



*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the First 5 Kings County Children and Families Commission's office at (559) 585-0814 at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting.  
Government Code Section 54954.2 (a)*

## **A G E N D A**

February 2, 2010  
3:00 p.m.

Kings County Board of Supervisors Chambers,  
Kings County Government Center  
1400 West Lacey Blvd.  
Hanford, CA 93230

**3:00 COMMISSIONERS ROLL CALL**

**REVIEW AND MODIFICATION TO AGENDA**

**3:05 OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons to address the Commission on any matter not on this agenda but under the jurisdiction of the Commission. Commissioners may respond to statements made or questions posed. They may ask a question for clarification, make a referral to staff for factual information or request staff to report back to the Commission at a later meeting. Also, the Commission may take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda.

**SPEAKERS ARE LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME BEFORE MAKING YOUR PRESENTATION.**

**3:15 CONSENT CALENDAR**

All items listed under the consent calendar are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion if no member of the Commission or audience wishes to comment or ask questions. If comment or discussion is desired by anyone, the item will be removed from the consent agenda and will be considered in the listed sequence with an opportunity for any member of the public to address the Commission concerning the item before action is taken.

**2010-02-001 Approval of Minutes: January 5, 2010 Commission Meeting**

**3:20 REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

- a) Fiscal Report
- b) Staff Report
- c) Grantee Report(s)
  - None
- d) Evaluation Subcommittee Report

**3:25 DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**

**2010-02-002 Separation from County Structure:** Commission Staff  
Commission to discuss/take action regarding approaching the Board of Supervisors to consider separation from County Structure.

**3:35 STUDY SESSION**

- 2009 Commission Annual Performance Review
- Governor's Budget Proposal & Impact to State and Local First 5 Commissions

**4:35 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- First 5 California Project Legacy Process - Update
- Legislatively Mandated Annual Strategic Plan Review
- 2009-2014 Financial Plan Review
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Grantee/Program Status Report
- Status Report: MAA Billing Opportunity

**4:40 COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

**4:45 ADJOURNMENT**

**Public Comment is Taken on Each Agenda Item**

**Please note that the order in which the agenda items are considered may be subject to change.**

*Agenda backup information and any public records provided to the Commission after the posting of the agenda will be available for the public to review at the First 5 office: **315 W. Lacey Blvd, Hanford, CA** for the meeting date listed on this agenda.*



**CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**

315 W. LACEY BLVD., HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93230

(559) 585-0814 FAX (559) 585-0818

Lisa Watson, Executive Director

**Date of Meeting: February 2, 2010**

---

**2010-02-001**

**Commission Minutes:  
January 5, 2010**



## MINUTES

January 5, 2010  
3:00 p.m.

Kings County Board of Supervisors Chambers,  
1400 West Lacey Blvd.  
Hanford, CA 93230

*Meeting was called to order by Commission Chair Peggy Montgomery.*

### COMMISSIONERS ROLL CALL

**Present:** Jackie Lowe, Joe Neves, John Stankovich, Keith Winkler, Peggy Montgomery, Mary Anne Ford-Sherman.

**Absent/Excused:** Bill/Black

### REVIEW AND MODIFICATION TO AGENDA

Commissioner Neves informed the Chair that he would need to leave at 4:00 p.m.

### OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

### CONSENT CALENDAR

**2010-01-001 Approval of Minutes: November 3, 2009 Commission Meeting**

**2010-01-002 Approval of Minutes: November 20, 2009 Special Commission Meeting**

An amendment was requested on Agenda Item 2001-01-001 to include the correct spelling of Commissioner Winkler's name. **Motion made to approve Consent Calendar with ammendment requested :**

<b>Motion Made by:</b>	<b>Commissioner Stankovich</b>
<b>Motion 2<sup>nd</sup> by:</b>	<b>Commissioner Neves</b>
<b>All in favor:</b>	<b>All other Commissioners in favor</b>
<b>Opposed:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Motion:</b>	<b>Passes</b>

### REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

- a) Fiscal Report. - November and December fiscal reports were presented. First 5 spending is on target in relationship to most budget line items. Transfers will be made to accounts that are over expended later in the year.
- b) Staff Report. –
  - o ED Watson outlined the administrative and program activities conducted during the last month.
  - o The calendars for January services at Lemoore Family Connection and Hanford Family Connections were attached to the report as well as a draft lay-out of the administrative offices that are tentatively scheduled to be occupied by May 2010.
  - o ED Watson pointed out an article published by The Fresno Bee in relationship to evaluation activities occurring in Fresno County.

- o The 2010 meeting schedule was presented to the Commission to determine if meetings will be held on June 1<sup>st</sup> and July 6<sup>th</sup>, as these dates directly follow a holiday. Commissioners agreed to keep schedule as presented, with a reminder as those dates near as to Commissioner availability.
- c) Grantee Report(s) - Written reports by UCP and Kettleman City were presented to the Commission providing update of re-location and program restructure. Judy Newton and Diane Hall from UCP talked about (1) the positive response from parents, (2) better attendance, and (3) the increased privacy at the new Kettleman City site. Hanford's Parent and Me program will be moving from Hanford Family Connection to Jefferson School sometime this month.
- d) Evaluation Subcommittee Report.- ED Watson reported out on the work done by the evaluation subcommittee. She informed the commission of the peer evaluation framework established for the CARES program as a pilot for use in the development of the Peer Evaluation proposal to replace UCLA evaluation activities. The work continues to establish a process that can satisfy the State's evaluation requirements. The subcommittee is planning on meeting again on January 19.

## **DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**

### **2010-01-003 2009-2010 Quarterly Grantee Status Report –**

Commission reviewed the progress of grantee's in meeting their contracted deliverables for the first quarter of FY 2009-2010. The report was presented one month behind schedule because there was no meeting in December. No questions asked and no action was taken.

## **STUDY SESSION**

### **▪ Status Report: Option of Separating from the County Structure**

ED Watson presented a historical breakdown of cap charges from FY 2003-04 to present as well as the MOU between Kings County Association of Governments and Kings County that should serve as an example of how a contract for services would be negotiated upon separation from the County. There was discussion questioning the legal and statutory structure of the Commission. Directive was given to ED Watson to provide a list of pros and cons and a timeline of the process that will ideally show separation by the end of FY 10-11. The issue will be brought back for discussion/action at the February meeting.

### **▪ Status Report: MAA Billing Opportunity**

This issue was back in front of the commission after a change in leadership at the Health Department. At this time, the conclusion is that the only option available for First 5 is to negotiate a sub-category relationship with the Health Department for the billing of activities that would be applicable to the MAA billing program. Commissioner Winkler, Health Department director will work with ED Watson to seek facts that may allow First 5 to participate in the MAA billing program.

