

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

Please stand by for realtime captions.

Hey, Misha, welcome. Hey, welcome. We will just give another minute or two for folks to trickle in before we start the meeting. Hey, welcome, everyone. Thank you for being here. We will give everyone another minute maybe just to see who else trickles in, and then we will get started. RA. Welcome, all. We may still have a few folks trickling in as we move forward. But, I think we will go ahead and get started in a minute here. So, yeah. My name is William Blackford. Thank you for coming to our third --welcome to our third meeting here of the Health Equity Framework Workgroup. Yeah, I am a white male in his late 30s with glasses and dark hair, and I believe my background is blurred. So, yeah. Welcome, everyone. We are going to start here by running through a little bit of the intro and go over a little bit of what we did last time, and introductions. So, I will go ahead and pass it over, and I believe we can start sharing the slide there.

Welcome, everyone. My name is Cessa Karson. I was not with you last meeting. Glad to see you all today. I'm a white woman with salt-and-pepper hair, I have glasses on, and I'm wearing a blue shirt, and I have a blue wall in the bookcase as my background. As a reminder, there are captioning links for English and Spanish in the chat. I am going to share with you some notes reviewing the last meeting, and if it looks to you like I am reading, it is because I am reading from the notes page. So, it sound like at the last meeting, there was review of the public health advisory board policy and procedure document, there was discussion of the policy and procedure of health equity, and there's the decision to continue that conversation. There is a discussion about the proposed meeting structure for these meetings, and the group determined that reducing the meeting time from two hours to one .5 hours felt good. Several crew member noted that future item agendas would help folks get grounded into diving into new material. Before diving into new material. That is what we are doing right now. Review of previous meeting and key points. There was also a decision made to discuss a decision-making model for the group, and to reduce agenda items and meetings to feel less rushed. Did I miss anything? Would anybody like to add anything to my summary of the last meeting? And if you think of something --

Hi, this is Maria. I am feeling like you are referencing slide three of our packet, however, the screen is showing slide two. I am just wondering -- thank you.

Thank you, Marie. That was my fault for not queuing. I apologize. If there are additions to the meeting minutes from last meeting, you can also feel free to add them in the chat. Oh, Marie, please?

Thank you. Sorry. I am having different behaviors today dependent upon my clicks. So, for the minutes, I need clarification. I don't see it explicitly in the agenda to review and revise the minutes. So, my clarification question is will that be a standard part of our meeting, and if yes, we need to follow Roberts rules, and do a motion and evil? Thank you.

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

That is a good question. And I am going to defer to Nandini Deo for an answer.

Sure. Hello. This is Nandini Deo, she/her pronouns. I do not think that we need to defer to Roberts rules unless the group decides on that. So, the idea for the meeting minutes ahead of time preferred each meeting is just to make sure that as we are posting them on the PHAB website, that we have captured everything member so brought to the table throughout the meeting so that people refer back to the meeting notes, and they are actually able to review what was said throughout the meeting. So, I don't know that a vote is necessarily required, but would you all like to review meeting minutes before the meeting, and make sure that there aren't any additions? Misha, I see that your hand is up.

Hi, thank you. My name is Misha Marie, I use she/her pronouns. I may also navigator, I am a white woman with long silvery hair. I have a very boring, white background. I think your proposal is a good one. You know, just to review it, make sure that our records are up to snuff for those that fall behind. That all seems sufficient for us. The only thing I would add to the minutes or to the records, it was done, and I thought it worked well, is that we use that survey process. I thought, you know, the kind of thumbs-up or thumbs down, you know, the five options there worked well. It keeps us moving ahead, and maybe we can capture that in, you know, what we have said about how we want to do some of our processes. That is all I was going to add to it. Thank you for doing that, and it felt like a good tool for us as a group. >> Thanks, Misha. So, it sounds like using the voting process is something that we want to keep, and we will discuss it further throughout this meeting. It is want to go back really, really quickly to Marie. Do we feel like we want to review and have a vote on the meeting minutes at the beginning of the meeting? Or are we just mostly checking in to see whether that is going to be a regular part of the agenda?

Hi, this is Marie. I am hearing two questions? So, the first question is about a regular part of our agenda being to check in about the minutes. I am hearing that may be hopeful so that we can have an opportunity to make any recommendations for revisions. I think the other question that I am hearing is whether or not we need to have a formal vote, and I am hearing so far that the group --some of the members of the group don't feel a formal vote is necessary. So, I don't feel it is my decision, but I am just hearing those two different questions. For today, I will add recommendations for minutes in the meeting chat, and I will turn it back to the facilitators for next steps.

