



## FIRST 5 SAN MATEO COUNTY

### Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Subcommittee Meeting

As authorized by Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-29-20, dated March 17, 2020, the meeting will be held via teleconferencing with members of the Commission attending from separate remote locations. The meeting will be held and live cast from the following location where members of the public shall have the right to observe and offer public comment:

**July 18, 2022**  
**3:30 - 4:30 p.m.**

#### Join Zoom Meeting

Online: <https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/98393899698>

Phone: 1 669 900 6833, Webinar ID: 983 9389 9698

This altered format is in observance of the recommendation by local officials that certain precautions be taken, including social distancing, to address the threat of COVID-19.

**Committee Members/F5SMC Commissioners:** Louise Rogers (Chair), Carole Groom, Naveen Mahmood

**Grantee Representatives:** Heather Cleary, Peninsula Family Service; Carol Elliott, AbilityPath

**Staff:** Kitty Lopez, Michelle Blakely, Jenifer Clark

**Minutes:** Jenifer Clark

### AGENDA

	Item	Presenter
1.	Adopt a resolution finding that, as a result of continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees <b>(Attachments 1A and 1B)</b>	Rogers
2.	Agenda Review & Announcements	Clark/All
3.	Approval of the Minutes of the May 16, 2022 Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee <b>(Attachment 3)</b>	Rogers
4.	Update: Request for Qualifications for Evaluation Consultation and Support Contracting Process	Clark
5.	Discussion: Equity Indicators Project: Key Informant Interview <b>(Attachment 5)</b>	Clark
6.	Next Steps	Rogers/All
7.	Adjourn	Rogers
<b>Next Meeting Date(s):</b> <i>October 17, 2022</i>		

**\* Public Comment:** This item is reserved for persons wishing to address the Commission Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee on any Commission Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee-related matters that are not otherwise on this meeting agenda. Public comments on matters not listed above shall be heard at the time the matter is called.

Persons wishing to address a particular agenda item should speak during that agenda item. Speakers are customarily limited to two minutes, but an extension may be provided to you at the discretion of the Commission Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee Chair.

The identified times are approximate and are intended to serve as a guide to the public and all First 5 meeting attendees regarding the approximate start times for any one section of the Agenda. The actual start and end times for an agenda item may differ from the noted times.

Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Commission Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee meeting are available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members of the Commission. The documents are also available on the First 5 Internet Web site at [www.first5sanmateo.org](http://www.first5sanmateo.org).

Individuals who require special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact Jenifer Clark, by 12 Noon on Friday, July 15, 2022 at [jdclark@smcgov.org](mailto:jdclark@smcgov.org). Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the Commission Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting, the materials related to it, and your ability to comment.

**Date:** July 18, 2022  
**To:** Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee  
**From:** Kitty Lopez, Executive Director  
**Subject:** **Resolution to make findings allowing continued remote meetings under Brown Act**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a resolution finding that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom, meeting in person for the Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

**BACKGROUND:**

On June 11, 2021, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, which rescinded his prior Executive Order N-29-20 and set a date of October 1, 2021 for public agencies to transition back to public meetings held in full compliance with the Brown Act. The original Executive Order provided that all provisions of the Brown Act that required the physical presence of members or other personnel as a condition of participation or as a quorum for a public meeting were waived for public health reasons. If these waivers had fully sunset on October 1, 2021, legislative bodies subject to the Brown Act would have to had contend with a sudden return to full compliance with in-person meeting requirements as they existed prior to March 2020, including the requirement for full physical public access to all teleconference locations from which board members were participating.

On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, a bill that formalizes and modifies the teleconference procedures implemented by California public agencies in response to the Governor's Executive Orders addressing Brown Act compliance during shelter-in-place periods. AB 361 allows a local agency legislative body to continue to use teleconferencing under the same basic rules as provided in the Executive Orders when certain circumstances occur or when certain findings have been made and adopted by the legislative body. Since September 28, 2021, Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission has renewed this finding on May 16, 2022.