## **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

## **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

- ED Watson will invite Dave Droker to the next Commission meeting to present him a plaque for his past service as Commissioner and to provide an update on the Home Garden Family Resource Center.
- Commissioner Ford-Sherman thanked Commissioner Montgomery for conducting today's meeting.
- Commissioner Neves thanked staff at the Hanford and Lemoore Family Connection centers for their very organized Christmas events where approximately 50 to 60 pictures with Santa were taken per site.
- Commissioner Winkler informed the Commission of a smoking cessation program that will be available free of cost starting February 2, 2010.
- ED Watson informed the Commission of a tele-conference that she will have with Kelly Marschall to identify the tool that will be utilized this year for commissioners annual performance review.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

With no other issues to discuss, meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm to the next regularly scheduled meeting on February 2, 2010 at 3:00 pm.



**CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**

315 W. LACEY BLVD., HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93230

(559) 585-0814 FAX (559) 585-0818

Lisa Watson, Executive Director

**Date of Meeting: February 2, 2010**

---

# **Fiscal Report: January 2010**



**CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**

315 W. LACEY BLVD., HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93230

(559) 585-0814 FAX (559) 585-0818

Lisa Watson, Executive Director

**Date of Meeting: February 2, 2010**

---

# **Staff Report: January 2010**



## Staff Report February 2010

### Executive Director's Report

#### Administrative Activities:

- **Governor's Budget & Impact to First 5 Organizations:** The Governor's proposed budget prescribes a number of "funding shifts" from First 5 to other current general fund programs. The proposal:
  - Takes \$308 million through a one-time take-away from current state and local reserves
  - Redirects \$242 million from new revenues each year for 5 years, beginning in 2010-11
  - Specifies that the revenues will be used for children 0 – 5 in programs operated by the State Departments of Social Services (DSS) and Developmental Services (DDS).
  - Places a ballot measure on the June 8 ballot to accomplish this.
  - In 2010-11, allocates \$200 million to DDS services for children 0 – 5 and the remainder to a variety of services at DSS, including Stage 1 CalWORKs child care, foster care grants and administration, adoptions assistance, and child welfare programs.

This is the statement from the Governor's Budget Summary:

"California Children and Families Act of 1998 (Proposition 10) – A reduction of \$550 million in General Fund through a redirection of Proposition 10 funding from the California Children and Families Commission budget to high-priority state programs serving children. This proposal includes shifting (for five years) approximately 50 percent of the Proposition 10 revenues currently directed to state and local accounts within the Commission's budget (\$242 million in 2010-11) and a one-time sweep of state and local reserves (\$308 million). The redirected funds will be used to support children enrolled in programs administered by the Department of Social Services and the Department of Developmental Services. Implementation of this proposal will require voter approval. It is anticipated this initiative will be included in the June 2010 election."

- **First 5 CA Legacy Process:** On January 26<sup>th</sup> I attended the First 5 CA Meeting in which staff began to present to the First 5 CA Commission recommended Signature Programs as a part of their legacy process. [I have included a copy of their proposed program approaches to this staff report.](#) Little was determined at the meeting held on the 26<sup>th</sup> as most of these programs were tabled until a special meeting which is tentatively scheduled for late February. I hope to provide you with more information at our March Commission Meeting.
- **MAA Billing:** Program Officer Scott Waite has been working closely with Medical Billing Technologies (MBT) to establish whether First 5 can participate in MAA billing as sub-set of the Health Department. We are continuing to research the issue both with State established documents as well as whether other First 5 organizations are participating in MAA billing in this fashion. Additionally, we have requested MBT assistance in completing a time study to help establish an estimation of the funds that may be leveraged through FRC activities. MBT may be willing to help us, however because of the time intensive nature of the time study; cost would be incurred to solicit MBT assistance. We will continue to work with MBT to finalize the details

and move forward with the time study. Finally, Commissioner Winkler has invited First 5 staff to a meeting scheduled for March 22<sup>nd</sup> in which a LGA MAA/TCM Consultant will be available to provide us with additional information regarding the MAA billing opportunity. I anticipate being able to provide the Commission with an update at the April Commission Meeting.

- **Database Update:** As an organization we have utilized 3 different database programs meant to collect data and generate reports useful at both the program level and at the funder level. All three programs were not successful at meeting either goal. As a result, we have been utilizing a rudimentary system with an excel file. We have been working with the Information and Technology Department to identify a pre-existing software option that would meet organizational needs for reporting as well as program development. We have mutually identified the Program AccuTrack which we believe will be able to meet the goals expressed. We have purchased the software necessary, and IT is building a server to support the database. We will be working with the program to fit local needs and anticipate being able to build our client database in preparation for data entry into the new system in FY 10/11.
- **Evaluation Subcommittee:** The Evaluation subcommittee has met twice in the month of January, discussing issues such as the peer evaluation matrix, the quantitative rating of program data, and the differences between Program Audits, Fiscal Review, and Evaluating for outcomes. With direction provided by the evaluation subcommittee, staff have completed the following:
  - **Conference Call with UCLA:** I had 2 conference calls with UCLA regarding their ability to assist us in developing the matrix criteria for CARES as well as all other programs following. They conceded that the best way for them to provide input would be to take first year evaluation efforts for each program and develop a mean score based on existing data tables/charts that would serve as the quantifiable mechanism for scoring. The more qualitative component would be left to us and/or the peer review committee.
  - **Meeting with Human Services & Behavioral Health regarding their Peer Evaluation efforts:** I met with the directors of both the Human Services Department and Behavioral Health to discuss the use of peer evaluation in their field. It was clear that the range of peer evaluation is dependant upon the length of organizational history. Behavioral Health peer evaluation focuses more on compliance issues more than meeting outcomes. Whereas Human Services does utilize peer evaluation efforts, but more as a method to assess what within the process didn't work when reunification was not successful. This method of peer evaluation utilizes significant resources to assess outcomes. What both processes had in common is that they utilized peers working in the same industry for the process. It was abundantly clear that what we were doing was drastically different.
  - **Met with Jim Shaver re: CARES data:** Jim Shaver and I had a meeting on January 14th to identify data/tables/charts necessary for evaluation efforts according to existing strategic plan. On January 29<sup>th</sup> we will spend time weighing each data set to identify those areas that have a greater impact on achievement of each outcome being sought.
  - **Review Peer Evaluation Manual as developed on behalf of FRC's:** I reviewed a peer evaluation manual that was established for Family Resource Centers to identify elements that could be useful to our own peer evaluation process. In the manual it was expressly stated that the peer evaluation process established was strictly meant to serve as a quality improvement mechanism as opposed to assessing effectiveness in efforts/strategy. I will look to take from the manual what I can in establishing something that is useful for our process, but it will not utilize many of the concepts outlined in the manual I showed the committee at our last meeting.

#### **Next Steps:**

- UCLA to establish Quantitative Rating Guides for use with Draft Evaluation Matrix: Because CARES is the program which has agreed to pilot the newly established Peer Review process, UCLA is working on their Evaluation Tool first. They will provide to the Commission the data points necessary for the quantitative portion of the tool on February 12<sup>th</sup>.