That is great. Thank you. I will turn it back to Cessa Karson.

Okay. Tamby Moore, could you go to the next light, please? So, the key discussion and decision items that we are going to cover today are reviews of the role guidance and co-creation process, discuss and determine decision-making processes for the workgroup, review and personalize group norms, decide on hours per week outside of the meeting, meeting dates and time, and facilitation structure. I will pause there if there are any questions or comments about that. Okay. And then, a couple

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

of questions that are related to follow up. Are there any additional thoughts about the PHAB policy and procedure document, and also noting for those workgroup members eligible for compensation, that compensation information will be placed in the chat, and you can also reach out via email without any questions about that. And I see a couple of comments in the chat. Can the notes be distributed a few days after the meetings for us to review outside of the meeting, and come to the meeting to approve and/or revise the minutes? It sounds like we will come to that discussion in a bit.

Yeah, absolutely. So, sorry, can the notes be distributed a few days after the meeting? Yes, absolutely. And I think as well, we are planning on reviewing the meeting minutes last meeting minutes during this meeting. So, we will go ahead and do that after we have gone through this initial process so that we have time to add all of the changes in real time. And not via chat.

Great. And then Marie, I see you have some specific revision recommendations noted in the chat. And they also see a question from Janine asking about similar efforts happening within departments at OHA. Maybe that is something we can come to later today if there is time? Or, maybe we can add it to the next meeting agenda. Okay. I'm getting some nods of agreement. Okay. For a warm-up, now that we have gotten to the business pieces, and before we get too deep into more conversation, if you have read a good book lately, watched a good movie, listen to a good podcast, we are wondering if you could share in the chat anything that comes to mind. We like to gather recommendations. We are having a good discussion before the meeting started about things that we had been listening to, watching, reading. Great. And I am still looking at my notes. Oh, yeah, please, go ahead, Marie?

Good morning, everyone. Marie Davis, she/her/hers, I am in this space as the statewide representatives of the conference of local health officials. I will have to pass on the prompt, because I just don't have any. But, I look forward to learning from others. Thank you. >> Okay. William is reminding me that I forgot, and we remodeled this very nicely, to also share your name and your organization and your pronouns if you would like to. So, please feel free to share in the chat, or if anyone like to share verbally, please, go ahead. And I will pass it on to Nandini Deo.

Okay, awesome. I'm looking forward to seeing in the chat the different responses. I'm wondering if we can maybe, Tamby Moore, go a couple of more slides forward? And then, I want to give us a moment to also go ahead and review the meeting minute notes so that we can add to those changes that folks were suggesting in the chat. And I also see you --I do want to circle back to Janine's question as well about the different efforts that are related to the health equity framework that are through OHA, and also to the Department of equity and inclusion. You will see that until the very end. But, let's -- lets go through the process first, and the making go ahead and move into the meeting notes before we do all of our decision-making. So, let's go two more slides. Are you. So, last meeting, one of the things that we heard was that, you know, and a