AB 361 provides that Brown Act legislative bodies must return to in-person meetings on October 1, 2021, unless they choose to continue with fully teleconferenced meetings because a specific declaration of a state or local health emergency is appropriately made. AB 361 allows legislative bodies to continue to conduct virtual meetings as long

as there is a gubernatorially-proclaimed public emergency in combination with (1) local health official recommendations for social distancing or (2) adopted findings that meeting in person would present an imminent risk to health or safety of attendees. AB 361 became effective on October 1, 2021 and will sunset on January 1, 2024.

AB 361 also requires that, if the state of emergency remains active for more than 30 days, the legislative body must make findings by majority vote every 30 days to continue using the bill's exemption to the Brown Act teleconferencing rules. The findings demonstrate the need for teleconferencing persists due to the nature of the ongoing public health emergency. Effectively, this means that legislative bodies must either agendize a Brown Act meeting once every thirty days to make these findings, or, if a legislative body has not made such findings within the prior 30 days, the legislative body must re-adopt the initial findings if it wishes to conduct a remote meeting.

**DISCUSSION:**

On September 28, 2021, in the interest of public health and safety, as affected by the state of emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19, the Board of Supervisors issued a finding that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and decided to invoke the provisions of AB 361 related to teleconferencing for Board meetings. The Board also strongly encouraged other County legislative bodies to make a similar finding and continue meeting remotely through teleconferencing.

Relevant data suggest that the Omicron variant of COVID-19 is more transmissible than the Delta variant. Indeed, local rates of transmission of COVID-19 continue to remain in the "high" tier as measured by the Centers for Disease Control. Requiring large numbers of individuals to gather, and potentially travel long distances, for in-person public meetings could potentially, and unnecessarily, expose numerous people to COVID-19, further contribute to the ongoing surge in cases caused by the Omicron variant, compound disruptions to our economy, and undermine public health measures during the current State of Emergency.

Accordingly, we recommend that the Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission avail itself of the provisions of AB 361 allowing continuation of online meetings by adopting findings to the effect that conducting in-person meetings would present an imminent risk to the health or safety of attendees. A resolution to that effect and directing staff to take such other necessary or appropriate actions to implement the intent and purposes of the resolution, is attached hereto.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None

**RESOLUTION NO.**

**RESOLUTION FINDING THAT, AS A RESULT OF THE CONTINUING COVID-19 PANDEMIC STATE OF EMERGENCY DECLARED BY GOVERNOR NEWSOM, MEETING IN PERSON FOR THE EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE FIRST 5 SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMISSION WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO THE HEALTH OR SAFETY OF ATTENDEES**

---

**WHEREAS**, on March 4, 2020, pursuant to Government Code section 8550, *et seq.*, Governor Newsom proclaimed a state of emergency related to the COVID-19 novel coronavirus, and subsequently, the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors (“Board”) declared a local emergency related to COVID-19, and the proclamation by the Governor and declaration by the Board remain in effect; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 17, 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended certain provisions in the California Open Meeting law, Government Code section 54950, *et seq.* (the “Brown Act”), related to teleconferencing by local agency legislative bodies, provided certain requirements were met and followed; and

**WHEREAS**, on June 11, 2021, the Governor issued Executive Order N-08-21, which extended provisions of Executive Order N-29-20 that waive otherwise-applicable Brown Act requirements related to remote/teleconference meetings by local agency legislative bodies through September 30, 2021; and

**WHEREAS**, on September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed AB 361 into law, and AB 361 provides that a local agency legislative body subject to the Brown Act may continue to meet without complying with the otherwise-applicable requirements in the Brown Act related to remote/teleconference meetings by local agency legislative

bodies, provided that a state of emergency has been declared and the legislative body determines that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and provided that the legislative body makes such finding at least every thirty (30) days during the term of the declared state of emergency; and

