



CAN Board of Directors Meeting

05/10/24 Minutes

Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting

Present: **Monica Muñoz Andry**, Greater Austin Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; **Megan Cermak**, Central Health; **Chris Cervini**, Austin Community College; **Suchitra Gururaj**, UT Austin; **Liz Johnson**, St. Edward's University; **Hal Katz**, Integral Care; **Yael Lawson**, Workforce Solutions Capital Area; **Patricia Longoria**, CAN Community Council; **Jeremy Martin**, Austin Chamber of Commerce; **Jeffrey Travillion**, Commissioner, Travis County **Lawrence Trevino**, CapMetro; **José Velásquez**, Council Member, City of Austin; **Ofelia Zapata**, Austin ISD Trustee; **Craig McNary**, CAN Community Council; **Pilar Sanchez**, Travis County; **Laura La Fuente**, Austin Public Health;

Other guests: Patricia Hayes; Ara Merjanian; Korey Darling, Travis County.

CAN Staff in attendance: Raul Alvarez, Jelina Tunstill, Carlos Soto

Call To Order, Welcome, and Introductions: CAN Chair Liz Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm and welcomed folks in attendance. Members introduced themselves.

Minutes: The February and April Board meeting minutes were approved after a motion was submitted by Hal Katz. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Travillion. The motion passed unanimously.

Community Council Report: Patricia Longoria mentioned two new members were voted in at the most recent Community Council meeting: Ara Merjanian and Pamela Garcia. Tiffany Harrison from Black Parents and Families Collective was a guest speaker at the meeting. They also finalized the work plan and decided to continue with the update to the Person-Centered report until June. Following that work, they will begin working on issues relating to "Expanding Opportunity." At the next meeting there will be presentations from Meals on Wheels and the Mayor's Committee on People with Disabilities on the topic of person-centered care strategies. Patricia also encouraged those present to help recruit potential candidates to add to the Council. There is a proposal to amend the bylaws to add the chair and vice-chair of the Community Council to the Executive Committee, which the EC has already approved. A motion to adopt the Bylaws Amendment was submitted by Jeremy Martin. The motion was seconded by Craig McNary. The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Director's Report & 2024 Work Plan Adoption: At the last meeting we were unable to approve the work plan as the quorum was lost when the time came to vote. A motion to adopt the 2024 CAN Work Plan was submitted by Commissioner Travillion. The motion was seconded by Trustee Zapata. The motion passed unanimously.

CAN Strategic Plan Update: In 2019 CAN began developing the Strategic Plan, which was approved in February 2020 approximately one month before COVID-19 became a global pandemic and the primary local issue. Since it was a 5-year plan, it is time to revisit the plan itself to see what may need to be revised given changes in local issues and needs. We have scheduled October as the date for our in-person CAN retreat to brainstorm around the strategic plan. Between now and then, we will be having 1-on-1 and small-group meetings with CAN members to go through a list of issues, questions, and get your input on this material and our work over the past 4-5 years. Patricia Hayes provided an overview of current conditions, considerations, and goals to help frame the conversation. Both current Priority Issues of focus (Expanding Opportunity and Mental Health and Wellness) include regional components. Members were asked what their thoughts were on considering CAN members serving areas outside of Travis County, and on engaging on a regional level on an on-going basis.

Small Group Report Out: Members wrote their thoughts on cards that were collected at the end of the meeting. See Attachment 1 for a listing of comments/feedback.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Attachment 1 – CAN Board Meeting, May 10, 2024

Strategic Plan Discussion – Summary of Feedback/Comments

Background

Both of the Priority Issues on which CAN is currently focused have a regional component:

- The follow-up to the CAN Regional Summit will likely include engagement on a regional level (planned activities include creating profiles of “earn & learn” programs for the 5-county MSA as well as establishment of a regional “Earn & Learn” Work Group); and
- The multi-lingual mental health toolkits that CAN has developed include a toolkit specific to Travis County as well as toolkits specific to all other counties in the MSA.

Thus, we are at a point where we have resources that would pique the interest of regional entities.

Feedback

Q1: What are your thoughts on considering new CAN members serving areas outside of Travis County?

(The first step – as reflected in current work plan – would be to establish a CAN board committee to develop a strategy and parameters for engaging regional stakeholders.)

Consider focusing on school districts with highest population growth and prioritize accordingly.

Work through public schools. They are mandatory (for students to participate). They are often the largest public entity in most communities.

City of Austin is primarily in Travis County but there are many residents in Williamson County

Travis County, Central Health, CapMetro and Integral Care are bound to Travis County.

Growing from 1 (county) to 3 or 5 is a lot to ask.

The more experiences and thoughts the better.

Yes, I am in favor. We need to identify key “CAN” -like entities to form a regional sub-committees comprised of non-profits, school districts and municipalities.

I prefer expanding the network based on particular issues, maybe an affinity group approach.

We should make sure that any regional work we do is not duplicative.

Developing a strategy makes sense. The lines are definitely blurring between cities. For example, Travis County-Williamson County has become a region because of people moving between the two.

I'm in favor of considering addition of Will-Co partners, including Round Rock ISD. Given the nationally noted growth of Round Rock – particularly corporate growth – then it would be useful to have this conversation to see what makes sense.

Yes, we should have more partners. San Antonio to Austin will become an American megalopolis. Partners should be from that corridor.

Open to it (regional expansion). More large institutional partners can add funds to organization.

Having better regional representation opens up membership and can provide more funding. Many issues, particularly affordability, are regional issues now.

Could dilute impact of organization. It depends if we are open to new issues based on what new members advocate.

Let's identify needs first, then we can consider organizations outside of Travis County once we find out if those same needs resonate outside of Travis County.

Q2: What are your thoughts on engaging on a regional level as an ongoing activity and not just one that is project-specific (e.g., regional summit; language access grant project)?

I would recommend project specific work to start.

I think we should pilot "regionalism" as consultants to the board, rather than official board positions.

I prefer we start on a project basis to see if it works and then expand, if it does.

I should not be project focused, it should be KPI focused.

Regional Summits can be very effective if they are worked through ISDs.

Any regional work needs to be focused. Multi-county is too much for the organization to take on as one organization without focus, funding or defined outcomes.

CAN members that operative significantly beyond Travis County can focus on higher education, healthcare and regional economy.

Regional work needs to be more sustained if we are going to do it.

We could have regional conversations on issue specific areas (e.g., educational workgroup).

As it relates to the region, what is our overall goal? Creating examples to be adopted widely?

We are at a point where we can create model programs or expand out (but that will mean an even larger board).