



# Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Subcommittee Meeting

January 9, 2023  
3:30-4:30 p.m.

Join Zoom Meeting  
<https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/92282533636>  
Meeting ID: 922 8253 3636, Phone: +1 669 900 6833

**Committee Members/F5SMC Commissioners:** Louise Rogers (Chair), Naveen Mahmood  
**Grantee Representatives:** Heather Cleary, Peninsula Family Service; Carol Elliott, AbilityPath  
**EVALCORP Representatives:** Kristen Donovan, Sally Lee, Devan Petersen, Marcella Hernandez-Wild  
**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.	Selection of a Subcommittee Chair for Calendar Year 2023	All
4.	Approval of the Minutes of the October 17, 2022 Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee <b>(Attachment 4)</b>	Rogers
5.	Discussion: Equity Indicators Project <b>(Attachments 5A and 5B)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Informant Interview Protocol</li> <li>• Staff Survey</li> </ul>	EVALCORP/ Clark
6.	Update: Other Research & Evaluation Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trauma-Informed Organizational Practices Assessment</li> <li>• Client-Level Data Collection</li> <li>• Partner Organization Social Network Analysis</li> </ul>	Clark
7.	Next Steps	Rogers/All
8.	Adjourn	Rogers
<b>Next Meeting Date(s):</b> March 20, 2023 May 15, 2023		

**Date:** January 9, 2023  
**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On June 11, 2021, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, which rescinded his prior Executive Order N-29-20 and set a date of October 1, 2021 for public agencies to transition back to public meetings held in full compliance with the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 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, the Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission has renewed this finding for the following Committee Meetings: May 16, 2022, July 18, 2022, and October 17, 2022 accordingly.

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 when California's state of emergency ends on February 1, 2023.

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

**WHEREAS**, since September 28, 2021, Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee of the First 5 San Mateo County Commission has renewed this finding for the following Committee Meetings: May 16, 2022, July 18, 2022, and October 17, 2022 accordingly; and

**WHEREAS**, 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, 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 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 Committee 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. 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

October 17, 2022

---

Commissioners Present:	Louise Rogers (Chair), Naveen Mahmood
Commissioners Absent:	Carole Groom
Grantee Representatives:	Heather Cleary, Peninsula Family Service; Carol Elliot, AbilityPath
EVALCORP Representatives:	Kristen Donovan, Sally Lee, Devan Petersen, Marcy Hernandez-Wild
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 agenda was approved with no changes.

**3. Approval of the minutes of the July 18, 2022 Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Subcommittee**

Minutes were approved with no changes.

**4. Presentation: Introduction to EVALCORP and Planned Evaluation Activities**

The group welcomed the EVALCORP team to its first Subcommittee meeting. Representatives from EVALCORP will attend all ECEA Subcommittee meetings for the duration of their contract. Dr. Kristen Donovan and her team introduced themselves and presented on their plans for this year's evaluation activities. Planned activities include:

- Assessing our portfolio's current data collection and evaluation practices and informational needs
- Designing and implementing enhanced protocols around data collection and utilization
- Evaluation and data use capacity building for F5SMC and funded partners
- Support for mixed-method data collection such as focus groups, key informant interviews, and parent storytelling
- Support for quantitative data analysis as needed

EVALCORP also presented preliminary results from our grantee survey on data collection and evaluation practices, which included information about the types of data collected by grantees and their internal capacity to support data analysis and utilization. Initial findings included: A wide diversity of resources available for data collection and analysis across funded agencies; and many different data management systems in use at different agencies, in some cases driven by funder requirements. Discussion of the findings touched on issues including: how some agencies are more reliant on paper forms, others have been able to move towards electronic

data systems; and how it can be challenging in service-oriented sectors and agencies to shift into a focus on metrics and evaluation, especially when resources are constrained.

**5. Discussion: F5SMC Annual Report to F5 California for FY 2021-22**

Jenifer Clark presented a brief overview of the FY 2021-22 F5SMC Annual Report to First 5 California. Of note this year, duplicated services numbers were higher than usual due to a digital outreach campaign by our Help Me Grow program which created nearly 15,000 impressions. This resulted in a larger differential than typical between duplicated and unduplicated service numbers. The group also reviewed some of the evaluation findings included in the Annual Report, such as initial results from the Friday C.A.F.É. Participant Survey and the Early Learning Workforce Study. This report will be presented to the Commission for approval at the Commission Meeting on October 24, 2022. It is due to First 5 California by midnight on October 31, 2022.