lot of these different workgroup spaces, I think what happens is we inundate with a lot of information, a lot of different documents, and then ask for folks to make suggestions in real time. While that works for some people, it is also a way that some people don't actually process. And, in addition, you know, we've been talking about going through, and creating this role guidance with the documents that we currently have, which are the modernization manual, and that we were reviewing the PHAB policy and procedure document. Something that we kind of talked about was it is really hard to understand tangibly what that process is going to look like. Even though we have had, a couple of times, talking to the process overview of how we might review the modernization manual, and then how we might make additions to create and develop out a role guidance, it can be a little bit challenging to see what that process is actually going to look like, and to actually consider what feedback we might want to add, or how we might want to change the process as we go along. So, for the next, like, few minutes, I think we'll all we really wanted to do was walk through what the process of co-creation might look like, and just have it pinned as a thing in people's brain that we are going to revisit and talk about for feedback and adjustments next week. So, I will walk through the process of how we might be utilizing the modernization manual to develop out role guidance, and then, if you have feedback, questions, or comments in real time, that is amazing, fantastic, and we should talk about it. And if that is something that you want to marinate on, we will have a link for your discussion next week. So, I think I'm ready for the next slide. Any questions before I hop into the process okay. So, the first part of the process would be we have this giant modernization manual that already has components, Core System functions, and roles that are defined for each of the seven domains for public health modernization in Oregon. So, we really wanted to try to use that as the basis of foundation for which we are working. So, the first part of the process would most likely be reviewing whatever the domain is, and we use domain separately, which is the cultural responsiveness, because it is most relevant to the work that we are doing. We review the essential components, and the Core System functions together as a group. I think we are ready for the next light. And then, we would review the existing roles that already exist. So, right now, for each domain, this is, again, the example for domain seven, there are roles defined for state and local health entities with regards to each domain. This is for fostering health equity and cultural responsiveness. So, we would review, look at what is missing, what feels like it needs to be added, and then, next slide. The third part would be considering and discussing what is missing, what needs to be expanded, and what role community partners will fulfill, because we would essentially be adding or already filling, essentially, we would be adding another column into this matrix, and building out additional roles, or build a whatever rules exist and need to be documented. And I think we have a lot of flexibility about how we go about this process. So, again, this is kind of walking through what we might be doing, but also we are really open to feedback and discussion about how we go through this process, and what else we might want to add to the process, what other questions we might want to ask, so, I just want to open it up for any questions. Marie, I see your hand.

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

Thank you for letting me take up more space in the group today. For the benefit of Michael members on this group, this document was created in alignment with a 2015 piece of legislation for the modernization of the public health system. And so, we have here acknowledged the role of governmental public health as the state column. So, that would be the Oregon Health Authority public health division, and the local column is the local public health authority is, which are most commonly county governments throughout the state of Oregon. However, there are a few variations. So, it is my understanding that we, as a system, are not updating this document at this time in terms of rose. But, we are definitely, in this space, wanting to add that community call him to identify and a college the important work community is currently engaging in. Are you intending, in this group, for us to be revising the existing rows of content? Or, --let me stop there. Is that the intention?

That is a great question. Thank you, Marie. That is a great clarifier question. We are not. It is not within the purview of this group to be revising the modernization document that already exists. Because these roles are already defined, being able to utilize that as some sort of guide rail and adding to it as we develop our community roles are providing our community roles, and also just considering, as you said, Marie, this document was created in 2015. So, a lot has changed in 2015, especially with the community centered work that has existed during the COVID-19 pandemic, and kind of moving and facilitating what we have learned from that work into our current work. So, we really want to make sure that as we are developing out these roles, that we are looking at what already exists, and we can use some of the similar language, we can make additions and kind of consider what already fits into the community bucket, but we are not actually revising the document itself. I don't know if that answers your question or makes a lot of sense.

Would it be okay if I try and summarize my understanding? >> Yes, absolutely.

Great. So, part of the role of our work in this group is to envision an additional column for community, and to identify which of the existing roles that have been defined here relate to community. So, that is one tangible, like, checkbox. >> Yes.

Okay. And then in terms of what is missing, that would be adding a new row that uniquely identifies and uplifts what the group feels is relevant to community, and is not currently included in the modernization manuals?

That is correct. Yes, exactly.

Okay. >> And, I think the one thing that it will add, Sarah Woodrow has a fount of knowledge and all things modernization, and she would be a little bit late to the meeting today, but I do want to read this and talk about the specific role areas, and how she envisions also the way that we develop out this work a little bit. So, when she pops in, which should be pretty soon here, I think we should come back to this as well. But, yeah, there was a really, really good clarification point. Thank you so much. Any other questions about this process for right now? And also, again,

