Convergence with a clear understanding of available resources and funder interest. ○ The report based on findings by the Aspen Institute will take a considerable amount of time to write, particularly if it is done collectively. ○ David speculated that good opportunities exist for communication between TCE, KP and CA Convergence and potential for identifying policy priorities that we are in a position to move. This is coupled with a need for policy translation and clarification of who is responsible for different portions of policy work; it is necessary to create a process of triangulating needs and next steps back to communities to ensure policy translation can be used at the community level. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coire Reilly suggested CA Convergence tie proposals to HEAL and BHC work, as they are already funded by KP and TCE respectively. These sites support independent work at the moment, and CA Convergence could possibly play a role in bridging the gap and bringing existing sites together. ▪ Emily Bourcier with Group Health's Center for Community Health and Evaluation (CCHE) introduced the two efforts currently underway to inform their concurrent evaluation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Evaluation is currently in analysis phase, as CCHE evaluators review transcripts from interviews with 15 community leaders and stakeholders. A draft should be completed in November to be presented for review at December 6th meeting with representatives from TCE and KP. The report is being drafted in concert with Shené Bowie, Susan Elizabeth and Anthony Taylor.
-------------	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Emily shared that CCHE has collected many different perspectives and thoughtful responses through their interview process. These comments have brought to light the complexity and ambitious nature of the CA Convergence mission. She further noted how struck she was by how many individuals mentioned CA Convergence as a welcome place for community and grassroots organizers to convene and collaborate. This was remarked to be a unique aspect of CA Convergence. ○ Two case stories produced by CCHE will focus on the CA Convergence shift in governance and the supported response to federal funding opportunities, with lessons learned and recommendations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One participant asked if the evaluation would be presented as three separate documents. Emily responded that CCHE treats the process as one evaluation effort; one strategic plan and the case stories will compliment this work. However, each will be completed as a separate document. ▪ Liz Schwarte shared information from the survey conducted by Samuels and Associates. She shared that the purpose of the survey was to gain an understanding of policy change work that is occurring across California where CA Convergence is and is not present. It presented input from a large region across counties throughout California. The focus of the survey was around Sugar-Sweetened Beverages (SSB) and Joint Use, but also included findings and priorities for CA Convergence. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The survey saw a 55% response rate from 27 out of 58 counties in California. Half of the respondents noted collaboration with local health departments. 30% were working with community-based organizations. ○ Roughly 66% of participants identified themselves as working on CA Convergence policy priority areas, the majority working around policy development as opposed to implementation. ○ Plans for future work focused around land use and transportation, with Safe Routes to School gaining the largest number of mentions. Responses also identified community gardens as another future priority. 70% of respondents noted working on local and statewide beverage environments as another priority, with 70% of participants noting an interest in working to limit SSB in public areas and improving access to, and consumption of, water. ○ Liz observed that survey results mirror priorities of CA Convergence, which is encouraging. She also noted that a great deal of work is being done around Joint Use and schools, identifying momentum around these policy areas and supporting consideration of campaigning around these issues in the future. ▪ Anthony Taylor reminded SC members that questions for Liz, or any of our evaluators
--	--	--	---

