

FIRST 5 SACRAMENTO COMMISSION

2750 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 330
Sacramento, CA 95833

EVALUATION COMMITTEE

ACTION SUMMARY

Monday, March 18, 2024 – 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM



Members: Steve Wirtz (Chair), David Gordon (Vice Chair), Dr. Olivia Kasirye
Advisory Committee Member(s): Robin Blanks, Tony Smith, Jennifer Mohammed (Alt.), Kairis Chiaji (Alt.)

Staff Present: Julie Gallelo, Carmen Garcia-Gomez, Kris Clinton, Elena Enriquez

Attendance: In-person: S. Wirtz, D. Gordon, J. Mohammed, R. Blanks, T. Smith, R. Blanks, K. Chiaji

Via Zoom: Dr. O. Kasirye

Consultant: Applied Survey Research



1. Call to order and Roll Call
Action: Meeting was called to order at 1:00 PM.
2. Public Comments on Off-Agenda Items
Action: None.
3. Approve Draft Action Summary of January 22, 2024
Action: Mohammed/Smith.
4. Evaluation Staff Report
Action: None.

Commission staff provided an update on the following items:

- Evaluation Staff Update: Elena Enriquez joined the commission on February 13, 2024.
- Evaluation Planning: Staff and ASR have been meeting with contractors to update Results Based Accountability tables and surveys to be implemented in July 2024.

In addition, the evaluation team will update the Family Information Form and Consent forms which will be presented to the Evaluation Committee in May.

- Child Health, Education, and Care Summit: First 5 staff will participate at the F5CA sponsored event later this month as part of a panel presenting on RBAs.
- Special Study: Crisis Nursery, exploring client return rate and how **clients define "better-off" after utilizing crisis nursery services.**
- Referral Portal:
 - i. Referral Agencies: 100 agencies in the referral portal
 - ii. # of contractors using the Referral Portal: 13 F5 contractors (out of 17)
 - iii. # of clients with at least 1 referral: 928
 - iv. # of referrals sent: 1710 (it may be lower)
 - v. # of referrals with outcome data: 988
 - a. Received services: 488
 - b. Pending: 315
 - c. Parent declined: 90
 - d. Unable to contact family: 70
 - e. On waitlist: 21
 - f. Not eligible: 4

Discussion:

- Staff to send special study proposal to Evaluation Committee.
- Committee members discussed the various outcomes and reasons for a client not being eligible for services and for declining them. Staff explained that it could be for various reasons such as not meeting the eligibility criteria, or the client is already receiving services. When parents decline, it may be that **they don't need the service or are just not interested.**
- Staff added that the commission is considering incorporating the questions, **"If you received a referral, did you receive services, and what was the outcome?"** into the follow-up process or including it in the Family Information Form.

5. General Evaluation Update – Applied Survey Research
Action: None.

ASR staff provided a summary of activities for the months of February and March.

6. Approve April Evaluation Committee Meeting
Action: Writz/Gordon.

Commission staff requested an additional meeting in April to allow time for this committee to review the evaluation plans and provide input. Staff will follow-up with an email to the committee and post the date on the website to give the public plenty of notice.

7. Approve Updated Evaluation Policy

Action: Committee would like to review and approve an updated policy.

Discussion: Staff explained the reason for the policy, an update from the 2016 approved policy. Staff recommends that the updated policy is included in the contracts and that it is widely distributed to data entry staff.

D. Gordon shared concerns regarding having the policy as part of the contract, as it may need to be reviewed on an annual basis and may need to be approved on an annual basis by the committee. Rather include the requirements in the contract.

Chair S. Wirtz asked for clarification on how non-F5 Funded participants are entered and handled in the system. Staff explained how the services are assigned the funding source for the specific service received by the individual/

Chair S. Wirtz asked staff to clarify services to families of children ages over the age of 6, it is not clear. Staff will update the information in the policy.

D. Gordon recommended a data entry guide and a high-level policy.

The Committee recommended the title of the document is also changed to "Data Management Requirements", a policy would not allow the flexibility to make changes or edits without the approval of the committee.

8. Received and Discuss: Evaluation Plans

Action: Reviewed and Discussed.

Committee members provided input and discussed in detail.

- WIC
- Help Me Grow

Discussion: Staff explained the evaluation procedures will be included in each contract. The evaluation procedures specify specific requirements for each contractor.

D. Gordon asked what the difference is between the policy shared in the earlier item and the evaluation procedures. Staff explained the policy is a high-level document and the evaluation procedures are specific to each contractors.

R. Blanks asked for clarification regarding the evaluation procedures. Staff explained the uniqueness of the indicators and forms are created for each individual agency depending on the scope and strategies.

S. Biegler provided a perspective from the contractor and recommended that some of the language is changed to include that the RBA was created in partnership with the contractor. Dr. Kasirye expressed a concern regarding making the change to the language as an evaluation should be objective and independent. Partnership should be clarified. S. Wirtz explained that getting the **provider's input is critical** part of establishing what is the objective measure.

S. Wirtz further explained that the community indicators are not the best indicators for program success because they are too distal. He urges us to continue to have a participatory process.

J. Katti explained that the partnership was to ensure we were all in understanding of what was being proposed in the scope.

Dr. Kasirye urged that we have an objective evaluation as to ensure we are not picking and choosing what is being evaluated and reported.

S. Wirtz recommends that the consent is changed; the participants should first consent to allow for the coordination of their care, then allowing the use of data for the participation in the evaluation.

ASR presented the RBA for WIC and HMG.

9. Received and Discuss: Family Strength Builder
Action: Reviewed and Discussed.

S. Wirtz wants to ensure the Family Strength Builder is as good as the previous tool. There is concern that the tool is not measuring reality, the crises families are experiencing.

ASR explained that the tool was created in partnership with B&B, B&B staff were concerned that the previous tool was not trauma informed. B&B is in the process of building a protocol tool on how to use the tool with families.

S. Wirtz suggested that ASR review literature of other tools and identify a way on how to implement. He feels the tool is not serving our needs.

K. Clinton explained the training B&B staff has participated in to learn how to administer the tool.

10. Committee Members Comments

a. Miscellaneous

a. **J. Mohammed expressed her gratitude to WIC for the services she's received.**

b. Future Agenda Items/Presentations

Adjourned: 3:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen Garcia-Gomez, Evaluation Manager
First 5 Sacramento Commission