- Evaluation Subcommittee to finalize:
  - CARES Evaluation Tool
  - Pilot-Evaluation Team Members
  - Training Tool for Evaluation Team
  - Timeline for Pilot Implementation
- Staff to Establish:
  - Parent & Me Evaluation Matrix
  - Raising a Reader Evaluation Matrix
  - Linkages to Learning Evaluation Matrix
  - Family Resource Center Evaluation Matrix

**Program Activities:**

- **Raising a Reader –**
  - **Preschool Implementation:**
    - First 5 Delivered Program Sites: Current year program sites are winding up and post-service assessments will begin in the month of February.
    - Preschool Direct Sites: Kings River Hardwick Preschool, First Baptist Preschool, and Kit Carson Preschool are program sites in which First 5 Resource Specialist have implemented Raising a Reader in previous years and where teachers in those schools have been mentored to provide the direct implementation of Raising a Reader within their classrooms. First 5 provided each classroom with a complete book set and curriculum for implementation and has made technical assistance available to each direct implementation site. We have also offered a Lakeshore materials stipend to incentivize the collection of data necessary for evaluation purposes. We will be inviting these direct implementation sites to join us at the next Family Literacy Event that we will be hosting for current RAR families with the hope that it encourages the continued use of these special events to highlight the joy of reading on a family level.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Family Literacy Events to occur: We will be hosting a Family Literacy event on February 24<sup>th</sup> at the Civic Auditorium. A Marionette show will be provided, and all families that participate will receive a free book to take home with them.
  - Modification to FRC Spring/Summer Implementation Format: The priority population of the FRC implementation of Raising a Reader is children who have had no previous preschool experience. We identify these children through the data collected during Backpack distribution at kindergarten registration time. The challenge that we have identified is that most kindergarten serving school sites do not begin conducting kindergarten registration until April, and this creates a timing challenge in implementing the full 20 session program prior to school starting in August. As a result we are modifying our program approach to offer a 12 week session during the spring/summer months and include additional books with children during the weekly book rotation. This decision was made recognizing that it was more important to reach the children who have had no preschool experience than to provide a 20 week program to children who may or may not have attended preschool. We anticipate beginning our FRC site implementation in mid-May, to allow for the receipt of backpack data and recruitment of participants based on such data
- **Linkage to Learning –**
  - Kindergarten Transition Plans Established: All schools have established their 10-11 Transition plans and will be approving them in the month of February.

- Backpack to Success Program: Backpack for incoming Kindergartners are in production and are expected to be delivered to us in mid-February. We will begin to deliver to kindergarten school-sites in March to ensure their availability during Kindergarten registration. Jon-Michael Hice, School Readiness Coordinator, will be utilizing data tabulated from previous year distribution to emphasize the need for school site personnel to collect distribution data. We will also be sharing the results of the data received with each school site (number of children who attended preschool, etc.).
- **Family Connection Programs –**
  - Services: [The calendar for February Services is attached for your convenience.](#)
    - Client Appreciation Event(s) Scheduled: We will be leveraging the Family Literacy Event that has been organized for Raising a Reader families, and provide a Marionette show to FRC families at the Civic Auditorium facilities in both Hanford (February 24<sup>th</sup>: 3:30-5:00) and Lemoore (February 23<sup>rd</sup>: 6:00-7:30). We will be providing the first 100 children age 0-5 with “I’m a First 5 Kid” T-shirts at each event. Books will be provided to all families that participate. Lemoore will also host community service providers at the client appreciation event as a strategy to expose clients to all services available through the center.
    - ASQ Implementation: We have been conducting ASQ screenings at both centers. We are previewing a database provided by ASQ (at a cost) which would allow for simultaneous screening and scoring. This would save a considerable amount of staff time, as current process includes manual scoring after the initial assessment and then requires a follow-up appointment with Parents to review the results.
    - New Service Partnerships: We are excited to partner with the following organizations to provide new service options to our clients at both Hanford and Lemoore Centers:
      - Behavioral Health: February presentation focus on providing a Parent Workshop focusing on understanding a child’s temperament. Each month Behavioral Health and Kings View Counseling Services will be providing a parent workshop on a topic that is of interest to parents of children -5.
      - Child Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council: The Period of Purple Crying Presentation will be provided to educate parents on the natural developmental stage of infant crying and the stress effects that this behavior can have on parents. Additional information regarding shaken baby syndrome will be provided at these sessions.
      - Health Net: Health Net will be on-site at each center to assist parents in completing Healthy Families Applications. Staff will be identifying through intake data families that may be eligible and will solicit their participation.
  - Organizational Activities:
    - Needs Assessments: We are reviewing existing needs assessment data to determine our ability to identify priority needs of children 0-5 and their families in both the Hanford and Lemoore areas.
    - Development of IMPACT (Improving Parents and Communities Together) Teams: IMPACT Teams are our community advisory boards that will influence the direction that both the Lemoore and Hanford Family Connection centers will take from a program perspective. We are currently working out our recruitment plan for these teams and hope to have teams in place no later than March.

## Calendar:

- 01/04/2010 Provided staff support to Evaluation Subcommittee
- 01/04/2010 Met with Behavioral Health and Human Services re: Peer Evaluation
- 01/05/2010 Conference call with UCLA re: Peer Evaluation
- 01/06/2010 Met with Kettleman City Foundation re: PIP
- 01/06/2010 Met with Tai Orton re: Healthy Smiles Partnership
- 01/06/2010 Conference call with Kelly Marschall re: Annual Performance Review
- 01/11/2010 Interviewed Intern for placement at First 5
- 01/19/2010 Provided staff support to Evaluation Subcommittee
- 01/19/2010 Attended Behavioral Health Prevention & Early Intervention/Innovation Presentation re: local needs
- 01/20/2010 Met with Kettleman City Foundation re: PIP
- 01/26/2010 Attended First 5 Association Meeting
- 01/27/2010 Attended First 5 CA Meeting
- 01/29/2010 Met with Jim Shaver re: CARES Peer Evaluation Pilot

## Technical Assistance Program Officer Report

### Technical Assistance:

- **Technical Assistance Projects** – I continue to work with Kettleman City FRC as well as Corcoran FRC in the implementation of the Performance Improvement Plan. We have met consistently with Kettleman City Foundation Board Members as well as representatives from the Corcoran YMCA to discuss the action plan and the expectations for the duration of the Performance Improvement Plan.