**WHEREAS**, on September 28, 2021, in the interest of public health and safety, as affected by the state of emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19, the Board issued a finding that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and decided to invoke the provisions of AB 361 related to teleconferencing for meetings of the Board; and

**WHEREAS**, since September 28, 2021, Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission has renewed this finding on May 16, 2022; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board also strongly encouraged other County legislative bodies to make a similar finding and continue meeting remotely through teleconferencing; and

**WHEREAS**, relevant data suggest that the Omicron variant of COVID-19 is more transmissible than the Delta variant; and

**WHEREAS**, indeed, local rates of transmission of COVID-19 continue to remain in the “high” tier as measured by the Centers for Disease Control; and

**WHEREAS**, requiring large numbers of individuals to gather, and potentially travel long distances, for in-person public meetings could potentially, and unnecessarily, expose numerous people to COVID-19, further contribute to the ongoing surge in cases

caused by the Omicron variant, compound disruptions to our economy, and undermine public health measures during the current State of Emergency; and

**WHEREAS**, the Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission has an important governmental interest in protecting the health, safety and welfare of those who participate in its meetings; and

**WHEREAS**, in the interest of public health and safety, as affected by the emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19, the Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission finds that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and the Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission will therefore invoke the provisions of AB 361 related to teleconferencing for meetings of the San Mateo County Commission.

**NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED AND ORDERED** that

1. The recitals set forth above are true and correct.
2. The Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission finds that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.
3. Staff is directed to take such other necessary or appropriate actions to implement the intent and purposes of this resolution.

\* \* \* \* \*

## FIRST 5 SAN MATEO COUNTY

### Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Subcommittee

#### Meeting Minutes

May 16, 2022

---

Commissioners Present: Louise Rogers (Chair), Carole Groom, Naveen Mahmood  
Grantee Representative(s): Heather Cleary, Carol Elliot  
Staff: Michelle Blakely, Jenifer Clark, Kitty Lopez

- 1. Resolution regarding meeting remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic State of Emergency**  
The resolution passed.
- 2. Agenda Review & Announcements**  
The group welcomed Dr. Naveen Mahmood to her first subcommittee meeting. The agenda was approved with no changes.
- 3. Approval of the minutes of the May 17, 2021 Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Subcommittee**  
Minutes were approved with no changes.
- 4. Selection of a Subcommittee Chair for Calendar Year 2022**  
Louise Rogers was nominated to continue as Chair, and graciously accepted the role.
- 5. Discussion: Research & Evaluation Activities and Timeline**  
The group reviewed a draft workplan for research and evaluation activities during through FY 2022-23. Planned activities include: ongoing collection of data required by First 5 California; updated data collection and sharing protocols for agencies providing intensive services; review and secondary data analysis of program-specific data, including a qualitative analysis of program narratives; equity indicators at both the client and organizational levels; a program-specific evaluation of the Friday Café model; an updated grantee survey on the impact of COVID-19; and the second administration of the Trauma Informed Organizational Practices Assessment as a part of the second cohort of the Trauma- and Resilience- Informed Systems Initiative (TRISI) project. Committee members discussed the need for communicating well-defined goals for any data sharing and analysis project, and providing the contextual information that will create buy-in among those being asked to collect and share data.

Committee members noted that it might actually be more challenging for grantee organizations to export data from their internal data system than it is for their staff to complete a small amount of double data collection/data entry. As part of its evaluation planning F5SMC will need to ask each organization what will create the least burden on staff.



Committee members recommended that F5SMC find population-level data on the low income residents of our County by age, county region, and race/ethnicity. HPSM or other County departments will have this information.

As regards the Equity Indicators Project, during the data collection efforts it will be helpful to provide a framework about F5SMC is asking these questions, and why the answers matter both to F5SMC and to the organizations who are providing data.

