



FIRST 5 ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, December 12, 2013

**First 5 Alameda County
1115 Atlantic Ave.
Alameda, CA 94501
Conference Room A**

9:00 AM – 11:30 AM

Commissioners: *Chair:* Pamela Simms-Mackey M.D., *Vice Chair:* Helen Mendel, CMD, Alex Briscoe, Wilma Chan, Ricky Choi, M.D., Renee Herzfeld, Lori Cox, Deborah Roderick Stark

- 1. Public Comment (for items not listed on the agenda) - Limited to 3 minutes per speaker**

CONSENT

- 2. Approval of Minutes from September 26, 2013**
- 3. FY 2013-14 (1st Quarter) Financial Report**
- 4. FY 2013-14 (1st Quarter) Investment Report**
- 5. Salary Guidelines Revision Recommendation**

INFRASTRUCTURE

- 6. Community Stories**
- 7. 2014 COLA Recommendation**

PROGRAM

- 8. Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) Presentation**
- 9. Community Stories**
- 10. F5AC Annual Report to First 5 California**
- 11. State Commission and Association Updates**
- 12. Legislation and Public Policy Updates**
- 13. Community Stories**

MISCELLANEOUS

- 14. Staff Announcements**
- 15. Communication from Commissioners**
- 16. Adjournment**

First 5 Alameda County 15th Anniversary Celebration



FIRST 5 ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMISSION MINUTES

Thursday, September 26, 2013

**First 5 Alameda County
1115 Atlantic Ave.
Alameda, CA 94501
Conference Room A**

9:00 AM – 11:30 AM

Commissioners: *Chair:* Pamela Simms-Mackey M.D., *Vice Chair:* Helen Mendel, CMD, Alex Briscoe, Wilma Chan, Ricky Choi, M.D., Renee Herzfeld, Deborah Roderick Stark

Meeting called to order 9:08 AM

1. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

2. FY 2012-13 Financial Audit Presentation

Mark Friedman, CEO stated that the audit firm of Patel & Associates will present the audit. Mr. Friedman introduced Mr. Ramesh Patel, Principal Auditor to present.

Mr. Patel stated that the audit is still in draft format until the Commission approves the report being presented today. He stated that the difference for this year's audit is that the single audit was combined with the financial audit. He stated that the report is very standard and in alignment with previous years, both practices were expectable and we were able to complete the single audit.

He stated that in general First 5 had complied with the generally accepted accounting principles. He stated that the audit was of clean opinion, there were no findings and the major programs for the single audit were identified and they didn't have any findings.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the FY 2012-13 Financial Audit upon motion by Commissioner Herzfeld, seconded by Commissioner Choi and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed).

3. Approval of Minutes from May 23, 2013

Commission Action: The Commission approved the May 23, 2013 minutes upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Choi and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed).

4. Early Connections Presentation

Janis Burger, Deputy Director stated that she is really pleased to introduce Margie Padilla, Early Connections Project Director. Ms. Padilla presented to the Commission the Early Connections program.

5. Legislation and Public Policy Updates

Mark Friedman introduced Liz Gregor, Contracts Manager who oversees the Tobacco Education Policy implementation with funded agency partners. Ms. Gregor provided an update of the tobacco education policy.

Vice Chair Mendel thanked Ms. Gregor for the update. She stated that this is obviously a project that is ongoing and that she is happy to see all of the things First 5 is doing.

6. Contract Authorizations

Ms. Burger presented the Contract Authorizations to the Commission. She stated that the Commission is being asked to approve the following contracts:

Commissioner Chan asked for clarification on the conflict of interest. She stated that her interpretation of conflict of interest would allow her to vote on the majority of these contracts. Mr. Friedman stated that this has come up over the years and our Attorney James Harrison has always advised us to air on the more conservative side and to recuse yourself if you are not sure.

- BANDTEC

Commission Action: The Commission approved the BANDTEC contract upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Stark and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed).

- Oakland Parents Together

Commission Action: The Commission approved the Oakland Parents Together contract upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Stark and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed).

- Lotus Bloom

Commission Action: The Commission approved the Lotus Bloom contract upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Stark and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed).

- Applied Survey Research

Commission Action: The Commission approved the Applied Survey Research contract upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Stark and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed).

- Ruby's Place (formerly known as Emergency Shelter Program)

Commission Action: The Commission approved the above Ruby's Place contract upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Briscoe and unanimously carried (6 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention with Commissioner Herzfeld abstaining from the vote).