### Technical Assistance Provided:

- 12/21/09 TA provided to Corcoran and Kettleman City FRC re: performance Improvement Plan
- 01/05/10 TA provided to Corcoran and Kettleman City FRC re: Performance Improvement Plan action plan.
- 01/11/10 On-site TA provided to Corcoran FRC re: Data and Resource and Referral
- 01/11/10 On-site TA provided to Kettleman City FRC re: Scope of Work, Quarterly Report and Data.
- 01/13/10 TA provided to Corcoran and Kettleman FRC re: PIP Plan.
- 01/15/10 TA provided to Corcoran and Kettleman FRC quarterly report
- 01/20/10 Corcoran FRC Performance Improvement Plan Executive Meeting Review
- 01/20/10 Kettleman City FRC Performance Improvement Plan Executive Meeting Review
- 1/27/10 TA provided to Corcoran FRC re: Special Event consent and data collection process

### Program Support:

- **Connection Programs:** Beginning in the month of January we have implemented the Ages and Stages Questionnaire screening tool at both of our centers and have received positive feed-back from our parents. Where appropriate we continue to refer clients to either UCP, the Office of

Education or other agencies as appropriate. Additionally, Parent and Me has relocated from the Hanford Family Connection to Jefferson School and we are in the process of revamping our space. We continue to collaborate and refer clients to the Parent and Me Program where appropriate.

#### Calendar:

- 12/15/09 Participate in Sexual Harassment Training
- 12/17/09 Participated in Behavioral Healthy focus group
- 01/04/10 Met with parenting provider to establish curriculum topics through the end of June, 2010
- 01/06/10 Met with Tai Orton from Healthy Smiles to discuss partnership, recent services and upcoming service at the Lemoore Family Connection.
- 01/19/10 Participated in Strategic Planning meeting at Behavioral Health Dept.
- 01/21/10 Participated in regular CAPCC meeting
- 01/27/10 Participated in Administrative Sub Committee CAPCC Meeting.

### Grants & Contracts Program Officer Report

#### Grants & Contracts Management:

- **2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Progress and Expenditure Reports** – First 5 Kings County Grantees turned in their 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter progress and expenditure reports on January 15<sup>th</sup>. I have been working to review these reports and provide feedback to each grantee and order the appropriate payment.
- **AccuTrack Database** – During the month of January I worked with Elvin Mathews of Engineerica Systems Inc. to preview and order a new database system for use at The Lemoore Family Connection and Hanford Family Connection. I also engaged Rick Teague from the Kings County IT Services to ensure that this software was compatible with the First 5 Kings County computer system and network.

#### Program Support:

- **Raising a Reader Affiliate Agreement** – At the request of the national raising a Reader office I completed the annual affiliate agreement.
- **Family Resource Center Support:** On 1/27/10 I Conducted Color Me Mine class at the Lemoore Family Connection.

#### Calendar:

- 01/07/2010 Attended an online software demonstration for the AccuTrack Database system.
- 01/12/2010 Attended an online software demonstration for the AccuTrack Database system with Kings County IT staff.
- 01/20/2010 Attended Local Childcare Planning Council meeting.
- 01/28/2010 Attended online webinar regarding the ASQ database and tracking tool presented by Brooks Publishing.

## School Readiness Coordinator Report

### Linkages 2 Learning:

- Linkages Transition Plans for each partner school site have been updated and modified. During the month of February 2010, schools will offer a final review and adopt plans for implementation. Highlights include:
  - An increase in outreach efforts at the community level to encourage EARLY registration for Kindergarten through direct communication with families, mailers and sign spinners at busy intersections.
  - An interest by two school sites in potentially utilizing an assessment tool for children prior to Kindergarten entry.

### Backpack 2 Success:

- Backpacks for the 2009-2010 school year are in shipment to First 5 Kings County. Distribution numbers are being compiled and shared with Kings County school sites in an effort to establish a more realistic distribution count.
- Staff is moving towards a closer working relationship at school sites versus working with district staff at distribution of backpacks this year to best ensure the integrity of data, all the while bettering the relationship with school sites.
- Data collected from last years Backpack recipients provide the following information :
  - Of those children participating in the Backpack to Success program, 60.7% have had a preschool experience at Kindergarten entry.
  - [Please see Backpack Distribution Spread Sheet \(attached\)](#)

### Calendar:

- 01/13/2010 Meeting with Principal Jill Rubalcava; Roosevelt Transition Team



**CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**

315 W. LACEY BLVD., HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93230

(559) 585-0814 FAX (559) 585-0818

Lisa Watson, Executive Director

**Date of Meeting: February 2, 2010**

---

# **Evaluation Subcommittee Report**



**CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**

315 W. LACEY BLVD., HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93230

(559) 585-0814 FAX (559) 585-0818

Lisa Watson, Executive Director

**Date of Meeting: February 2, 2010**

---

**2010-02-002**

**Separation from  
County Structure**



**Date of Meeting: February 2, 2010**  
**Agenda Item #: 2010-02-002**  
**Discussion/Action Item: XX**

---

**PROJECT TITLE: Separation from County Structure**

**A. Background/History:**

Discussion has repeatedly occurred within the commission of the potential of establishing itself as a free-standing public entity, separate from the county structure. Recently, the Commission has studied this issue at both its September 2009 Commission meeting, as well as at its January 2010 Commission Meeting. The issue was requested to be brought back as a discussion/action item at the February 2010 Commission meeting for further consideration.

**B. Summary of Request, Description of Project and Primary Goals**

Staff requests the Commission provide further direction regarding possible separation from county structure.

**C. Timeframe:**

Separation from the county structure will take a minimum of 12 months.

**D: Costs:**

Cost estimates to contract back with county for services currently provided within organizational structure:

County Counsel:	\$ 3,500 – estimate based on information provided by County Counsel
Information & Technology:	\$16,632 – estimate based on information provided by IT
Human Resources:	\$18,466 – estimate based on use of staff at Human Resources
Auditing & Payroll:	\$28,000 – estimate based on information provided by Finance Dept.
Auditing & Payroll:	\$ 1,318 – estimate based on average costs over 5 years as provided by Finance
TOTAL:	\$67,916*

\*\* Unknown costs: Use of Safety Officer/Supports currently provided by County Administration

**E. Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the commission table the discussion regarding possible separation from the County structure to allow for the following to occur:

- Assessment of whether, as a county department, First 5 can access MAA Billing opportunities
- Further development of the State Budget for FY 2010/2010, with possible impacts to First 5 funds available.

**F: Attachments:**

- Legal Status Options for First 5 County Commissions
- Historical Schedule of Cost Allocation Charges for the First 5 Department
- Task List associated with the Shift in Organizational Structure
- MOU between Kings County Association of Governments and Kings County

# Legal Status Options for First 5 County Commissions

Prepared by Mike Smith, Social Entrepreneurs, Inc. – Updated November 2005

This information brief outlines options for how Children and Families Commissions can be legally organized and how those options have been applied in other counties.

Under the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 130140.1, County Commissions can adopt either one of two different organization types.