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

with the knowledge that we will come back and revisit this next week and in the interim, as you are looking to the slides, or digesting this information, you can feel free to add any questions, feedback, or anything that is coming to your brain, and send it over so that we can talk about it next week. Okay. Is there are no questions, I will hand it off to William to start talking about voting, and the voting process or group decision-making. And then, we can come back to the question about the role development. >> Okay, thank you, Nandini Deo. So, yeah, we are - - we have about, let's see. We have, well, five minutes until break. We will push into that a little bit. We will see how long this system takes. So, yeah, we are about to figure out how we want to make decisions together. So, we essentially have a couple of options here that we want to present to you all, and then four of these options, we will just do a simple majority vote in the chat. I will just go over what the options are, and trade to ask women to the best of my ability, you can ask questions about them, and they will just vote simple majority on which one that we want to use. So, the first is a consensus system, which is called fist 25. It is essentially using a hand is a representation for your level of agreement with something. Does the next light show the graphic for that? Yes, thank you. Right. So, a zero or closed fist is a no way, never, I don't want to do this at all. One is, like, yeah, we need to talk about it, I am still not sure. Two, I have reservations, three as I am okay with it. This is the threshold from fist 25. What we are essentially trying to do is get an average. So, everyone is voting a three or higher on something. If it does not get there, we go back, we talk about revised, and then we do another vote. Four sounds good, and five is a total agreement. So essentially, we would do this for three rounds. If we cannot reach everyone at a three or higher, that we were just moved to a simple vote. In order to save time, and for efficiency, we will give it the best effort that we can with this, and that we would just go to the simple vote. Which is the other option. If we don't feel like we need or want this consensus system, we will just moved to a simple voting system, which is either 80-20, or a two thirds vote. That is the difference of about two votes for our group since we have 15. I believe the two thirds is 10 or 11, and the 80-20 --I'm sorry, the 80-20 is 12, and the two thirds is 12 saying yes. So, it is a little bit of a difference. Right, and if we don't get there, we discussed more, revote, and department how many times we need to revote. Before we go into voting on that, are there any questions about either of these voting systems that you would like clarification or clarity on? >> Hi, this is Nico. Sorry, I can't find the handrails.

No worries.

It is have a question about the first one.

Fist to five?

Excuse me. Can you just give me, my brain, I like this one, but I can't seem to conceptualize in my head, what happens if you take a vote, and let's say that they are, I don't know, there are six people, and four of them are three and above, and two of them are at two and three. You take a moment to figure out what their questions are? How does that work?

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

Yes, good question. I would go back to discussing, okay, what needs to change in this in order to get everyone on board, what can we add, what can we take out? Instead of, oh, you know, if we are talking about time committed to the group outside of the meeting time, if we can't get everyone on board for an hour, maybe will go back and say okay, let's do 30 minutes instead, and vote on that. So, something like that, and we get as far as we can on that after three rounds. If we still can, we'll switch to the simple vote, which is 80-20, or two thirds of the vote. Is that clear?

That is clear. Then, I have two more questions. >> Yes?

So, if we go fist to five? Yes? Fist 25? So, for these voting systems, are these permanent and set in stone? Can they ever change if we want to go to another one that isn't listed, or the other option? And then, I am okay with it, how do I explain this? So, I can also see how I am okay with it sounds good. It can be like okay, fine, we need to move this along. I guess I am just wondering how they are really different. I am in terms of thinking some groups belong to community organization, belong to local governmental organizations, certain community folks. So, how does everybody get a voice in this process when they want to be impactful? That is all my questions.

Absolutely. Part of this, too, is we are recording the votes, and what did we call it? Yes, dissenting opinions will be sort of, like, noted and recorded. I think the ideal is that if someone is just okay with something, we can sort of circle back and follow up with them later around, like, how is going, you know, what could help you get you to a sounds good are a total agreement kind of thing. Even though the group has made a decision, we are still considering what the other opinions in the group are, and how we can, you know, make them more amendable or more convenient. Maybe there is a solution for just that person that they do on the side that works. So, yeah, we deftly want to be taking that into consideration. Yeah. Okay. Any other questions? Before we vote on this? Yes, Marie? Oh. No? Okay.

I'm trying to get all of the technology to work. Okay. So, thank you for bringing it forward with the voting. In recognition of my colleagues comment about the difference between the second row, I am wondering if the group would like to consider an alternative. Instead of five options, it is three? Sometimes it is called traffic light voting? I'm going to put it in the chat.

Red, yellow, green?

Yes. The red, yellow, green. That's just as another option. Five feels like too many, because I may be challenging to distinguish between if I am a three or a four, I am wondering if the group would like to consider this other model. Thank you.

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

Sure. So, can I ask, in this model, are you trying to get everyone to a green? To at least a yellow? Do you know, where, like, where the tipping point for this model?

That is a great question. I am not prepared with an answer, because I'm still unclear about the tipping point for the first five.