- Ann Martin Center

Commission Action: The Commission approved the above Ann Martin Center contract upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Stark and unanimously carried (6 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention with Commissioner Briscoe abstaining from the vote).

- Youth Uprising

Commission Action: The Commission approved the above Youth Uprising upon contract motion by Commissioner Stark, seconded by Commissioner Choi and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions with Chair Simms-Mackey and Commissioner Briscoe abstaining from the vote).

- Children's Hospital & Research Center at Oakland

Commission Action: The Commission approved the above Children's Hospital & Research Center at Oakland upon contract motion by Commissioner Stark, seconded by Commissioner Choi and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions with Chair Simms-Mackey and Commissioner Briscoe abstaining from the vote).

- Family Resource Network

Commission Action: The Commission approved the above Family Resource Network upon contract motion by Commissioner Stark, seconded by Commissioner Choi and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions with Chair Simms-Mackey and Commissioner Herzfeld abstaining from the vote).

7. Biennial Conflict of Interest Code Approval

Mr. Friedman stated that this is a housekeeping item. He stated that every year we review the conflict of interest code.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the Biennial Conflict of Interest Code Approval upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Choi and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed.)

8. ACERA 414(h)(2) Pick-up Resolution

Mr. Friedman stated that ACERA legal counsel has requested that our Commission adopt the attached resolution which reaffirms and restates our practice of treating should First 5 Alameda County wish to continue these practices. If adopted, the effective date of this resolution will be January 1, 2014.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the above ACERA 414 (h) (2) upon motion by Commissioner Herzfeld, seconded by Commissioner Stark and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed).

9. Foundation Collaboration Update

Mr. Friedman stated that for the past year we have been working to finalize strategic collaboration agreements with the San Francisco Foundation and the Philanthropic Ventures Foundation. These two institutions were selected after a Request for Proposal process. Among the original reasons for seeking these strategic partnerships was the desire to ensure that money in our Sustainability Fund is available for serving children in Alameda County and to leverage funds placed with these foundations to attract additional philanthropic support for First 5 Alameda County programs.

He stated that now that the state budget is in much better shape and after the courts overturned AB 99, there is much less potential for attempting to redirect local First 5 funds. But we are still very interested in leveraging our funds to attract more philanthropic investments to expand and/or sustain our programs.

He stated that during our recent audit the field auditor, Lilian Zhu of Patel & Associates, said that since the proposed agreements with the two foundations are subject to termination and the return of First 5 funds, we cannot remove the money from our books. Further she said that any funds placed with the foundations will have to be subject to our Investment Policy. This is not a problem with Philanthropic Ventures, but San Francisco Foundation contracts with very successful money managers who invest in equities, among other vehicles.

He stated that the recommendation to the Commission is to proceed with the investment of \$5 million with the Philanthropic Ventures Foundation and to hold off on the \$5 million investment with the San Francisco Foundation until we have a clearer picture of how the leadership changes there will impact our collaboration. He stated that he would also like to get further clarification on how the proposed investment fees will be handled if San Francisco Foundation is required to conform with our Investment Policy.

Commissioner Briscoe stated that Alameda County has had a really fruitful process with Philanthropic Ventures Foundation. He stated that they have had a long standing relationship with them and that he is more than comfortable working with them.

Commissioner Stark added that there are enough questions regarding the San Francisco Foundation that we should hold back until we have more information.

10. State Commission & Association Updates

Mr. Friedman stated that the Executive Director of First 5 California is still working on their strategic plan. He stated that basically they wanted input from staff. They will bring their plan to their Commission in October for a vote with three focus areas, the first area is on public policy, and the second area is to work on fund development and the third is messaging. He stated that George Albertson is very committed to the messaging project. He stated that it has been challenging to be able to synthesize the variations in what First 5 does. To the public and most legislatures there's only one First 5 so any messaging needs to be coordinated and have a common theme and whenever possible have a common goal.

- **Raising California Together**

Mr. Friedman stated that this is a coalition that has formed within the last few months to increase awareness and to demand leadership. He stated that it since it started many other groups have joined, and they have asked him to be Chair. So far there was one press conference in Los Angeles and the theme was 'Preschool not Prisons'. He stated that this can augment other efforts like the Children's Movement and all such efforts at a time when one billion dollars has been cut from the stated childcare budget over the last 5 years and, when the state was in a better position the governor didn't reinstate that money.

Vice Chair Mendel stated that it is really in our best interest to be at the table. She stated that we can't do enough to publicize what's been going on with the stated budget. She suggested we need to bring in a few media people to join this group that are regular followers of children's issues.