1. ***Free-standing public entity.*** Under this option, the County Commission is a legal public entity separate from the county. All statutory and contractual obligations of the Commission belong to the Commission alone; the Commission gains no access to County services, insurance protection, legal support or other resources unless a contractual relationship is established between the Commission and the County. As a public entity, the Commission can obtain its own employer identification number, employ staff, execute contracts, receive funds, acquire and dispose of property (both real and personal), sue and be sued, and otherwise conduct its operations.
2. ***County agency.*** This option enables Commissions to operate under the umbrella of the county government. Conceptually, the Commission becomes like a department and corresponding special fund of the county, operating under the personnel and administrative guidelines of the county. However, a Children and Families Commission is a unique type of county agency because, by law, the Commission must retain “independent authority over the strategic plan ... and the local Children and Families Trust Fund” (Health and Safety Code section 130140.1(c)). This means that the Commission, unlike any other county department, cannot be required to seek Board of Supervisors approval for its strategic plan or administration of its funds; such decisions rest solely with the Commission.

The County Board of Supervisors actually makes the election of legal status on behalf of the Commission by virtue of the language in the state law that “...the county may establish a county commission that is either [a separate public entity or a county agency]...”. This election should be reflected in the local ordinance that establishes the Commission and defines its membership and duties.

Discussion has occurred within many counties of the potential of establishing an independent nonprofit corporation with tax-exempt status under Internal Revenue Code section 501(c)(3). The provisions of existing state law make it clear that a Commission cannot “become” a nonprofit corporation – it cannot abandon its status as a public agency. However, a hybrid organizational model is possible. For example, a county Commission could operate as a free-standing public entity for its normal activities and at the same time sponsor the formation of a nonprofit corporation to conduct selected types of fund raising and program development activities that better fit the nonprofit model.

Which is the best structure? It depends on the unique circumstances in each county. A summary of the primary advantages and disadvantages of each legal status option is provided in the table below.

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Free-standing public entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not subject to county policies and procedures such as hiring, personnel administration, bid processes, contracting for services and so on</li> <li>• In general, offers the most autonomy by not being tied into the county structure on a day-to-day basis</li> <li>• May best fit the general public's perception of how the Commission should operate (independence)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to hire or contract for all administrative services and legal counsel, including setting up all type of organizational infrastructure – accounting, human resources, risk management and so on</li> <li>• Can be harder to hire staff if the Commission cannot offer benefits and career opportunities that are comparable to the county</li> <li>• Possible greater legal risks if unable to secure comparable insurance and legal protection, plus the potential that a Commission will be an easier target for a lawsuit than a county</li> </ul>
County agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leverages the extensive administrative and legal support structure already established within counties</li> <li>• May be able to develop a stronger collaborative relationship with other county agencies, especially those related to children and family services</li> <li>• Staff should be able to participate in county benefit plans; may enhance ability to recruit qualified staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must operate under county administrative procedures; may add time and complexity to work</li> <li>• Adherence to civil service regulations can reduce staffing flexibility</li> <li>• Can introduce potential for excessive involvement from political forces within the county</li> </ul>

Questions to consider when selecting the structure to adopt for a particular county include:

1. **How is implementation of the First 5 strategic plan affected?** Since the first and foremost job of a First 5 County Commission is to define early childhood development priorities and support effective programs and services to address those priorities, the first issue is to consider whether one organizational form better supports (or inhibits) the implementation of the First 5 strategic plan.
2. **How are day-to-day operations affected?** Functions of First 5 Commissions to be carried out in the most effective manner possible include strategic planning, fund allocation, program and contract management, evaluation, public relations, fiscal management, linkage to state and regional efforts, human resources, support for Commission operations, and others.
3. **Are there financial advantages?** This can mean getting more done with the same resources, and can also mean being able to move quickly as new funding and other opportunities emerge. The choice of legal status and other aspects of the organization structure can have major cost implications. Here, it must be noted that neither structure has been shown to be across-the-board more cost effective – in some counties, clear cost advantages were demonstrated by becoming independent entities while the

Commissions in other counties found equally compelling cost advantages to being a county agency.

4. **Which structure is most sustainable?** Look at what is expected to be best for the next 5-10 years, not just today.

Virtually all Commissions have stayed with the organizational form they settled upon during the first three years after Proposition 10 was passed (although it must be noted that numerous counties changed their organizational form during the initial three years of Proposition 10 implementation). The only Commission to formally change its status since 2003 is First 5 Alameda County, which became an independent entity as of July 1, 2004. An extensive cost-benefit study that was conducted in 2002 estimated that over a three-year period, taking into account one-time conversion costs, it would cost the Commission \$286,000 more to function as an independent entity than to remain part of the County system (negligible compared to their \$27 million annual expenditure budget) but in the long run there would be cost savings. In Alameda County's situation, the difficulties of operating within the County civil service system with a staff of almost 50 people were so acute that it was worthwhile to absorb some extra upfront costs in order to gain full control over staffing and benefits issues.

As an illustration, a First 5 Commission that is part of the County and wishes to become completely independent is typically faced with developing or obtaining the following types of organizational infrastructure that were previously received from the County:

- Fiscal and personnel policies and procedures
- Accounting functions – software, forms, files, transaction coding protocols, etc.
- Payroll processing
- Employee benefits and benefits administration capabilities
- Other forms of human resources support – recruitment, performance evaluation, legal compliance support
- Workers compensation insurance
- Property, liability and errors and omissions insurance
- Legal counsel
- Office space
- Office equipment and maintenance
- Telecommunications equipment and support
- Information technology support
- Investment management, if the County Treasurer is unwilling to continue to perform this function on behalf of the Commission

Although this list may look formidable, numerous County Commissions in rural areas and with small budgets (e.g. Sierra, Plumas and Lassen Counties) were able to address these infrastructure needs and have operated effectively for many years as independent entities.

It also must be emphasized that the organization structure is not an “all or nothing” proposition. Many hybrid models have been developed by other First 5 Commissions to best fit their local situation. Examples of different models that have been used include:

1. **County agency that is granted “independence” from standard county procedures.** The Yolo County Commission negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding with the County that offers it much more flexibility than any other County department. For the most part, the Commission can selectively decide when to utilize County services and when to operate more autonomously. For example, the Commission can set up its own job classifications and salary levels, and then recruit for new positions, with limited involvement by the County Personnel Department. The San Francisco Commission obtained a favorable legal opinion that freed it from county contracting procedures on the basis that county procedures conflicted with state law granting County Children and Families Commissions independent authority over administration of its trust fund.
2. **Independent entity that contracts with the County for services.** Most Commissions that are structured as independent entities still contract with the County to provide various administrative services. For example, the Contra Costa Commission utilizes County accounting, payroll, employee benefits, risk management and legal services (for a fee) but otherwise functions independently. There are many variations on this model – essentially, it comes down to determining what services the Commission still wants from the County that the County is willing to provide, and negotiating a fee.
3. **Outsourcing of staffing and administrative functions.** The Santa Cruz County Commission contracted with the local United Way to hire staff and provide all necessary administrative functions on behalf of the Commission. The Colusa County Commission, similarly, contracts with their local One-Stop Career Center to provide staffing and administrative support for the Commission while remaining part of the County government structure for all other purposes (fiscal processing, legal support, insurance and so on). The Lassen County Commission contracts with a local management company for staff and administrative support services.

