BUTTE COUNTY
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COMMISSION
Friday, November 21, 2003
Minutes

Held at the Mira Loma Drive county offices, the meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

Item 1: Introductions

Commissioners present: Patricia Cragar, Marian Gage, Sandra Machida, Karen Marlatt, Linda Moore, Phyllis Murdock Alternates: Jeff Fontana, Mary Neumann
Commissioners absent: Jane Dolan, Mark Lundberg, and Gene Smith
Staff present: Cheryl Giscombe, Anna Dove, Bobbi Dunivan, Eva Puciata, and Susan Billings
Staff absent: None.

Also present were: Cindy Wolff/Opt For Fit Kids, Peggy Mitchell/BCOE, Carey Gross/KISP, Sandra Woodson/KISP, Michael Ramsey/DA, Insu Hyams/Public Health, Connie Carter/DA, Kris Simpson/DA, Ann Dickman/Public Health, Bill Hubbard/HelpCentral.Org, Jacqui Brugnano/Youth For Change, Carol Roberts/VOCS, Sheri Leno/CUSD, Dana Campbell/PEN, Sherry Bloker/IZ Registry, Kiyomi Bird/IZ Registry, Felicia Maha/VIP, Barbara Hanna/KISP, Lloyd King/KISP, Alma Gamboa-Applebee/Public Health, Tara Silva-Haynes/HelpCentral.Org, and others who arrived later.

Vice Chair Karen Marlatt, acting in the absence of Chair Mark Lundberg, opened the meeting with introductions. Because we were initially short a quorum, the Grantee Presentations were moved to the beginning of the meeting.

Item 3: Grantee Presentations

Michael Ramsey delivered the first Grantee presentation. The Butte County Drug Endangered Children Program (DEC) was created to battle the increasing drug issues of the Northstate. Butte County is the number one rated county in California for methamphetamine production. In years past, children were ignored as victims and often times left in the unsafe environment where drugs were being manufactured and used, were not drug tested, and seldom offered counseling or alternatives. The original DEC Response Team was started as collaboration between the District Attorney, Child Protective Services, and the Butte Interagency Narcotics Task Force. In February 2003, funding cuts threatened the continued success of the program. Thanks to the financial assistance of the Butte County Children and Families Commission, the DEC Program has continued to save the lives of drug endangered children in Butte County.

Kiyomi Bird presented information on the Immunization Registry Project, known as the Butte Automated Immunization Registry (BAIR). Thus far, BAIR has helped 12,248 patients receive 73,765 immunizations in Butte County. Internet access for the program was established in August 2003 and the Butte County Provider 'Go Live' program is currently being implemented. Staff identified future challenges as both technical- county firewall setup, and Administrative- HIPAA requirements. Future sustainability will depend greatly on matching funds and shared objectives of both the Butte County Children and Families Commission and First 5 California. The presentation culminated in a lively vocal performance by the IZ Registry staff.

Ann Dickman presented information on the Public Health's Visiting Infants and Parents Program (VIP Program). Ann thanked the Commission for their support and explained that grant funds from the Commission were matched through Title 19 of the California MCH branch, doubling grant funds for the program. The VIP program employs four outstation nurses who provide home visits for the Gridley, Paradise, Chico, and Oroville areas. The home visitation program is initiated during pregnancy and continues through the baby's first year of life. The program has had 54 babies born under their care, including six sets of twins, and currently has sixty-eight active clients. Services are provided to new and expectant fathers as a key component of the VIP grant. The program also acts as a distributor for the Kits for New Parents, having disseminated more than 166 kits thus far. Delivery of the kits by nursing staff has become a sort of First 5 'Welcome Wagon' for the community.

Bill Hubbard and Tara Silva-Haynes expounded on the efforts of the Butte County Information and Referral System, HelpCentral.Org. The database provides an online directory of Health and Human Services in Butte County. Program funding comes from a number of organizations, namely the Commission, TANF incentive funds (DESS), and the Private Industry Counsel of Butte County. The database currently lists information on over 270 non-profit and government agencies and over 630 programs that these agencies provide. The site is available twenty-four hours a day and is user friendly. The database has the capability of collecting information on search trends, geographic data, and demographics of visitors to the site. As well, the database has the ability to cover multiple counties and to integrate into a live call 2-1-1 dialing system. Goals for the future include expanded presentations and trainings to groups, case workers, and frontline staff, online updates and information about the Low Cost No Cost directory, and hotlinks to www.helpcentral.org on public access computers and agency websites.

