



ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA

Values Statement: *Through respectful inquiry, genuine interest, and intention to learn from its diverse members, this committee operates as a safe space in order to fulfill our purpose to advise the Commission on how best to serve all children and families in Sacramento County.*

March 21, 2025

1:00-2:00PM

This is an **In-Person Meeting for Committee Members**

2750 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 330
Sacramento, CA 95833

Community/Public May Join By Zoom:

<https://saccounty-net.zoomgov.com/j/1604748709?pwd=aWSG0mkZaCVNQrYE3G2pcbtVqHqbq.1>

Members:

Javeed Ahmad, Robin Blanks, Kairis Chiaji, Carolyn Curtis, Junior Goris (Chair), Janea Hackett-Little, Kesha Harris, Heidi Keiser, Maria Lopez, Fatima Malik, Jennifer Mohammad (Vice Chair), Alexandria Paige, Silvia Rodriguez, Chase Smith, Tony Smith, Linda Thrift, Darsey Varnedoe, Darla Williams, Walter Wyniarczuk

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions | 5 minutes |
| 2. Public Comments on Off-Agenda Items | 5 minutes |
| 3. Presentation & Discussion:
ZIP Code Priorities for Equity in Action Funding Process | 50 minutes |
| 4. Adjourn | |

*First 5 Sacramento Advisory Committee

Background on Participatory Grantmaking / Equity in Action ZIP Code Prioritizing

Intro

As part of the Racial Equity priority in the 2024-27 strategic plan, F5 Sacramento allocated approximately \$4M for a participatory grantmaking (PGM) process. These funds will go to new (have not been funded directly by First 5 Sacramento in the last 15 years) partners who serve children 0 – 5 and their families in under-resourced communities. In order to determine which Sacramento County ZIP codes should be included in this funding allocation, staff have gathered data that can be used to select high-priority ZIP codes. We are asking the Advisory Committee to consider how the focal ZIP codes will be selected. Staff will bring proposed methods of selection for your consideration. Once reviewed and agreed upon by the Advisory Committee, staff will finalize the recruitment process for the Equity in Action Funding Workgroup based on the prioritized neighborhoods.

The Implementation Plan describes the PGM funding as “A separate funding pathway to engage new partners serving Black, indigenous, and people of color populations and underserved communities, as well as technical assistance to build agency capacity among these new partners”.

The ZIP Code Data

First 5 Sacramento’s vision is that Sacramento County will have strong communities where children are safe, healthy, and reach their full potential. Given this vision, we identified assets that help this vision come true – things that contribute to children’s health, safety, and well-being – that can be measured at the ZIP code level.

We started with the Strong Start Index. This is a tool that uses information collected at birth from every child in California. By looking at how these assets vary across ZIP codes, we can see which ZIP codes might benefit from additional supportive services. The Strong Start Index includes 12 measures including:

- **Family** (legal parentage established at birth; born to non-teen parents; born to parents with at least a high school diploma)
- **Health** (healthy birthweight; absence of congenital abnormalities; absence of mother-to-child infections)
- **Service** (access to and receipt of timely prenatal care; receipt of WIC if eligible; hospital with high percentage of births with timely prenatal care)
- **Financial** (ability to afford and access healthcare; born to a parent with a college degree; born to parents with employment history)

Overall, babies born in Sacramento County have an average of 9.2 of these 12 assets. Thirty-seven of the 53 ZIP codes in Sacramento County had children born in 2021 who had a Strong Start score of 8 or fewer assets, ranging from 12 to 443 children. We used these as our starting place for selecting priority ZIP codes.

Because First 5 Sacramento is not focused only on newborns, but on the whole first 5 years, we also included data that is a marker for child safety: the number of children with a substantiated child abuse allegation (meaning that a report of child abuse or neglect was investigated and sufficient evidence was

found to believe that child abuse or neglect had occurred). While recognizing the racial disparities in child abuse allegations, we felt that no matter the cause of the higher numbers of substantiated allegations, communities with higher numbers of child abuse allegations might benefit from additional supportive services. As a result, we included the ZIP codes with at least one child with a substantiated allegation, a total of 46 ZIP codes, and raised the total number of priority ZIP codes to consider to 47.

In addition to assets at birth and basic child safety, we added third grade English language arts scores for each ZIP code. The percentage of children in a ZIP code who scored Proficient or better was included as a proxy for academic readiness (third grade scores are closely correlated with scores of school readiness of Kindergartners) and later success (they are also closely correlated with high school graduation rates). We believe this additional data point rounds out the picture of the First 5 vision of strong communities where children are safe, healthy, and reach their full potential.

Finally, we looked at how many children under 5 lived in each ZIP code, to give us a sense of reach for how many families might be served in a given ZIP code.

Barriers to Services

In 2022, as part of our strategic planning process, 855 parents responded to a survey. As part of the survey, they reported on the barriers to accessing services. Among the top barriers were:

- things related to poverty (too stressed; lack of transportation; cost of service)
- things related to culture (staff not reflecting values, culture or life experience)
- things related to language (providers who speak my language)

For this reason, we chose the following data points to reflect “Barriers to Services”:

- Child poverty rate (rather than general poverty, this one gives the rate for families with children)
- Percentage of population who are people of color
- Percentage of population who speak a language other than English

(continued on next page)

The table below includes each of the above data points, the range of scores in the identified ZIP codes, the average score for the identified ZIP codes, and the Sacramento County overall score.

Data Point	Range for identified ZIP codes	Average for identified ZIP codes	Sacramento County overall
# children under 5	46 – 5,117	1,992	95,165 total
Strong Start Index - % babies with 8 or fewer of the 12 assets	0 – 73.06% (where 0 = all babies were born with 9 or more assets in that ZIP)	24.29%	31.7%
# children with substantiated child abuse allegations	0-139 children in each ZIP code had a substantiated allegation	38 children	1,847 total children in Sacramento County
% Proficient in 3rd grade English Language Arts	13.7% - 69.44% of 3 rd graders scored Proficient or better	36.46%	39.78% average
Child Poverty Rate	2.6% - 55.3%	18.18%	13.5% average
% Black, indigenous, people of color population	25.84% - 91.53%	57.99%	59% average
% Language other than English	10.2% - 56%	32.14%	34.7% average

Questions to Consider (we will discuss these at the meeting)

- How many of the 47 identified ZIP codes (out of 53 total in Sacramento County) should we include? Is that a starting point or do we decide on criteria and then see how many fit the criteria?
- Do we want to use the methodology of the Black Child Legacy Campaign when they were scoring ZIP codes for a possible location for an eighth service center? (score one point for each “top 10” ranking on each data point) or does this call for more complexity?
- Is there a minimum number of children in a ZIP code in order to be considered? BCLC uses a minimum of 500, for example. Does density matter?
- Is there a cut-off for any of these data points, with those ZIP codes falling above/below that limit taken out of consideration? For instance, if there were no children born with 8 or fewer Strong Start assets, or if there were fewer than a third of residents who speak a language other than English at home, do we remove that ZIP code from consideration? Or if a ZIP code falls outside the top 40 of the 47 ZIP codes on any given score, does that remove it from consideration?
- The flip side of the question above: is there anything that keeps a ZIP code in consideration even if one of the above disqualification rules fits? If the child poverty rate is in the top 20, should a small number of substantiated child abuse allegations not remove that ZIP code from consideration?
- Do we use “above/below the county average” on any of these data points as an inclusion factor?