Creative approaches are also possible to address organizational needs that don't fit well into a governmental entity regardless of whether it is a County agency or an independent public entity. For example, First 5 Kings County sponsored the creation of a new nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization to provide technical assistance and administrative coordination of a countywide network of family resource centers because no already-established organization was prepared to fulfill this important role. As a different example, based on recommendations from the Annie E. Casey Foundation during a 2005 First 5 workshop on long-term sustainability strategies, some Southern California County Commissions were exploring the formation of a new nonprofit foundation that would be dedicated to community fundraising for early childhood development issues. The point here is that, although a County Commission cannot “become” a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, it can partner in innovative ways with existing nonprofit organizations and/or be a catalyst for creating new nonprofit organizations that are independent of the Commission but address key roles in the implementation of the First 5 strategic plan.

The bottom line is that the experience of other County Commissions has not shown one organizational form to be superior to the other – it truly depends on the unique circumstances of each county. This may be why roughly half of the County Commissions are currently structured as county agencies and half are independent entities.

**County of Kings**  
**Schedule of Cost Allocation Charges to First Five**

<b>Cost Category</b>	<b>Annual Average</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2003-04</b>
Building Use									
Equipment Use	1,958	13,709	2,186	1,620	1,884	2,129	2,491	1,808	1,591
Administration	11,191	78,334	20,738	19,026	11,204	7,973	5,784	5,864	7,745
Insurance	1,318	9,227	1,736	1,505	1,367	1,282	1,468	1,079	790
Personnel	5,497	38,477	7,407	8,036	4,271	4,879	4,821	4,520	4,543
Finance	15,825	110,775	27,241	19,886	17,626	15,221	11,859	10,111	8,831
County Counsel	-1,259	-8,815	379	4,311	-15,772	-1,168	-314	2,204	1,545
Central Services	85	592						494	98
Single Audit	557	3,896				1,312	974	667	943
	0								
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,171</b>	<b>246,195</b>	<b>59,687</b>	<b>54,384</b>	<b>20,580</b>	<b>31,628</b>	<b>27,083</b>	<b>26,747</b>	<b>26,086</b>
	0								
Roll Forward	12,368	86,574	39,107	22,756	-6,503	5,375	997	6,620	18,222
Cost with Roll Forwards	47,538	332,769	98,794	77,140	14,077	37,003	28,080	33,367	44,308
Adjustments	-81	-569	-75					-494	
	0								
<b>Proposed Cost</b>	<b>47,457</b>	<b>332,200</b>	<b>98,719</b>	<b>77,140</b>	<b>14,077</b>	<b>37,003</b>	<b>28,080</b>	<b>32,873</b>	<b>44,308</b>

Task	KCAG	HR	Task List			Comments
			Admin	CC	ADP	
1 Joint Powers Agreement (JPA)	X					
2 EIN Number	X					
3 D U N #	X					
4 State Identification Number	X					Contact @ State Kay Jackson 916-464-3031
5 Unemployment Insurance & SDI	X				X	Staff needs to hold vote
6 Taxes ( payroll deposits/quarterly (W-2)					X	Make sure not to pay FUTA (federal unemployment tax) not necessary
7 CalPERS Annual Actuarial Valuation		X				Contract documents expected mid-February-07
8 CalPERS (est separate account)	X	X				Meeting with Allison on 7/7 Needs to be board validated Have the contract goes to Commission on 6/27/07
9 ACES training for managing PERS Account	X					on-line management of employees
10 Workers comp/join CSAC/apply/resolution	X					Resolution 06-04 dated July 19, 2006, employees voted to elect in Disability Insurance
11 EAP (allows employees access to service)	X	X				Avante/Allison side letter-identifier re: KCAG employees
12 Deferred Comp (separate account set-up)		X			X	Pers/Hartford side letter-identifier re: KCAG employees
13 Liability & Property Insurance	X		X			Includes Workers Comp, General Liability & Vehicle insurance
14 Policy Manuals re: Department	X	X		X		County Rules & Policies MOU/05/97 follow County by reference for now Needs to be addressed in the MOU
15 Legal				X		Continue with direct bill? Addressed in MOU
16 Auditing Services	X					Continue with present Outside Auditor KCAG pay our own costs
17 Drug Screening	X	X set up				Employee Health Care HR calls
18 Physical Exams	X	X set up				Call Health Dept for appointment & results back to KCAG
19 I-9 Forms/W-4 Forms/Oaths	X	X				HR to provide list of required docs to file
20 New Employee Orientations		X				w/County for consistency & as applies
21 Insurance Sign-ups (Health Ins)(Admin w/Chimenti)	X	X				Auditors office side letter-identifier re: KCAG employees
22 Employee transition county-KCAG formal separation	X	X				KCAG Board to validate action
23 Recruitments (KCAG job specifications)	X	X				MOU
24 Recruitment flyers (modified)	X	X				MOU
25 Disciplines/Grieances/Formal Termination		X				MOU
26 FMLA approvals	X	X			X	MOU
27 Vacation Donations	X					within KCAG
28 Safety Program	X					in-house
29 Education Reimbursement Program	X	X				HR to send forms & criteria
30 Employee awards						on own after 1st year
31 Payroll	X				X	Need to decide on payday/Paydays
32 EOC community report		X				size driven if required
33 Payroll reports (hrs/leave balance	X				X	ADP calculated Vac/Sick/service hrs
34 Salary Ranges (5-step process)/coincide w/union MOU	X	X				MOU
35 Employee evaluations & Action Forms	X				X	MOU
36 Deposits & Banking	X					set up account ADP uses BofA
37 Time Cards PP reports	X				X	Make up our own
38 New Hire registry to State	X				X	ADP does the reporting once we enter info
39 Budget	X					KCAG board approval

Task	KCAG	HR	Admin	CC	ADP	Comments
40 Computer/Phone	X		X			County IT Services
41 Mail/Interoffice Delivery	X		X			MOU with County
42 Printing forms/envelopes	X		X			MOU with County
43 Building Maintenance	X					Part of Rental Agreement
44 Janitorial	X					Independent Contractor
45 CAP charge or direct charge		X	X			MOU with County
46 MOU to establish all services designation				X		KCAG board to approve
47 lease/direct bill/cap charges/different depts.		X	X			as done before left county
48 County Budget 06/07 & 07/08	X		X			Per Deb need action taken

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING  
BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF KINGS AND THE  
KINGS COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made and entered into this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2007, by and between the Kings County Association of Governments, a joint powers entity, ("KCAG") and the County of Kings, a political subdivision of the State of California ("County").

WHEREAS, the KCAG and the County desire to enter into this MOU in order to formulate and maintain a cooperative working relationship which will more effectively and efficiently enable the KCAG to meet its obligations and responsibilities pursuant to the Kings County Association of Governments Joint Powers Agreement of 2006 ("JPA Agreement").