			<p>can be forwarded to Kristania De Leon with the California Convergence coordinating office at krdeleon@partnershiph.org, who will sent them to our presenters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robin Dean, Resource Development and Evaluation Coordinator with the California Convergence coordinating office provided an update on the E-Profile Assessment. Robin stated that within a week the full report will be posted to the CA Convergence website with a five-page executive summary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Robin also noted that the process of collecting data through e-profiles is also part of getting members and partners connected through Community Commons which will go live on Monday, October 31. ○ She also observed that the data collected from the 70 responses to the e-profile assessment echoes the findings from Samuels and Associates relayed by Liz, identifying SSB/Soda Tax as a strong priority across the state. ▪ Liz Schwarte thanked Robin and CA Convergence coordinating staff for their support and collaborative efforts.
<p>3:20</p>	<p>Policy Action Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update on state policy successes re CAC 2011 Legislative Priorities - Soda Tax, Healthy Food Financing Initiative, Safe Routes to School – ▪ Food Day – October 24, 2011 ▪ CA Convergence Policy Subcommittee Update and Proposed Action 	<p>Taylor</p> <p>Sarah Mercer</p> <p>Juliet Sims</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steering Committee Co-Chair Anthony Taylor introduced policy inviting Sarah Mercer, Director of Government Affairs with the California Pan-Ethnic Health Network (CPEHN), to provide an update on policy successes around CA Convergence 2011 legislative priorities: Healthy Food Financing Initiative (AB581), Safe Routes to School (AB516), and Soda Tax (AB669). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sarah shared that AB581 has been passed and signed, with a council to oversee the food financing initiative established. AB516 was a big win for equity with its passing. Sarah mentioned possible ways to begin its implementation before it becomes statute. Ab669 is currently in appropriations. If it is not out of the first house by the end of January, it will die and have to be re-introduced next season. She recommended interested contributors follow up with action committee about the resubmission of the bill. ▪ Juliet Sims, Program Coordinator with the Prevention Institute was invited to share an update on Food Day which occurred on October 24th. She shared that Strategic Alliance supported and coordinated this event, with CA Convergence providing a strong support role. Over 200 events were held across California and many more nationwide with counties working to use the day’s momentum to support local efforts as well. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Over 16,000 statewide signatures were collected to support California’s Food Day Farm Bill petition, to tell Governor Brown, state agriculture and health officials and congressional delegations to stand up for a health food and farm policy. 60 organizations also signed on to support the bill. ○ Juliet concluded that she and her colleagues are looking forward to Food Day 2012 and using the data from this year’s even to highlight and advance policy work currently going on around the state.

		Taylor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Taylor provided an update from the CA Convergence policy subcommittee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Taylor shared that the subcommittee’s goal is to make advocacy and policy change the easier choice for leaders and residents. The subcommittee’s focus is to guide CA Convergence policy action to increase the probability of policy change. ○ The subcommittee will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focus efforts on advancing the 3 current CA Convergence policy priorities, promoting advocacy through implementation. ▪ Build a policy advocacy system. ▪ Select a current priority that has traction and test out the policy advocacy system to engage local communities and build capacity in the policy/legislative process and create change. Further, members will partner with regional organization and groups to ensure the system is functioning as it is meant to. ▪ Inform the 2012 CA Convergence policy agenda through assessing priorities of importance or those that are currently being addressed by local communities, Sacramento political environment, and potential allied groups. The goal is to set the agenda as opposed to “reacting” to the set agenda. ○ Taylor announced that the subcommittee had elected a co-chair. Dolores Gonzalez Hayes, Policy Director for Latino Health Access will co-chair this subcommittee. Two other workgroup members, Debbie Oto-Kent from Sacramento and Coire Reilly from the Bay Area have agreed to explore serving as co-chairs with Dolores. ○ Taylor also shared that the subcommittee had established a small, time-limited Task Force charged with strategically assessing possible priorities and determining the system to elicit specific policy priorities from the regions by January 2012. The goal is to put forth recommendations to the larger policy subcommittee in early December 2012, to allow the CA Convergence Steering Committee to select its top 3 priorities at the January 2012 Steering Committee meeting.
3:45	<p>Provide input for January 26, 2012 In-Person Meeting Agenda</p> <p>Location: The California Endowment Oakland Conference Center</p>	Susan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan Elizabeth thanked those who were able to present findings at the meeting, particularly those who altered their presentations to be cognoscente of time. ▪ Susan invited participants to share proposed agenda items for the January 26th Steering Committee meeting. Proposed agenda items include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developmental Work: approval of sound bite language, update on regional representation, regional updates, and revisiting co-chairs transition to address possible staggered position in the future. ○ Strategic Planning: plan for Resource Development workgroup coupled with

CALIFORNIA
CONVERGENCE

Working together to improve food and physical activity environments.

			<p>funding proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Updates from subcommittees and workgroups.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Determine future policy priorities with recommendations from Policy Subcommittee▪ Update on Evaluation▪ Susan reminded participants that further suggestions can be emailed to Kristania with the CA Convergence coordinating office at krdeleon@partnershipph.org.
4:00	Adjourn		