Barbara Hanna, Carey Gross, and Lloyd King provided an overview of the Kids Improving Safety Project, or KISP. The project consists of three agencies collaborating to provide home health services, a literacy program, and a support group for Grandparents as Parents. The Home Health Care Management program has been able to provide baby-proofing products and home visits and assessments by a Registered Nurse to new and expecting parents in the community. Because of the continuing need for quality childcare in Butte County, the program has collaborated with Valley Oaks Children's Services to provide training mandatory for home day care licensing, such as first aid and CPR. The Literacy Coach is providing literacy oriented programming to children and families in the community. A major target of the Coach is the isolated population, such as geographic isolation, language barriers, and economic barriers. The literacy coach is the product of Commission funding and offers interactive Story Time, arts and crafts, and free books for children. Informative parent meetings offer ideas on how to read to children and what parents can do to help with school readiness. Kits for New Parents are a popular distribution item on the Coach. The Grandparents as Parents program offers support groups in Paradise, Oroville, and Chico. In Butte County, there are approximately 2,600 children living outside the traditional home (with other relatives). The program offers information on community resources such as guardianship clinics and respite care.

At the conclusion of grantee presentations, the Chair opened the floor to Commission and public comment. Pat Cragar and Karen Marlatt shared their appreciation of hearing what Commission funds are accomplishing, saying that it breathes life into the paperwork they see every day.

Item 2: Consent Calendar

The following items were addressed during previous Commission meetings. Staff has identified them as having no opposition and presenting no new or unusual issues requiring the Commission's attention. Unless a member of the Commission or the public requests discussion, this consent calendar will be voted upon with one motion.

A. *DRAFT* September 19, 2003 Meeting Minutes

B. *DRAFT* October 10, 2003 Special Meeting Minutes

Mary Neumann made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Pat Cragar seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 4: Administration Committee Report

During the November 2003 Administration Committee Meeting, two items were recommended for action by the Commission.

(A) The Chico Children and Families Center recently mailed flyers for an Open House. Upon receiving the invitation, some Commissioners and members of the public were confused by the name of the organization and wondered whether or not the Butte County Children and Families Commission was providing direct services. As it turned out, the center is affiliated with the Butte County Office of Education. The Administration Committee requested that the Commission address the issue of limiting the use of its name by its contractors to lessen confusion about whether the Commission is providing direct services or contracting with grantees. Some Commissioners felt that restricting contractor use of the term "Children and Families" would be very limiting. Restrictions of this nature might discourage established businesses from coming forward for assistance. On the other hand, any confusion that arises would present an opportunity to educate the community about the Commission and its efforts. Pat Cragar noted that we want grantees to credit the Commission as a source of funding, but not to confuse the public by using our name in their title. **The Chair tabled this ACTION item and deferred it back to the Administration Committee for further discussion and recommendation to Commission, as well as, directing staff to contact Heather Senske of BCOE for further discussion on the issue.**

(B) The Administration Committee requested that the Commission take action to set aside a reserve for Special Funding Proposals beginning at the amount of $200,000, and diminished yearly by the same rate as the expected revenue decline (expected decline is 5%). In FY 03-04, the Special Fund will be $200,000 less the already awarded DEC contracts (totaling $100.6K). This fund would give the Commission flexibility in dealing with unanticipated requests for funding. Marian Gage wanted to know if there was a policy in place for this kind of reserve, and what the procedure would be for deciding whether to go with a Request For Funding Proposal or Request For Special Funding. Phyllis Murdock explained that those discussions would likely take place once the funding has been allocated. Cheryl Giscombe clarified that the Request For Special Funding Policy (SFP) was developed to address requests for funds, received by Commission outside of the formal competitive funding cycle. The SFP's would be mailed out in response to incoming requests for funding, as well as being posted on the web site for public information.

Pat Cragar made a motion to set aside a reserve for Special Funding Proposals. Phyllis Murdock seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

Item 5: Project REWARD Committee Report

Project REWARD was established to enhance and increase the quality of services for young children aged 0-5 by offering stipends to child care workers employed in a licensed setting. The Project Reward Oversight Management Team created a proposal to expand Project REWARD to include outreach and incentives to informal care (license-exempt) providers in Butte County. Commissioners voiced positive feedback about the proposal, saying that it provides depth and breadth to the Commission's efforts at helping the child care community focus on child development issues and would provide a greater range of services to a previously underserved portion of the population.