Commissioner Choi asked why this group is deciding to organize now and what are the immediate and then long term goals.

Mr. Friedman stated that the reason it's being formed now is because of the disappointment that the legislature's request to reinstate the childcare funds did not go through. He stated that other states have developed statewide systems and our Governors are making every effort to be prudent fiscally. He stated that goals are still being developed but it is important to make every effort to get into the budget discussions early on in the process.

Vice Chair Mendel stated that we need to have some visibility in the fall and get commitments from champions and get some interaction with the governor. She suggested hosting a legislative breakfast.

Commissioner Chan asked who some of the groups are and are there any conflicts with any other organizations that rally for Children. Is the attitude around this cooperative? Mr. Friedman stated this is a start and they would like for the Teachers Association and Resource and Referrals to get involved and the key is that these efforts are coordinated.

Commissioner Herzfeld suggested the Child Care Planning Council. Commissioner Stark asked if the Children's Movement and Early Education California are involved.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the above Raising California Together upon motion by Vice Chair Mendel, seconded by Commissioner Choi and unanimously carried (7 in favor, 0 opposed).

11. Staff Announcements

Jeff Gillenkirk announced on behalf of Kevin Bremond the launch of the Fatherhood Corps, a program training providers to work with providers who work with fathers. He stated that the need is there and the impact on families and children of not having a father in the home is great. He stated that they'll be discussing topics such as meeting men where there at and overcoming some of the obstacles that fathers are having.

12. Communication from Commissioners

Commissioner Chan voiced her concern and asked whether we've had any discussions recently about how Transitional Kindergarten (TK) is going. She stated that California has gone through these various cycles on what it is to teach kids. She's concern that the discrepancy is going to be more and more evident. She stated that she has a grandchild who just started kindergarten.

Erin Freschi, Program Administrator stated that transitional kindergarten really varies from school to school. Basically the common corps standard is that now teachers get to teach the way they want. She stated that there's so much variation, some district have been really great about providing more engagement.

Commissioner Choi added that he also has a child in TK and that things have not been communicated very well.

Ms. Freschi stated that TK is really an anomaly for people. It's going to serve 120k statewide at capacity. It is not going to replace early childhood. It's an option for some families but not all. It really varies. She added that we also haven't seen the outcomes.

Chair Simms-Mackey stated that in her practice she's seen a lot of parents reporting that their children are not doing well. She stated that this is because the standards are so high. She stated that there is a lot of variation out there and it can be detrimental to the kids and the families.

Commissioner Herzfeld stated that she's wondering if there's any data or anecdotal knowledge of expectations and what's in high performing districts versus lower performing, and are there any patterns.

13. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:52.



To: First 5 Alameda County Commission

From: Mark R Rasiah, Financial Controller

Date: December 12, 2013

Subject: First Quarter Financial Report for July 1 – September 30, 2013

REQUESTED ACTION

To review the Financial Report for the first three months of FY2013-14.

BACKGROUND

This narrative and the attached statements report Revenues and Expenses for the period July 1 – September 30, 2013. With 25% of the fiscal year complete, it is reasonable to expect both revenues and expenses to be at 25% of the budget projection, subject to timing lags. While this is the case with most of the budgeted items, material exceptions are noted below.

Revenue

As of September 30, total first quarter revenues were \$4.3m, or 25% of the revenue projection for the year. Of this amount:

- Tobacco Tax receipts were in line with budget expectations for the first three months of the fiscal year, and were nearly equal to the amount received in the corresponding period in the prior year.
- Inter-agency Income was budgeted at \$1.36 million, all of which is expected to be received in the next three quarters of the fiscal year.
- The Federal Grants Budget represents the reimbursable amount from the Race To The Top Early Learning Challenge Grant, from the CA Department of Education. We have received a quarter of the funds budgeted for the current fiscal year.
- A Private Grant from the Long Foundation to expand some school readiness sites was budgeted, and all funds were received during the quarter.

- Revenues for Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) were budgeted at \$0.7m for FY 2013-14, in keeping with prior years. The reimbursement is based on expenditures incurred in FY 2012-13 and the invoicing is expected to be completed in February 2014.
- Investment revenue of nearly \$0.12m represents nearly 24% of conservative budget projections.
- Sustainability funds from the First 5 Alameda County Sustainability Fund reserve will be used to bridge the gap between actual revenues and expenses at year-end, to the extent authorized by the Commission. None was needed in the first quarter of this year.