Yeah. The tipping point for first five is everyone is that a three or higher essentially. So, like, we propose something, we discussed it enough to maybe change something so everyone is at least a three, and then a somewhat is, you know, less than a five, we are hopefully following up with them later in some way that we can determine together, or we can propose a process in terms of feedback of, like, okay, we know that you want 100% on this, and we have noted that here in the meeting minutes or wherever it is. So, how can we work with them to make the more amendable. And I do apologize, I will circle back because it was a two part question. So, the first part being can we ever change this, I think, yes, if we tried for, like, we decide actually, this is not working at all, we don't like this, we can deftly try a different decision-making system. So, yeah, this is just the first iteration to get us going, I think. And, yeah, a couple of comments in the chat. Misha writes I am one of those who likes the wiggle room with the 55. Emery, I am happy to withdraw that recommendation. Yeah, so, any other questions about these two voting systems? Okay! So, now comes the hard part. We need to make a decision about our decision-making process. Essentially, we have our two options, which is first to five, which is one, which is our first option, and then the second option, simple majority. As long as one vote for one, that is what we will go with for now. We will visit this later for sure. So, in the chat, yeah, type one for consensus, or two for simple voting, and then we will tally those and see what we get. Oh, sorry. Yes, if there are any members of the public your, the voting is for the group members only. I forgot to mention that. Marie?

Thank you. For future votes, I am wondering if we can enable the poll feature in Zoom so that we feel more comfortable about voting?

Ray. Thank you. Thank you for that. Okay. Have all of our voting members voted? Yeah, does anyone else have verbal feedback that they would like to share about either of these voting systems or preferences? Yes?

Hi, good morning, thanks. Just to clarify the first option. Will that always be on the screen if we are voting? Do I have to remember the one through five thing? I guess that is just my clarifying question.

Yeah, we can definitely, I think it is something that we can do to make sure that that is up on screen so folks know what their vote is indicating when we take those votes. Okay. It looks like from what I am saying is that the first to five is the preference here for this vote. So, yeah, we really appreciate the discussion. So, we will use a voting system moving forward for the decisions that we are going to make today. And again, if there's any feedback on how that system is working or feeling, we would love to hear it as always. But, we will move forward with that for now. So, I think with that done, we will go ahead and take



## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

a quick little break. Let's come back at let's say 11:48. Is that a transient to come back? Yes. 11:48, let's give that a shot. We will come back and do some voting with our newfangled voting system. I will see you all soon.

Welcome back, everyone. Okay. Shifting some things around, all right. So, our next piece of business here is to use our new voting system to vote on a few things regarding our meeting structure, time outside of the meetings, facilitation structure, that sort of thing. So, we are going to go to our first piece, which is voting on the meeting dates and times, as we do need to move the date so that everyone can make these meetings. So, I believe the next slide has our options on it. Yes. So, our first option for new meeting days the first and third Tuesday of every month instead of the second and fourth. That means our next meeting would be in three weeks, not next week. Our second option is the first and third Wednesday of the month instead of Tuesdays. Once we figure out what day, we will send a pullout to figure out the right time. So, I believe the process here is that we will vote on the first option, so, the first and third Tuesdays using the fist to five method. So, Tamby Moore, if you want to go back there, so, for this vote, we are voting on the first and third Tuesday of the month instead of the second and fourth. And if you put in the chat, sorry. What your vote is, zero through five, if we don't get there, we can amend, or we will move to the second option and see if that works. If it doesn't, we will go to the next step, which is some sort of amendment to the first.

This is Sarah. In terms of finding a permanent meeting cadence, it seems like will also be important to check in with people who are not here because they can't make this meeting time. So, I just want to make sure that that is part of the process.

Indeed. Thank you, Sarah. We have seven votes in. And yeah, I do think in the future, we will do the poll with the options pre-populated with zero through five, which might also help with, yeah, what the numbers are indicating as well. So, it looks like, yeah, we have some zeros and two. Not everyone is that a three for this option. So, listen to the second option, which is the first and third Wednesday of every month. So, I will put it in the chat there. If you're able to, yeah, vote on the first and third Wednesday of the month. Okay. I believe that is all of our votes there. It looks like Wednesday hazard. We have reached three for everyone. We will note the numbers here, and keep track of that, and we will be asking the individuals who are not here. So, that means that for now, we are going to go ahead and switch to that time, but we will let you know for sure once we check in with the other individuals -- the other members of the group to make sure that the time works for them. And then, yes, and also sent out a poll regarding the time of day that works. Okay, thank you. So, our next piece of voting --it comes in two pieces here. The first piece is would all group members like to agree to a minimum or maximum amount of time that they can commit outside of work group meetings? That time would be for reviewing documents --actually, I am not sure what that time is for, but I do believe it is generally for reviewing documents. Yeah, making edits or suggestions, that sort of thing. So, that is our first piece here. So, I will put that in the chat.