Marian Gage made a motion to approve the Project REWARD revised Proposal/Scope of Work and Budget Revisions for the State Commission. Mary Neumann seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 6: Strategic Plan & Evaluation Committee Report

(A) The Commission annually reviews the Strategic Plan and adopts necessary revisions. In year 2003, revisions were minimal and none of the original wording was changed. A revised Definition of Terms, additional information of the Indicators, Strategies, and Performance Measures, and clarification of the Resource Allocation guidelines were included. On recommendation by the late Commissioner Deborah Rowell, the State Commission's Equity Principles have been adopted. Rather than change the original document and focus areas, the Strategic Plan & Evaluation Committee decided to add additional information as needed. Jeff Fontana noted that he would like the 30-day policy for public recommendations to remain and to be honored, allowing adequate time for public input on pertinent issues. Marian would like to see the Commission consider incorporating more youth development language in a future review of the Strategic Plan.

Pat Cragar made a motion to approve the desired identified revisions to the Strategic Plan and final adoption following the public hearing on January 16, 2004. Phyllis Murdock seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(B) The DRAFT Evaluation Request for Qualifications was created to invite consultants and firms to submit their qualifications to provide evaluation of the Commission's overall program and individual projects. With hopes of awarding the contract in March 2004, the timeline is tight. Statements of Qualifications would be due on February 05, 2004 by 4:30 P.M. In Section 4, Selection Criteria, the Commission would like for staff to do an initial screening to determine the top candidates and change the wording to reflect that the *top* proposals will be screened by the panel, not *all* proposals. It was decided that the Commission would need a Policy and Procedure for the RFQ process, which will be added to the next Commission Meeting Agenda. Per Eva Puciata, no budget amendment would be necessary as there are adequate funds available in the Professional Services Fund.

Sandra Machida made a motion to approve the Evaluation Request for Qualifications. Pat Cragar seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 7: Contract Awards Committee Report

With the last Request For Proposals, the Commission encouraged potential grantees to apply for every focus area and gave more points to grantees that chose to do so. The current DRAFT RFP does not assign points based on focus areas applied for. In case of continued funding for Project REWARD, priority area 2 will not be considered as available funding for the Requests For Applications. A separate RFQ will go out if REWARD is not continued.

Also changed was the funding amounts for the Scope of Funding and Contract Terms, which limits grant applications to a maximum amount of $100,000 over a one year period, with a maximum of $300,000 over three years, not to exceed $100,000 per year. In light of diminishing resources, Phyllis Murdock questioned why we would ask grantees submit a one-year budget and then commit to three years of funding. Not only would it tie up Commission funds, it would diminish the circle of opportunity for the Commission to look at new projects. Marian Gage shared that it is very difficult to get a project going in one year and usually takes at least three years to affect change. Pat Cragar noted that when the Commission started, they were granting numerous one-year mini grants in order to get money flowing into the community. Over time and with diminishing resources, the Commission leaned towards making a larger impact with fewer grantees. There was a public request to include an explanation of available funds in the RFP.

In the Contract Awards Committee Notes, Marian Gage pointed out the Committee's recommendation to hire professional readers to review proposals for funding. Because the item was not on the agenda as an action item, it was tabled to the next Commission meeting.

The notes also addressed the request to limit grant applications to $100,000 for the first year, with a maximum of $300,000 over three years. Sandra Machida suggested changing the wording to 'up to $100,000, with a maximum of *up to* $300,000 over three years'. A comment from the public wondered how the Commission determines when to fund mini grants versus larger grants, and why they are not using some sort of rotation method to meet both grantee needs. If a large grantee was funded for three years and provided a valuable service to the community, and then disappears when the grant ends, what has the grant money ultimately accomplished in the community? One of the ways a grantee can gain award points is by demonstrating that they have leveraged grant funds and attained outside funding. Marian pointed out that the Commission awards points to grantees that provide evidence of integration and collaboration. Some Commissioners felt that the Commission should be putting more emphasis on potential grantees that show that they have gained outside financial support. If grantees do not reach self-sustaining capacity before grants funds expire, the Commission will be leaving a huge void in the community. A solution might be to revisit the number of points given and change the language in #5- Service Integration to indicate a higher number of points and to specifically target financial matches, such as "Provide evidence of integration, collaboration, and long term sustainability".

In light of discussion length on Item A, Commissioners felt too rushed to make decisions on Items 7 – A (RFP Document), B (Funding Policy Manual), & C (Contract Amendments for Current Grantees). The RFP's schedule of events calls for a July 1, 2004 contract start date, which coincides with the start of the new Fiscal Year and the start date of the funding allocation plan**. The possibility of re-addressing items recommended by the Contract Awards Committee during the January Commission meeting was considered, but ultimately it was requested that Commissioners and the public provide additional feedback to Bobbi Dunivan within two weeks. Then, the Contract Awards Committee will revisit all three of the tabled items on December 8, 2003. A Special Commission Meeting was scheduled on**

December 19, 2003 to address Items 7 - A, B, & C of the Contract Awards Committee recommendations included in their November 21, 2003 report to the full Commission.