**6. Next Steps**

The next meeting of the Early Childhood Evaluation Advisory Committee is to be determined. The 2023 calendar year schedule for Commission and Subcommittees will be voted on by the Commission at its December 2022 meeting.

**First 5 San Mateo County**  
**Equity Indicators Project**  
**Overview and Informed Consent**

**[THE FOLLOWING IS TO BE READ AT THE START OF EACH INTERVIEW]**

First 5 San Mateo County (F5SMC) recently contracted with our firm (EVALCORP) to contribute to First 5 San Mateo County's commitment to equity work. As part of this process, we are collecting information from First 5 San Mateo County-funded organizations to better understand: 1) the needs of children and families in San Mateo County, 2) engagement with diverse families, and 3) goals for the future.

Our interview today is part of this information collection process and will help us understand the diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging priorities of First 5 San Mateo County stakeholders. **[WILL ADD DEFINITION OF DEIB]**. Your input is very important to this process, and we appreciate your time.

Please know that your participation is voluntary.

The interview is expected to take approximately 45 minutes to complete.

With your permission, we would like to record the interview for transcription purposes only and to ensure that we capture everything as said. **Each recording will be held in the strictest confidence and will not be shared with anyone outside of the EVALCORP and F5SMC research and evaluation staff. Also, all the information collected through the interviews will be described in aggregate form – that is, nothing you say will be quoted or attributed to you directly without your explicit permission.** Do we have your permission to record your interview?

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Do you have any questions for me before we begin?

Proceed to begin the interview →

**First 5 San Mateo County – Stakeholder Interview Guide**

Respondent(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

Title(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

---

We are going to ask a series of questions about your First 5 San Mateo County-funded work. The first few questions will focus on learning more about the clients/participants your organization serves and how they are engaged. Lastly, we'll move on to talking about the future of including and supporting diverse families.

**Respondent Background Information**

1. Could you please spend a couple of minutes telling me about your background in terms of:
  - a. Years at your current organization
  - b. Partnership with First 5 San Mateo County?

**Assessment of Client Challenges/Barriers**

2. What are the biggest challenges or barriers children, and their families face when trying to access services in San Mateo County?

**Assessment of Organizational DEIB Practices: Community**

These next questions will be about Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging practices (or DEIB) within your organization.

3. What efforts (or initiatives) are in place at your organization, if any, to include and support children and families from diverse backgrounds? [Efforts could include policies and procedures in place to recruit, engage, and retain families]
  - a. **Probe:** community initiatives e.g., providing services in common community spaces.
4. What pathways, if any, does your organization have to collect community input on services?
  - a. **Probe:**
    - a. What pathways, if any, does your organization have to include community members in leadership (or advisory) roles?

- b. How is community input used to inform decision-making within your organization?  
[Decision-making processes can include: programmatic, resource allocation, data collection and evaluation, and communications]

### Looking Ahead

These next questions will help inform what engagement with families from diverse backgrounds looks like for the next three (3) to five (5) years.

5. What are the top three (3) priorities that will best support children and families from diverse backgrounds and abilities in the next three (3) to five (5) years? [Definition: Diverse backgrounds and abilities may include, racial/ethnic, language, sex/gender, immigration status, geographical, disabilities, socio-economic status, literacy level, underinsured/uninsured, etc.]
  - a. **Probe:**
    - What do you think would be the most effective ways to achieve these priorities?
    - What resources/tools would help you implement these strategies?
    - What challenges do you anticipate with implementing these strategies?

### Assessment of Organizational DEIB Practices: Board and Staff

These next questions will be about Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging practices (or DEIB) for staff at your organization.

6. What pathways, if any, does your organization have to collect staff input on services?
  - a. How is staff input used to inform decision-making within your organization? [Decision-making processes can include: programmatic, resource allocation, data collection and evaluation, and communications]
7. What do you see as the role of your Board regarding issues related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging within your organization and the community you serve?

### Wrap-Up

8. Finally, is there anything else you would like to share that would be helpful for us to know as First 5 San Mateo County moves forward?