Expenses

At \$1.9m, total Expenditure for the quarter was 10% of the budgeted amount of \$18.8m. This is lower than the amount for the corresponding period last year.

Most line item expenditures are tracking well within or close to 25% of budget. Grant payments to Community Grantees are made according to a schedule of payments. At the end of the first quarter nearly 36% of scheduled payments had been made. General Expenses are much lower than in previous years, primarily due to the absence of monthly lease payments of nearly \$60,000 for the old office building. Costs from the Infrastructure Budget will be allocated to all programs at year-end and will reflect a more complete picture of program costs at that point.

Summary

Revenues are very much in line with the progression of the fiscal year. Expenses are expected to trend closer to budget as the year progresses.

Fiscal Impact

None.

REQUESTED ACTION

To review the Financial Report for the first three months of FY2013-14.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Mark R Rasiah ,
Financial Controller

Mark Friedman, Chief Executive Officer

First 5 Alameda County
Revenue and Available Funds
For the Period July 1, 2013 - September 30, 2013

Revenues	Budget	Actual	Variance	Percentage Received
Prop 10 Tobacco Tax	13,037,150	3,535,848	(9,501,302)	27%
Interagency Income				
- ACBHCS Early Connections(SAMHSA)	278,000	0	(278,000)	0%
- ACPHD Project LAUNCH (SAMHSA)	608,237	0	(608,237)	0%
- ACPHD ECCHANGE Hosting & Mtce	86,674	0	(86,674)	0%
- SART Linkage Line	250,461	0	(250,461)	0%
- First 5 Contra Costa	139,072	0	(139,072)	0%
Total Income from Alameda Co. Agencies	1,362,444	0	(1,362,444)	0%
Grants				
Federal- Race To The Top	607,000	151,750	455,250	25%
State - CARES PLUS	300,000	0	(300,000)	0%
Private - Long Foundation	450,000	445,500	(4,500)	99%
Total Grants	1,357,000	597,250	150,750	44%
Fiscal Leveraging				
MAA	700,000	0	(700,000)	0%
Total Fiscal Leveraging	700,000	0	(700,000)	0%
Investment Revenue	500,000	120,000	(380,000)	24%
Misc.Income	17,000	17,380	380	102%
TOTAL REVENUE	16,973,594	4,270,478	(11,792,616)	25%
Available Funds				
Sustainability Funds	1,826,406	0	(1,826,406)	0%
TOTAL REVENUES & AVAILABLE FUNDS	18,800,000	4,270,478	(14,529,522)	23%

First 5 Alameda County
Budget Vs Actual Expenses
For the Period July 1, 2013 - September 30, 2013

Expenditures	Budget	Actuals	Variance	Percentage Spent
Personnel Costs	6,699,190	1,030,837	(5,668,353)	15%
Contracts	8,357,981	0	(8,357,981)	0%
Grants	2,065,000	744,043	(1,320,957)	36%
Professional Services Contracts	179,250	11,995	(167,255)	7%
Program Operating Costs	972,449	49,678	(922,771)	5%
Infrastructure Costs	526,130	100,343	(425,787)	19%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	18,800,000	1,936,896	(16,863,104)	10%



To: First 5 Alameda County Commission
From: Mark R Rasiah, Financial Controller
Date: December 12, 2013
Subject: First Quarter Investment Report, July 1 – September 30, 2013

REQUESTED ACTION

To review the Investment Report for the first three months of FY2013-14.

BACKGROUND OF ACTIVITIES

The investment objectives of the First 5 Alameda County Agency are first, to provide safety of principal to ensure the preservation of capital in the overall portfolio; second, to provide sufficient liquidity to meet all requirements that may be reasonably anticipated; and third, to earn a commensurate rate of return consistent with the constraints imposed by the safety and liquidity objectives.

The performance objective of the First 5 Alameda County Agency portfolio is to earn a total rate of return that exceeds the total rate of return on a market benchmark index of 1-5 Year Government securities.

In 2005-06, First 5 Alameda County transferred \$34,000,000 from the Sustainability Fund held by the Alameda County Treasurer's investment pool to outside money managers. This report summarizes the activity and status of the investment portfolio as of September 30, 2012.

PORTFOLIO HIGHLIGHTS

The Investment Report shows the performance of funds that are invested in the Alameda County pool and with two money managers, Cutwater Asset Management and Chandler Asset Management. At the end of the last fiscal year, the total market value of the funds with Cutwater and Chandler was \$30,029,093. There were no withdrawals during the first quarter ending September 30th and the market value of the portfolio was \$30,169,867 at a cost of \$30,388,266.