There was a break from 10:50-11:00 AM.

Item 8: Staff Report

Anna Dove was introduced as the newest and final member of the Commission's staff team. It is a pleasure having her on board! Anna shared information on a recent smoking cessation workshop she attended in Sacramento and expressed excitement about working for Prop 10.

Byron Brace addressed the Body with the Butte County Tobacco Prevention Coalition's request for the Commission to adopt a Tobacco-Free Environment Policy. The policy was developed by the Coalition in the hope that programs funded by the Commission would be required to comply with the policy. Byron Brace reviewed the policy and referred to supporting documentation included in the binders. An aspect of the policy is that all programs receiving funding from the Butte County Children and Families Commission would receive training by the Butte County Public Health Department, the American Lung Association and/or the American Cancer Society staff regarding the harmful effects of tobacco, secondhand smoke and cessation resources. The Policy is for consideration only at this time and will be added to the January Consent Agenda. Jeff requested that staff provide language of the State First 5 Tobacco Policy prior to taking action on the item.

The Glenn County Children and Families Commission Director contacted Cheryl Giscombe about sharing the cost of a joint training seminar with Dr. Ruby Payne. Dr. Payne specializes in sensitizing people who work with low income and economically disadvantaged populations. The training would be open to the Commissioners and staff, grantees, and the general public. Our cost for training would be $5,000, possible catering expenses, and the request for CSU, Chico house to the event if possible. Sandra Machida felt that Dr. Payne sounded much like a motivational speaker and that there may be more positive areas to focus on than poverty, which we already know to be a bad thing. Jeff Fontana felt that we have qualified experts within our own community to address the local poverty issue, rather than hire an outside expert to train us on the poverty status of Butte County. The general consensus of the Commission was to decline Glenn County's invitation.

Cheryl distributed copies of the 2004 First 5 Butte County calendars for Commissioners.

Jeff Fontana reiterated that he would like to see the Commission make a concerted effort to develop a media communications plan. The Rogers & Associates representative contracted by the State Commission to provide support services to County Commissions, Heather Cho, is willing to meet with interested Commissioners to develop a plan for the next fiscal year. Cheryl asked that interested Commissioners coordinate with her to discuss a potential meeting date with Heather. Rogers & Associates recently aired a media story by way of local news stations on the Butte County Visiting Infants and Parents Program, as well as other Butte and Glenn County First 5 related programs. Commission staff has retained a copy of the story for posterity.

Before moving on, Commissioners offered thanks to staff for their continuing hard work for the Commission and appreciation for the Butte County First 5 2004 calendars.

Item 9: Butte County Commissioner Advocacy – California First 5 Association

In September 2003, the First 5 Association of California sent a letter to the Butte County Children and Families Commission Chair, with ideas on possible collaboration with other County Commissioners on statewide advocacy issues. Commissioners requested that the letter become an Agenda item and felt that they would like to see a local plan to address the larger outreach picture in California. With the Commission at full staff, it may be time to look at opportunities for pro-activity, possibly on an annual basis. Jeff Fontana felt that interested Commissioners, himself included, should get backing from the Commission before moving forward with collaboration efforts. There are a series of questions on the second side of the First 5 letter to be discussed at the local level in preparation for the statewide effort. It is completely voluntary and responses should be forwarded to Cheryl Giscombe for review by the Administration Committee during their next scheduled meeting. Jeff suggested the possibility of pooling resources in the Northstate region and appointing a representative to be our voice at the State level.

Public Comment

Barbara Hanna called attention to a letter she submitted to the Commission on behalf of the Butte County First Five Implementation Grant Recipients, a collaborative grantee group. The group met as a coalition to draft the letter, which requests that the Commission give careful consideration to the provision of continuation funding or transition funding for those programs with the potential for obtaining adequate alternative funding for the continued provision of First 5 grant developed services. Phyllis Murdock noted that the letter did not contain names or signatures of coalition participants and there was not an attachment of minutes or explanation on how decisions from the group came about. She asked that future correspondence contain these elements. For the record, two grantees from Public Health did not approve the letter, did not attend the meeting to draft the letter, and did not sign to bring it forward to the Commission.

Items 10 and 11: Closed Sessions

The Commission went into closed session with County Counsel for discussion on litigation and the Program Manager Performance Evaluation at 11:40 P.M.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 P.M.

Minutes by Susan Billings
Administrative Assistant