**6. Discussion: Request for Qualifications for Research & Evaluation Support**

The group briefly reviewed the draft Request for Quotes for Evaluation Consultation and Support Services scheduled for release this week. These consultation services will support F5SMC staff in implementing the activities outlined in the evaluation workplan. Committee members felt that this support would be helpful, and discussed the appropriate funding level for these services.

The next meeting of the Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee is scheduled to be held on Monday, July 18<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 pm.

## Equity Indicators Project

### Agency-Level Information and Key Informant Interview:

#### **Agency information:**

*Prepared by F5SMC before the interview*

- Name of agency; location and type of agency
- Names/titles of leadership to participate in interview
- F5SMC-funded programs
  - Services provided
  - Program-level leadership
  - Staff supported
  - Clients served through F5SMC-funded programs

*Data request prior to the interview through agency data management and/or program staff:*

- Org Chart and total number of staff within the organization (or relevant department)
- Clients served, broken out by F5SMC-funded and not:
  - Breakdown by race/ethnicity, preferred languages
  - Zip codes/census tracts where clients live (if available)
  - Socioeconomic information if they have it (income, education levels, employment status, immigration background)
- Waitlist information *[If we can't get this via quantitative data request, we will ask about it in the interview. If we do get some info via the data request, we will go over what we received during the interview to verify accuracy and add nuance to our understanding.]*
  - Is there a waitlist?
  - If so, is the waitlist broken out by client characteristics such as preferred language, services needed, eligibility requirements, etc.?
  - HOW MANY CLIENTS are on the waitlist (broken out by relevant characteristics if possible)? (Could be individuals or families, depending on how tracked/how services are provided)
  - HOW LONG DOES IT TAKE for a client on the waitlist to be enrolled in services? Does this differ by client characteristics (e.g. preferred language, service needed)?

- Board Information: *[If we can't get this via data request, we will ask about it in the interview. If we do get some info via the data request, we will go over what we received during the interview to verify accuracy and add nuance to our understanding.]*
  - Roles and responsibilities
  - Number of members, how members are selected/criteria used, how long they typically serve, etc
  - Current members' history with the organization
  - Current members' life experiences that are relevant to populations targeted/served

### **Topics for Key Informant Interview with Leadership:**

- Review/verify information we have compiled thus far to verify accuracy and allow the leadership to provide any additional information or nuance they would like for us to have.
  - Request detailed org chart (if not received via pre-interview data request). *[If we received a detailed org chart via data request, we will briefly review it during the interview to verify accuracy and add nuance to our understanding.]*
  - Number of staff
  - Board of Directors information
  - Waitlist information
- History/description/current status of any Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) efforts within the organization.
  - In what ways do you see issues related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging playing out in the services your organization provides, and in the lives of the children and families you support?
  - In what ways do you see these issues playing out in the work environment for staff at your agency?
  - In what ways do you see these issues playing out in your organizational policies and procedures?
  - Has your organization ever implemented any formal initiatives focused on DEIB (current or in the past)? If so, please tell us a bit about these efforts.
- How are decisions made within the organization, and who has input/insight into these processes? Are DEIB issues or principles incorporated into various decision-making processes? If so, how?
  - Programmatic decisions
  - Resource allocation decisions
  - Staffing and personnel decisions
  - Data collection and evaluation decisions
  - Communications decisions

- What do you see as the role of your Board in addressing diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging needs within your organization and the community you serve?
- Do clients serve on boards, advisory committees, or have other ways to provide input on how decisions are made (program development, resource development and allocation, client engagement practices, data collection and sharing, etc.)
- Do staff serve on boards, advisory committees, or have other ways to provide input on how decisions are made (program development, resource development and allocation, client engagement practices, data collection and sharing, etc.)
- Overall, how satisfied are you with the way diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging are being incorporated into your organization's service provision and work environment?
  - Do you feel that more needs to be done? Less? Or that it needs be done differently?
  - What would your organization need in order to do this work in the way you think it should be done?