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as set forth below.

1. Term.

The term of this MOU shall be from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, and shall continue in effect until terminated by a party to the MOU in conformance with Section 7 below, or by operation of the law.

2. Independent Status of the KCAG and Its Employees.

(a) The KCAG is a public entity separate from the County. The KCAG is a joint powers agency exercising public and essential government functions, which has all the powers necessary and convenient to meet its obligations and exercise its rights under the provisions of the JPA Agreement.

(b) The KCAG shall file any required amended information statements required by California Government Code section 53051.

(c) Any and all contracts, leases or other agreements of any nature, including collective bargaining agreements, between the KCAG and third parties other than the County shall contain an express provision advising the third party that the KCAG is a separate governmental entity and that such agreement does not bind the County.

(d) The employees of the KCAG shall not be, and shall not be construed to be, employees of the County for any purpose. However, the employees of the KCAG shall retain the same employment benefits, rights and protections as are afforded employees of Kings County. The KCAG shall enact the provisions of the Kings County Personnel Rules and Employee-Employer Relations Policy until such time as the KCAG develops and adopts its own personnel rules and employee-employer relations policy.

(e) The County shall control the standards of performance, the management and control of County personnel, and the manner of performance of services under this MOU. Notwithstanding this provision, if in the judgment of the KCAG any County employee assigned to provide services under this MOU is not satisfactory to the KCAG, the KCAG may so notify the County in writing and within thirty days of receipt of such written notification, the County shall respond in writing.

3. County Services to the KCAG.

(a) County Administrative Office. The County Administrative Office shall extend its self-insured health insurance benefits and other benefits to employees of the KCAG to the extent and under such terms that such benefits are currently available to County employees.

The County Administrative Office shall additionally provide risk management services to the KCAG as and when needed.

(b) County Department of Finance. The County Department of Finance shall perform fiscal and accounting functions as required by the KCAG, with the exception of processing payroll. The Department of Finance shall make available to the KCAG staff and Board financial reports for such transactions. All services provided by the Department of Finance shall be in accordance with the policies and procedures for fiscal and accounting functions established by the County for its internal departments.

The County Department of Finance shall additionally perform banking and investment services to the KCAG, including but not limited to, investing any surplus funds on behalf of the KCAG in accordance with the policies established by County.

(c) County Information Technology Department. The County Information Technology Department shall provide services relating to the KCAG's office automation requirements, including but not limited to, computer and telephone support services, linkage to the countywide area network and other telecommunications equipment and support as shall be requested. Such services shall be provided in compliance with existing County standards.

(d) Human Resources Department. The County Human Resources Department shall provide personnel services, including, but not limited to, the following: staff recruitment, disciplines and grievances, health insurance enrollment, pre-employment physicals, drug screening, monitoring of family medical leave, pregnancy disability leave and other leave policies and practices; and all other programs available to Kings County employees, such as employee assistance and deferred compensation programs. The County Human Resources Department shall provide services to the KCAG in conformance with the Kings County Personnel Rules and other established County policies and procedures.

(e) County Counsel's Office. The Office of the County Counsel shall perform legal services and provide representation to the KCAG only as and when requested by the KCAG. When requested, the County Counsel's Office will assist and advise the KCAG with regard to compliance with any applicable local, state or federal statutes, ordinances, laws, rules, regulations or the orders of any governmental or regulatory body having jurisdiction over the KCAG. Reimbursement for such legal services will be based upon actual costs and billed directly by the County Counsel's Office at rates generally applicable to non-County agencies.

(f) Public Works Department. The County Public Works Department shall provide motor pool services to the KCAG when and as requested at rates established by the County for the same services provided to non-County agencies.

(g) Additional Services. County may provide on an as needed basis any additional services as are necessary for the operation and administration of the KCAG as requested by the KCAG.

4. Compensation.

(a) Cost Allocation Plan Compensation. For services provided by the County's Administrative Office, Finance Department, and the Human Resources Department (except as set forth in subsection (c) below), the KCAG shall compensate County according to the annual "Countywide Cost Allocation Plan," as calculated by the Finance Department.

(b) Direct Billing for Services. For services provided by the County Counsel's Office, Information Technology Department, Public Works Department, and any other additional services, the KCAG shall reimburse the County for such services at the then current rates charged by each department for such services. Each department shall provide itemized invoices which shall include the name of the staff member providing the services, a description of the services performed, the dates the services were performed and the time spent on the services.

(c) Human Resources Fee. The KCAG shall pay an annual flat fee to utilize the County's staff recruitment, discipline and grievance services. This payment shall be made regardless of whether the KCAG utilizes these services in any given year. The base payment shall be \$11,982.00 for fiscal year 2007/2008. This amount may be increased by an amount not to exceed ten percent per fiscal year subject to a written agreement signed by the Human Resources Director and the Executive Director of the KCAG.

(d) Reimbursement for Expenses. In addition to payment for services as provided above, the KCAG shall also reimburse County for all travel and other expenses incurred by County in furnishing the services under this MOU. The rates for such reimbursement shall be consistent with the travel and expense schedule approved by the Kings County Board of Supervisors for the reimbursement of County employees.

(d) Payment. Payment for services provided under the Cost Allocation Plan shall be accomplished by the County Finance Department by fund transfers on a monthly basis with notice of such fund transfers being provided to the KCAG on a monthly basis no later than the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the following month. For direct billing services, the KCAG shall compensate County for services provided and expenses incurred within thirty days of receipt of invoices therefore.

5. Insurance.

(a) The KCAG shall obtain, from an insurance carrier authorized to transact business in the State of California, and maintain continuously during the term of this MOU, Commercial General Liability Insurance, including coverage for owned and non-owned automobiles, and other insurance necessary to protect the County and the public with limits of liability of not less than \$2,000,000.00 per occurrence.

(b) This insurance shall not be reduced or canceled during the term of this MOU. All insurance (except Worker's Compensation) shall include an endorsement or an amendment to the policy of insurance which names the County of Kings, its elected officials, officers, employees, agents and volunteers as an additional insured and provides that coverage shall not be reduced or canceled without 30 days written prior notice to the County. If the endorsement or amendment does not reflect the limits of liability provided by the policy of insurance, the KCAG shall provide the County a certificate of insurance reflecting those limits.

(c) The KCAG shall additionally maintain a program of Workers' Compensation insurance in an amount and form to meet all applicable requirements of the California Labor Code, to include Employer's Liability coverage with limits of \$250,000.00.

(d) The KCAG shall deliver to the Kings County Administrative Office an endorsement or amendment of all required policies of insurance as evidence of insurance protection prior to the commencement of this MOU.

6. Indemnification.

The KCAG shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the County and its authorized officers, employees, officials, agents and volunteers from any and all claims, actions, losses, damages and/or liability arising out of this MOU, or arising in any way from the County's performance of services hereunder, or from any cause whatsoever, including the acts, errors or omissions of any person and for any costs or expenses incurred by the County as a result of any claim or litigation.