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

Okay. So, using fist to five, if individuals can vote on the first question? Okay. Yeah, it looks like we have a pretty unanimous agreement on the question in terms of committing a maximum minimum amount of time. So, if we moved to the second piece, which is how many hours, or less than an hour, how much time per week with members like to commit outside of work group meetings? We had two suggestions from our last meeting. The first one was 30 minutes. So, let's start there with 30 minutes. And then we can go ahead and enter your vote now, if that seems like doable, like that is something that you can commit, and you feel like it is enough. Okay. Good point, Janine. There may not be enough context year to determine if it is enough. I guess I may need some help there in figuring out whether it is enough. Maybe Nandini can give us a little bit of context in terms of what we are asking folks to do, and if that would be enough time?

Yeah, absolutely. This is Nandini. I think, in general, what I would imagine that amount of time being used for is for, like William said, reviewing materials that we worked on together, adding any edits, and being able to review other edits of folks from the workgroup have contributed as well. Is just a period of focus time to be able to work on processing what we are building outside of this work group setting. And I think that the amount of time, whatever is considered enough, might move and flow week to week. However, I think that this process is really for us to just determine the amount of time that people are willing to contribute outside of the workgroup is just a general cap. So, we don't want people spending or allocating more things than are reasonable outside of a meeting if folks won't have time to actually be able to do that, if that makes sense. So, we would move those things into our actual meeting work time together. That is mostly the idea. I hope that that helps.

Yeah. I'm happy to, yeah, take any questions, or, like, if anyone wants to come on and give their thoughts about the time, and then maybe we can vote on an hour as the Max? Or we can just a with the 30 since we did get to three with everyone here. Okay. Okay. Well, yeah, in that case, it makes sense to me to just honor the voting process that we have done. We got to three with everyone here, so, I think that that is the decision we will make. We can also, of course, revisit it if we feel like it is not enough time. We can have another vote on whether to extend it up to an hour for sure. I think an hour would be the max. I don't think we would ask more than that for sure. Okay. So, the next piece is the facilitation structure. So, we do have the option to select someone from the workgroup itself to facilitate. You know, we are interested in having the group be inclusive. Not just be run by OHA. We are giving all of the instructions and all the things. It would require more commitment from that individual or those individuals. However, we just wanted to pose the option to the group to have a work group member facilitate. So, let's see. I will go ahead and put the question in the chat here, then we can vote on it. So, feel free to put in your votes for that. Or, if you have any questions or need clarification on it, please feel free to ask.

I just have a question for the workgroup. Nevermind, sorry, I got confused. Scratch that.

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

No worries. Okay, we have a couple of more. Okay. Any other members? Okay. All right. All right. It looks like the consensus here is that you would like for OHA staff to facilitate the meeting. So, we will continue to do that. The other question is we have a few --oh, yeah, I see that last out there. So, thank you. So, the other question is, you know, we have been switching around facilitators as needed for different topics. But, you know, it affects the flow of the training, or might be confusing to have multiple people speaking on different topics. So, we wanted to pose this question of whether or not the workgroup wants multiple facilitators or one facilitator. So, we have had multiple so far, so, I think that that will be the first question. The question we are voting on is does the workgroup want multiple facilitators as we have had so far? Good question, defining multiples. So, yeah, we would have our roles for the group here. I will scroll up and find that little table. I am a facilitator here, sort of, like, opening the meeting, passing things over to different folks who are speaking, and then, we have Nandini and Cessa Karson is go facilitators. And, we have different folks coming in for different pieces that they are facilitating. Yeah, we just want to make sure that that is not confusing, or strange, or maybe easier to follow up on facilitators is sort of weeding the whole meeting as we go through. So, that is the question is whether or not we keep doing what we have been doing, or we can pivot to having one facilitator that weeds the whole meeting. Any other questions? Okay. Great. It looks like the consensus there --excuse me. The consensus there is that we will continue to multiple facilitators, though I kind of want to open up if folks have comments about their reservations about having multiple facilitators, because we do have a number of folks in three. That is great, but we would just love to hear some feedback on that if you have questions or concerns in ways that we could maybe do better at the multiple facilitation piece. Okay. I'm seeing in the chat from Christina that too many voices gets crowding and confusing. For sure. It might be helpful to identify the facilitators possibly on the next agenda? Great suggestion. Yes, Marie?