Recent economic indicators show that the economic recovery is still slow and that the unemployment rate is likely to continue at current levels for the foreseeable future. Treasury rates increased over the July – September quarter, and the resultant yield curve flattened slightly, with long term rates remaining stable. The yield curve is expected to remain relatively steep for the foreseeable future, since the rates on long term Treasuries continue to be higher than the short term ones. The Federal Reserve Bank continues to maintain its federal funds target rate between zero and 0.25% and has signaled its intentions to maintain this posture through the middle of 2014 aimed at reducing long term borrowing costs for consumers and businesses to support economic growth. Despite this challenging economic environment, the portfolio managed to yield a little over 0.5 % on an annualized basis.

INVESTMENT REPORT

Investment Income

Investment income is primarily derived from interest or yield payments on securities held in the investment portfolio. Typically, interest income from each security is received semi-annually. The money managers buy, sell and exchange securities consistent with the First 5 Alameda County Investment Policy in order to optimize overall yields.

Net investment earnings for the three months ended September 30, 2012 totaled \$120,000 from the money managers and \$0 from the Alameda County Treasurer's pool – a slight decline from the corresponding period last year.

Investment Fees

Fees include those levied by the money managers (Cutwater and Chandler) and the fees levied by the account custodian (Union Bank of California). The total fees paid during this period were \$9,898, less than the \$11,000 paid last year.

Investment Activity

The Investment Activity shows all transactions affecting our portfolio. A purchase of securities increases the value of the portfolio whereas the sale of securities decreases the total portfolio value and may result in a gain or loss on the transaction.

Market Value and Unrealized Gains and Losses

There was an unrealized loss of \$218,399 at the end of September. This is determined by comparing the Cost and the Market Value of the portfolio on that date. It implies that a loss would have been realized, had the portfolio been liquidated on September 30th. Since the portfolio was not liquidated, this section is for informational purposes only. Government entities are legally required (GASB 31) to report unrealized gains and losses on investments.

Yield Benchmarks

Investment yields are compared to the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) yields in order to benchmark investment manager performance. Cutwater and Chandler’s yields (0.73% and 0.53%, respectively) are higher than the LAIF benchmark (.26%) for the same period.

The Alameda County Treasury Investment Pool is net of fees and has yielded a 0.24% annualized cash basis rate of return for the month of September.

FISCAL IMPACT

The total realized investment earnings at the end of the 1st quarter was \$129,898.

REQUESTED ACTION

To review the Investment report.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Mark R Rasiah,
Financial Controller

Mark Friedman,
Chief Executive Officer

**First 5 Alameda County
Combined Holdings Report
As Of September 30, 2013**

<u>Holder</u>	<u>Asset Name</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Investment Type</u>	<u>S & P</u>	<u>Moody</u>
CUTWATER	FHLB	\$ 180,000.00	\$ 180,844	\$ 180,526	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	FHLB	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 499,300	\$ 499,850	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	FHLB	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 305,976	\$ 299,208	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	FHLMC	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,031,000	\$ 1,006,520	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	FHLMC	\$ 3,500,000.00	\$ 3,471,563	\$ 3,502,940	Other Fed Govt	AA=	Aaa
CUTWATER	FHLMC	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,002,560	Other Fed Govt	AA+	AAA
CUTWATER	FHLMC	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 501,940	\$ 501,175	Other Fed Govt	AA+	AAA
CUTWATER	FHLMC	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 498,375	\$ 488,390	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	FNMA	\$ 325,000.00	\$ 328,413	\$ 325,478	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	FNMA	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,002,910	\$ 992,410	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	FNMA	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,002,910	\$ 992,410	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	FNMA	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 501,455	\$ 496,205	Other Fed Govt	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	Colgate Palmolive NT	\$ 910,000.00	\$ 930,511	\$ 924,451	Corporate Bonds	AA-	Aa3
CUTWATER	Johnson & Johnson SR	\$ 791,000.00	\$ 833,168	\$ 821,026	Corporate Bonds	AAA	Aaa
CUTWATER	IBM	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 260,835	\$ 257,433	Corporate Bonds	AAA	Aaa
CUTWATER	Merck & Co Inc	\$ 720,000.00	\$ 797,918	\$ 762,026	Corporate Bonds	AAA	Aa1
CUTWATER	NY Life Global Bonds	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 254,074	\$ 250,725	Corporate Bonds	AAA	Aaa