7. Termination.

Either party may terminate this MOU with or without cause upon giving ninety days written notice to the other party. However, the MOU may be terminated earlier by mutual written agreement of the parties. The termination of services by one County department shall not result in the termination of this MOU as to the remaining County departments.

8. Notices.

All notices and correspondence pertaining to or arising out of this MOU shall be sent to:

County: County of Kings  
County Administrative Officer  
Kings County Government Center  
1400 West Lacey Blvd.  
Hanford, California 93230

KCAG: Kings County Association of Governments  
339 West "D" Street, Suite "B"  
Lemoore, California 93245

9. Severability.

If any part of this MOU is found to be in conflict with applicable laws, such part shall be inoperative, null and void insofar as it is in conflict with said laws, but the remainder of the MOU shall be in full force and effect.

10. Integration.

This MOU represents the entire understanding of the parties as to those matters contained herein and supersedes all prior negotiations, representations or agreements, either written or oral. This MOU may be amended only by written instrument, signed by the governing boards of both the KCAG and the County.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Memorandum of Understanding to be effective on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2007.

Dated:

Dated:

By Tony Barba  
Chairperson, Kings County  
Board of Supervisors  
JUL 3 2007

By Seo Baek  
Chairperson, Kings County  
Association of Governments

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By Rhonda Bray, Deputy  
Catherine Venturella

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

County Counsel

By [Signature]



**CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**

315 W. LACEY BLVD., HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93230

(559) 585-0814 FAX (559) 585-0818

Lisa Watson, Executive Director

**Date of Meeting: February 2, 2010**

---

**STUDY SESSION:  
2009 Commission  
Performance Review**

First 5 Kings County Children and Families Commission  
315 W Lacey Blvd. Hanford, California 93230  
(559) 585-0814 phone ~ (559) 585-0818 fax  
Lisa Watson, Executive Director



**PRESENTATION FORM**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	<b>Lisa Watson</b>
<b>Date Submitted:</b>	<b>January 25, 2010</b>
<b>Email Address:</b>	<b>Lisa.watson@first5kc.org</b>
<b>Telephone Number:</b>	<b>559 585-0814</b>
<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>2009 COMMISSION ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW</b>

**Presentation Description:**

In 2007, the Commission elected to participate in annual performance reviews. Consequently, performance criteria was established and integrated into the Commissions Operational Guidelines which were revised and adopted by the Commission in April 2007. The Annual Performance Review would occur at the end of every calendar year and would be presented to the Commission and public for accountability purposes, and in an effort to strengthen process and systems associated with the management of public funds.

Commission staff requests the Commission review and discuss the Commission Annual Performance Review as presented by Kelly Marschall, principal to SEI.



**CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**

315 W. LACEY BLVD., HANFORD, CALIFORNIA 93230

(559) 585-0814 FAX (559) 585-0818

Lisa Watson, Executive Director

**Date of Meeting: February 2, 2010**

---

**STUDY SESSION:  
Governor's Budget  
Proposal FY 2010/2011**



First 5 Kings County Children and Families Commission  
315 W Lacey Blvd. Hanford, California 93230  
(559) 585-0814 phone ~ (559) 585-0818 fax  
Lisa Watson, Executive Director

## **PRESENTATION FORM**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	<b>Lisa Watson</b>
<b>Date Submitted:</b>	<b>January 25, 2010</b>
<b>Email Address:</b>	<b>Lisa.watson@first5kc.org</b>
<b>Telephone Number:</b>	<b>559 585-0814</b>
<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>GOVERNOR'S BUDGET PROPOSAL &amp; IMPACT TO FIRST 5</b>

### **Presentation Description:**

On January 8th, the Governor released his budget proposal, which includes a major shift of Prop 10 funds away from First 5 and into the General Fund. ED Watson will provide an overview of the Governor's proposal, specifically as it relates to First 5.

## **Governor's Budget Proposal and Potential Impacts to First 5**

### **The proposal:**

- Takes \$308 million through a one-time take-away from current state and/or local reserves
- Redirects \$242 million from new revenues each year for 5 years, beginning in 2010-11
- Specifies that the revenues will be used for children 0 – 5 in programs operated by the State Departments of Social Services (DSS) and Developmental Services (DDS).
- Places a ballot measure on the June 8 ballot to accomplish this.
- In 2010-11, allocates \$200 million to DDS services for children 0 – 5 and the remainder to a variety of services at DSS, including Stage 1 CalWORKs child care, foster care grants and administration, adoptions assistance, and child welfare programs.

### **This is the statement from the Governor's Budget Summary:**

“California Children and Families Act of 1998 (Proposition 10) – A reduction of \$550 million in General Fund through a redirection of Proposition 10 funding from the California Children and Families Commission budget to high-priority state programs serving children. This proposal includes shifting (for five years) approximately 50 percent of the Proposition 10 revenues currently directed to state and local accounts within the Commission's budget (\$242 million in 2010-11) and a one-time sweep of state and local reserves (\$308 million). The redirected funds will be used to support children enrolled in programs administered by the Department of Social Services and the Department of Developmental Services. Implementation of this proposal will require voter approval. It is anticipated this initiative will be included in the June 2010 election.”

Other notable items the Governor's budget proposal:

### Prop 63

The Governor proposes using \$452.3 million of Prop 63 funds for a portion of the EPSDT program and a portion of the Mental Health Managed Care program. This will require a ballot initiative in the June election. If the state receives less federal funding than the Governor's budget assumes, a greater percentage of Prop 63 – up to the entire amount – will be diverted to the General Fund.

### Healthy Families

The Governor's budget includes a one-time payment of \$55.6 million from First 5 California to fund the Healthy Families Program in 2010-11.

The overall Healthy Families budget is reduced by lowering eligibility from 250 percent of the federal poverty level to 200 percent, increasing family premiums for families with incomes from 151 percent to 200 percent of the FPL, and eliminating vision coverage.

### MediCal

The Governor's budget cuts \$750 million from the MediCal budget, to be realized through cost containment measures that will limit service; increase co-pays, premiums, or both; and other programmatic changes to be determined. (None of these proposals are specific yet, but they are likely to reflect research the administration is currently doing about how other states have contained costs.) The budget also reduces the rates paid for family planning services, beginning March 1, 2010, lowering them to 2007 levels.

### CalWorks

The Governor proposes reducing monthly grant payments, taking the maximum grant for a family of three in a high-cost county from \$694 to \$585, for a loss of \$109 per month. In a low-cost county, this the reduction would be from \$661 to \$557, for a loss of \$104 per month. The Governor proposes to put this into effect June 1, 2010.

### Federal fund triggers

The Governor's budget assumes a large increase in the funding that California receives from the federal government. If these funds do not materialize, his budget includes \$1.9 billion in further cuts, including the elimination of the CalWORKs program, IHSS, and Transitional Housing Program-Plus (THP-Plus).