Thank you for the additional space to voice things. I voice my understanding. So, I understand that the group, the overall group facilitator your is not mandatory. I am seeing Sarah shake her head yes. So, with that, as far as meeting facilitators, what I am hearing is Nandini would be a constant, unless obviously Nandini has to be out for some reason, and someone steps in and we have a substitute, but that Nandini may invite others, for example, from OHA, like you today to facilitate specific pieces of the meeting. Is that what we are discussing here? That we can can't count as Nandini as our point of contact in our primary facilitator? That the group is notable leaving room for others on the agenda?

Maybe you can speak to that a little bit, Nandini? Not sure.

Yes, I can. Thank you, Marie. Yes, so, what we decided on is yes, I will be a constant point of contact. Absolutely. In terms of the people that you can reach out to in terms of concerns around the group, feedback, excitement, questions, and the end all kind of things, I am happy to

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

receive all of that into my inbox. I am the first person who will respond to you. As far as facilitation, I think we are trying to balance out partially, I want to be really honest about this, our facilitation styles. So, you know, William is really, really excellent at opening meetings, you know, a facilitating in this beautiful, organized way, and really moving folks through. I have a different facilitation style. When we are opening up a conversation that we are really deep diving into something, I am here for that, and will be here to facilitate us through those conversations. But, I think that it is most likely that we will move back and forth between the two of us throughout the span of a meeting. So, in terms of planning on, like, multiple facilitators, it will most likely be the two of us with support from Cessa Karson, and other folks from our workgroup coming in whenever needed. And, if we are inviting other folks, you know, to speak about topics, then those people would also be part of the facilitation process. I think that is what I would add. So, it would really be the two of us really going back and forth and co-facilitating. Larry, I see that your hand is up.

Yes, thank you, Nandini. First of all, that's a great description. I have classes, a blurred background, too many folks on. There is this strange orb, I am not sure what that is. One of the things that came up, because we are very cognizant of the fact that, you know, this is a collective effort. We want to make sure that we are not too top-heavy and how these meetings are ran, and we want to give an opportunity for people to bring voices and facilitate in a manner that is comfortable for them. Our ears, you know, as you come to these meetings, they could be governmental. We are trying to change up the flow of that, right? We have to embrace community along with other systems that serve out in the community. With our collective voice, we want to be able to provide opportunity for you all to stand up and to facilitate meetings all for the purposes of being inclusive, and being more, than anything else, a model for sharing power in all facets of what we are doing. So, that was some of the mind-set behind why this question even came to be. We are trying to change things up and make things a little bit more comfortable for people to style it in a way that they feel comfortable. So, that is my two cents. >> Thank you, Larry. Okay. I hope to provide some clarity for folks. Any other questions or concerns about the facilitation structure? Any questions that we wanted to circle back to?

I have a question. So, just one quick question for clarification. If folks feel comfortable as this group progresses, and grows, and those other wonderful things, and they want to volunteer, and they are not OHA staff people, or they are OHA staff people, but not for this particular program, they can just go ahead and reach out to Nandini, I guess Nandini, and volunteer facilitate? And that would be an extra hour added on to the 30 minutes of prep time perhaps in the near future? Is that possible?

Go ahead.

Are we talking about folks who are members of this workgroup? Or outside of the workgroup?

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

Folks in this workgroup. >> In the workgroup? Yeah, if you feel --yeah, if we are moving and grooving, and we know we have things that the pipeline that you would like to speak to, or you would like to co-facilitate, we are super happy to have you on, and we would love to have you facilitate with us alongside, you know, you facilitating in general, that would be amazing. They want to take the second also to ask if we might take a second right now, when we are done with this conversation, to circle back to the question about the modernization manual, and just have Sarah speak to that really quickly, because I know she will have some valuable information for everyone.

Hi, everyone. I use she/her pronouns. I work in the office of the state and public health director here, and I support the public health advisory board, and a lot of work related to public health modernization. I am happy to chime in, but I do not know what questions were coming up.