**First 5 Alameda County
Combined Holdings Report
As Of September 30, 2013**

<u>Holder</u>	<u>Asset Name</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Investment Type</u>	<u>S & P</u>	<u>Moody</u>
CUTWATER	NY Life Global Bonds	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,016,296	\$ 1,002,900	Corporate Bonds	AA+	Aaa
CUTWATER	Fed Govt MMKT	\$ 695,641.40	\$ 713,576	\$ 695,641	Money Market Funds		
CHANDLER	FAMC	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 161,227	\$ 159,507	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AAA
CHANDLER	FFCB BDS	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 160,000	\$ 157,363	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AAA
CHANDLER	FFCB BDS	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 80,946	\$ 82,217	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AAA
CHANDLER	FFCB BDS	\$ 460,000.00	\$ 458,882	\$ 465,474	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AAA
CHANDLER	FFCB BDS	\$ 315,000.00	\$ 318,424	\$ 315,394	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FFCB BDS	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 158,349	\$ 152,061	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AAA
CHANDLER	FFCB BDS	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 59,966	\$ 59,958	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FFCB BDS	\$ 270,000.00	\$ 268,134	\$ 270,311	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AAA
CHANDLER	FFCB BDS	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 249,783	\$ 250,005	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AAA
CHANDLER	FHLB Note	\$ 320,000.00	\$ 321,139	\$ 321,450	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLB Note	\$ 320,000.00	\$ 320,646	\$ 318,669	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLB Note	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 93,744	\$ 93,467	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLB Note	\$ 310,000.00	\$ 318,680	\$ 316,299	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLB Note	\$ 315,000.00	\$ 322,306	\$ 317,583	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLB Note	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 156,219	\$ 153,818	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+

**First 5 Alameda County
Combined Holdings Report
As Of September 30, 2013**

<u>Holder</u>	<u>Asset Name</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Investment Type</u>	<u>S & P</u>	<u>Moody</u>
CHANDLER	FHLB Note	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 160,147	\$ 159,597	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLB Note	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 297,783	\$ 299,208	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 140,000.00	\$ 150,141	\$ 144,971	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 105,000.00	\$ 108,745	\$ 108,799	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 200,000.00	\$ 207,133	\$ 207,236	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 116,447	\$ 115,280	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 200,000.00	\$ 211,722	\$ 209,600	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 51,766	\$ 51,319	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 113,885	\$ 112,901	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 325,000.00	\$ 320,466	\$ 326,008	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 310,000.00	\$ 312,875	\$ 312,114	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FHLMC NTS	\$ 315,000.00	\$ 304,561	\$ 306,949	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FNMA	\$ 65,000.00	\$ 66,771	\$ 65,899	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AAA
CHANDLER	FNMA NTS	\$ 315,000.00	\$ 316,599	\$ 319,571	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FNMA NTS	\$ 125,000.00	\$ 124,709	\$ 124,669	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FNMA NTS	\$ 320,000.00	\$ 322,277	\$ 323,587	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FNMA NTS	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 150,130	\$ 148,512	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+

**First 5 Alameda County
Combined Holdings Report
As Of September 30, 2013**

<u>Holder</u>	<u>Asset Name</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Investment Type</u>	<u>S & P</u>	<u>Moody</u>
CHANDLER	FNMA NTS	\$ 155,000.00	\$ 155,134	\$ 153,462	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FNMA NTS	\$ 310,000.00	\$ 306,984	\$ 304,553	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FNMA NTS	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 151,425	\$ 150,012	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	FNMA NTS	\$ 315,000.00	\$ 305,597	\$ 306,035	Other Fed Govt	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	Apple Inc Bonds	\$ 190,000.00	\$ 188,225	\$ 183,018	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A+
CHANDLER	Bank of New York Mellon	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 122,385	\$ 116,445	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A+
CHANDLER	Bank of New York Mellon	\$ 105,000.00	\$ 116,822	\$ 111,152	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A
CHANDLER	Berkshire Hathaway Fin	\$ 220,000.00	\$ 220,663	\$ 228,061	Corporate Bonds	Aa2	AA+
CHANDLER	Berkshire Hathaway Fin	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,121	\$ 41,466	Corporate Bonds	Aa2	AA+
CHANDLER	Black Rocking NTS	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 114,897	\$ 113,838	Corporate Bonds	A1	A+
CHANDLER	Black Rocking NTS	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 52,226	\$ 51,745	Corporate Bonds	A1	A+
CHANDLER	CHAIT 212-A5 A5	\$ 165,000.00	\$ 165,000	\$ 164,941	Corporate Bonds	NR	AAA
CHANDLER	Chevron Corp	\$ 55,000.00	\$ 54,437	\$ 54,211	Corporate Bonds	Aa1	AA
CHANDLER	Chevron Corp	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 29,693	\$ 29,570	Corporate Bonds	Aa1	AA
CHANDLER	Chevron Corp	\$ 58,000.00	\$ 57,407	\$ 57,168	Corporate Bonds	Aa1	AA
CHANDLER	Chevron Corp	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 11,877	\$ 11,828	Corporate Bonds	Aa1	AA
CHANDLER	COCA-Colants	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 99,840	\$ 100,396	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A+