Thank you again for your participation. Your feedback is extremely helpful.

## Equity Indicators Project: Board and Staff Survey

[INTRODUCTION AND CONSENT LANGUAGE]

### **Organizational Practices Around Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (Taken/Adapted from the TIOA):**

Include the definitions below in the introduction to this section

- Diversity: Recognizing the value of Individuals with a variety of different backgrounds and personal identities;
- Equity: Fair treatment, opportunity, and advancement for all, while recognizing and accounting for advantages and barriers:
- Inclusion: Every individual feel value respected, supported, and welcome to fully participate as a member of the groups
- Belonging: When individuals feel like they are truly a part of the group

### **Organization and Role**

1. What is the name of the organization where you work? [TEXT BOX]
2. Which of the following best describes your role within your organization?
  - Administrative professional (e.g. front office, HR, finance, IT)
  - Direct service/program staff (e.g care coordinator, family advocate, counselor, clinician, teacher)
  - Program/Project Manager (e.g. supervisor, program planning/oversight, grant management)
  - Executive Leadership (e.g. ED/CEO, department directors)
  - Member of Governing Board/Commission
  - Other (please specify)
3. Do you supervise other staff at your organization? [Yes/No]
4. How long have you worked at this organization?
  - Less than one year
  - One to three years
  - four to six years
  - Seven to nine years
  - 10 years or more

**Demographic Information**

5. Please **select all** races/ethnicities below that apply to you:
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
  - Black/African American
  - East Asian/East Asian American
  - Hispanic/Latinx
  - Middle Eastern/North African
  - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
  - South Asian/South Asian American
  - White/Caucasian
  - Prefer not to state
  - Another race/ethnicity (please specify)
6. Please select the option below that **best reflects** how you identify your race/ethnicity:
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
  - Black/African American
  - East Asian/East Asian American
  - Hispanic/Latinx
  - Middle Eastern/North African
  - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
  - South Asian/South Asian American
  - White/Caucasian
  - Biracial/Multiracial (I have more than one race/ethnicity and this is how I identify)
  - Prefer not to state
  - Another race/ethnicity (please specify)
7. What is/are your preferred language(s) (mark all that apply)?
- Arabic
  - Chinese
  - English
  - Korean
  - Russian
  - Spanish
  - Tagalog
  - Vietnamese
  - Prefer not to state
  - Other (please specify)
8. Do you consider yourself bilingual/multilingual? Yes, no, prefer not to state, comments

9. Do you consider yourself bicultural/multicultural? Yes, no, prefer not to state, comments
10. Are you a first- or second-generation immigrant to the US? That is, were you or either one of your parents born outside the United States? Yes, no, prefer not to state, comments
11. In your own opinion, how well do you speak English? Very well, Well, Not well, Not at all, prefer not to state, comments [This phrasing is adapted from the census]
12. How old are you?
- 25 or younger
  - 26-33
  - 34-41
  - 42-49
  - 50-57
  - 58-65
  - 66 or older
  - Prefer not to state
13. Gender identity (mark all that apply):
- Female
  - Male
  - Transgender
  - Non-binary/genderqueer
  - Prefer not to state
  - Other (please share the gender identity term you prefer)
14. What is your sexual orientation? (check all that apply)
- Asexual
  - Bisexual
  - Gay
  - Straight (Heterosexual)
  - Lesbian
  - Pansexual
  - Queer
  - Questioning or unsure
  - Same-gender loving
  - Prefer not to state
  - An identity not listed above. Please share the orientation you use to describe your sexual orientation:
15. What is the highest level of education that you have reached so far (choose one):
- Less than high school diploma/GED

- High school diploma/GED
- Some college or technical school
- Associate or technical degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Graduate or professional degree
- Don't know
- Prefer not to state
- Other (please specify)

16. What is the zip code of your primary residence? [TEXT BOX; MUST BE NUMERIC AND 5 DIGITS]

17. Please rate how much the following statement sounds like you:

I can really relate to the clients served by my organization because we come from similar backgrounds and have had many similar life experiences. [SIX POINT SCALE; NOT AT ALL LIKE ME TO VERY MUCH LIKE ME]

Comments field: If you feel comfortable sharing, we would appreciate learning more about why you gave this answer.