So, Sarah, just for some context, and Marie, not to put you on the spot, but to reiterate your question. But we had been going over the process. One of the things I was asked, you know, is one of the tasks of this group to revise pieces of the modernization manual, or is it to really use it as a thing that exists, a guideline, and a basis, and then to add additional roles for community partners, and additional language? In a might be, you know, missing the root of that question, but our task is not to revise. But, I will pass it over to Marie.

Thank you. Would it be possible to go back to the slide we were reviewing when we were having this conversation? Thank you. So, Sarah, I am not going to get this perfect recall bias. So, please forgive me. And group, thank you for your grace. My understanding is it is two parts. The first part is we are to imagine we are adding a third column community. And within that column, we would I check marks that would be currently relevant to community. That is the first piece of it. Is that close? And then I have a second piece. Sarah, I will stop there.

Okay. So, the modernization manual is very much written for governmental public health. I know it was covered, but any wholesale revision of the manual would be done through a bigger process that more broadly included governmental public health. You know, the task of this workgroup is to take the manual and connected to our work to achieve health equity in Oregon. And I think the slide before sort of shows a starting place for that conversation can be looking at those Core System functions, and really identifying which of those Core System functions are the ones that most closely speak to equity issues. Not all of them do. Then, the next task would be really looking at the roles for all partners in that Core System function. For state and local public health, I think the manual provides us a way to get there, because we have already done a lot of the work. So, it is really identifying, you know, what roles already exist, and what is missing. What is different than how we thought about things in 2016, and then also developing those rules for community-based organizations. So, I do envision what we are working towards is a document that is complementary to the manual, and not, you know, be an addendum to the manual, I don't really know. But, not edits to the manual itself. How does that line up with what you all talked about earlier?

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

This is Marie. In terms of not editing the actual content of this manual, I think we are aligned. However, perhaps in the next meeting, it would be helpful to show an example of what this may be working towards, because I'm trying to envision rows, columns, and check marks, when and what is in, and what is out, and it is a little challenging.

It is.

So, maybe that is the next phase.

I think that is where we are hoping to go in the next meeting, or, you know, soon, anyway, or at least how we are thank you putting it together a work but format or something like that. We just want to make sure it is clear and able to be accomplished by the workgroup.

Okay. Any other thoughts or questions about the modernization manual and this process here before we move into public comment? And they will do a quick, little, next steps check in. Yeah, Nandini?

Yes. Just before you move into public comment, if there are no other comments, one thing I wanted to acknowledge is I know that this particular meeting has felt very governmental. You know? We have gone through each and every step that we've needed to go through to get through our agenda, and I know we have said over and over again throughout the few meetings that we have had that we really want to be able to open up for discussion and co-create together. I know that this meeting probably did not feel a whole lot that way. So, we really trying to figure out how to balance finishing the logistical pieces that we need to finish in order to get our group moving and grooving together, and also making sure that people have the space to really be able to sink in and contribute. Hopefully next meeting will be a little bit more open in that regard. But, if you all had things that you think about after this meeting that you would like to, you know, speak into, or feedback that you have, just know that you can email us anytime, and hopefully we will have more of that SpaceX time. So, we appreciate you all holding on for this particular ride, and the structure that we had to utilize for this meeting.

Thank you, Nandini. Okay. Just some quick next steps. So, next week, we are going to do the agreements -- sorry, next meeting, we will finally the do those group agreements, I promise you. And then, we are going to take a look at the dock, start going through a little bit, and yeah, we will let you know -- we will touch base with you around some of the feedback that you have given, the vote so we have made, and make sure that we follow up with the folks that were not present for those votes. And, will update the meeting time and send out the pool for the new day. Okay. So, again, I would like to know open up before for public comment if we have any members of the public here. Please introduce yourself for the record, and please keep your comments under three minutes. So, we will give some time for that. The floor is open. All right. So, yeah, I want to thank you all so much for your time and attention today. If you like really got through some good stuff, and it was really good to hear from so many of

## PHAB Health Equity Framework Workgroup 2.13.24 - English transcript

you about, yeah, what you are needing here, and the questions that are arising for you. We hope that we were able to provide clarity where it was needed, and if not, we are always here. We are always available. Please feel free to reach out. So, yeah, I hope you have a wonderful rest of your day, and we will see you next time. Yeah, will send that new meeting invite, and we will see you then. And feel free to stick around, ask questions, whatever you need.

Thank you. [Event Concluded]