**First 5 Alameda County
Combined Holdings Report
As Of September 30, 2013**

<u>Holder</u>	<u>Asset Name</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Investment Type</u>	<u>S & P</u>	<u>Moody</u>
CHANDLER	COCA-Colants	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 99,840	\$ 100,396	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A+
CHANDLER	Disney Walt Co	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 161,306	\$ 151,248	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	Ebay Inc	\$ 125,000.00	\$ 124,781	\$ 127,395	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	GECC NTS	\$ 70,000.00	\$ 76,848	\$ 72,409	Corporate Bonds	Aa2	AA+
CHANDLER	GECC NTS	\$ 165,000.00	\$ 181,141	\$ 170,678	Corporate Bonds	Aa2	AA+
CHANDLER	General Elec Cap Corp	\$ 55,000.00	\$ 60,380	\$ 56,893	Corporate Bonds	Aa2	AA+
CHANDLER	Google Inc	\$ 130,000.00	\$ 136,148	\$ 134,732	Corporate Bonds	Aa2	AA-
CHANDLER	HAROT	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 249,987	\$ 249,863	Corporate Bonds	Aa2	AA-
CHANDLER	IBM Corp	\$ 210,000.00	\$ 210,750	\$ 206,405	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A+
CHANDLER	Intel Corp	\$ 190,000.00	\$ 190,566	\$ 187,545	Corporate Bonds	A1	A+
CHANDLER	John Deere	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 34,978	\$ 35,193	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	John Deere	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 124,813	\$ 122,804	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	JDOT (John Deere) Pass Through	\$ 155,000.00	\$ 154,995	\$ 154,983	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	JDOT (John Deere) Pass Through	\$ 65,000.00	\$ 64,991	\$ 65,141	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	JP Morgan Chase & Co	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 112,698	\$ 113,927	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A+
CHANDLER	JP Morgan Chase & Co	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 122,943	\$ 124,284	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A
CHANDLER	Occidental Petroleum	\$ 155,000.00	\$ 158,694	\$ 156,421	Corporate Bonds	A1	A

**First 5 Alameda County
Combined Holdings Report
As Of September 30, 2013**

<u>Holder</u>	<u>Asset Name</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Investment Type</u>	<u>S & P</u>	<u>Moody</u>
CHANDLER	Pfizer	\$ 190,000.00	\$ 187,004	\$ 188,463	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	Praxair	\$ 85,000.00	\$ 97,347	\$ 89,564	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	TAOT (Toyota Pass Thru)	\$ 155,000.00	\$ 154,985	\$ 154,746	Corporate Bonds	A2	A
CHANDLER	United Tech Corp	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 14,987	\$ 15,262	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	A+
CHANDLER	Walmart Stores Inc	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 109,899	\$ 107,543	Corporate Bonds	Aa2	AA
CHANDLER	Wells Fargo	\$ 175,000.00	\$ 182,674	\$ 183,958	Corporate Bonds	Aa3	AA-
CHANDLER	Wells Fargo	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 52,193	\$ 52,560	Corporate Bonds	A1	A+
CHANDLER	Bank of Tokyo Mitsubishi	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 299,762	\$ 299,982	Negotiable CD's	P-1	A-1
CHANDLER	Toyota Motor Cred Discounted Comm Paper	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 299,594	\$ 299,811	Commercial Paper	P-1	A-1+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 104,739	\$ 103,672	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 104,240	\$ 103,211	U.S. Treasury	Aaa`	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 205,000.00	\$ 213,691	\$ 211,583	U.S. Treasury	Aaa`	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 117,293	\$ 114,907	U.S. Treasury	TSY	TSY
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 190,000.00	\$ 202,597	\$ 198,476	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 205,000.00	\$ 209,563	\$ 208,797	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 105,000.00	\$ 107,337	\$ 106,945	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 315,000.00	\$ 318,102	\$ 317,930	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+

**First 5 Alameda County
Combined Holdings Report
As Of September 30, 2013**

<u>Holder</u>	<u>Asset Name</u>	<u>Shares</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Investment Type</u>	<u>S & P</u>	<u>Moody</u>
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 320,000.00	\$ 322,626	\$ 320,774	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 330,000.00	\$ 326,740	\$ 323,786	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 248,975	\$ 249,980	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	U.S. Treasury Notes	\$ 310,000.00	\$ 305,036	\$ 303,413	U.S. Treasury	Aaa	AA+
CHANDLER	Federated Govt Oblig	\$ 34,626.25	\$ 34,626	\$ 34,626	Money Market Funds		
TOTAL			\$ 30,388,267	\$ 30,169,867			

**First 5 Alameda County
Investment Report
For the Period July 1, 2013 - September 30, 2013**

	<u>Union Bank</u>	<u>Cutwater Asset Management</u>	<u>Chandler Asset Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
INVESTMENT INCOME:				
Interest Received		61,432	68,466	129,898
Income from Alameda County Treasurer				0
Total Investment Earnings				<u>129,898</u>
Investment Fees Paid	(1,562)	(4,201)	(4,135)	(9,898)
Net Investment Income (Net of Fees)				<u>120,000</u>
INVESTMENT ACTIVITY:				
Portfolios - Cost Basis at 7/1/2013		15,064,940	15,214,038	30,278,978
Purchases		1,176,436	2,021,168	3,197,603
Sales		(575,212)	(1,657,574)	(2,232,785)
Maturities		(535,100)	(320,430)	(855,530)
Cash Disbursement		0	0	0
Net Cash Management		0	0	0
Portfolios - Cost Basis at 9/30/2013		<u>15,131,064</u>	<u>15,257,202</u>	<u>30,388,266</u>
COST VS. MARKET VALUE:				
Portfolios at Market 09/30/2013		15,001,874	15,167,993	30,169,867
Portfolios at Cost 09/30/2013		15,131,064	15,257,202	30,388,266
Unrealized Gain (Loss) at 09/30/2013		(129,190)	(89,209)	(218,399)
YIELD AND BENCHMARKS:				
Cutwater Asset Management (current yield)				0.73%
Chandler Asset Management (current yield)				0.53%
Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)				0.26%
Alameda County Treasurer's Pool				0.24%
1-5 Government Index (total rate of return)				0.51%



MEMORANDUM

TO: First 5 Alameda County Commission
FROM: Janet Basta, Human Resources Administrator
DATE: December 12, 2013
RE: Employee Salary Guidelines Revision

REQUESTED ACTION

That the Commission review the following proposed revisions to the First 5 Alameda County Employee Salary Guidelines.

BACKGROUND

First 5 Alameda County has Employee Salary Guidelines to guide and systematize the setting of salaries and granting of salary increases. The salary scale was developed in 2003, in preparation for First 5's separation from Alameda County. The 2003 salary ranges were developed based on a market-based salary survey that compared First 5 job descriptions and salaries with comparable positions in the Bay Area.

To ensure that First 5 salaries remain competitive, an updated market-based analysis was commissioned in December 2006 and was completed in May, 2007 by Social Entrepreneurs, Inc. (SEI), the same vendor that conducted the original survey. Revisions to the classification levels, salary ranges, and general document updating was done and approved by the Commission in June 2007. The guidelines were revised in March, 2011; no changes to the salary ranges were made as part of those revisions as the labor market had been relatively stable during that time period.

We are not recommending any changes to the salary ranges at this time as:

1. The labor market, at least in the sectors related to our work, has remained relatively flat, and we have not seen evidence that comparable positions in other organizations are compensated at rates significantly higher than what we are able to offer.

2. We have not experienced problems recruiting qualified, talented staff at our current salary levels, and our guidelines allow for some flexibility in determining starting salaries for specific positions when needed.
3. As our revenues decline, we are moving towards a more conservative approach to salary administration to help in long term cost controls.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO EMPLOYEE SALARY GUIDELINES

1. General document clean up, reformatting changes, updates to terminology, and clarification of procedures that do not affect policy (throughout).
2. Revision of the Job Classification System section describing our salary levels (page 3-4) to reflect changes in organizational structure, programmatic needs, and the current staffing structure. The primary change was the consolidation of the two sets of ranges (general and Family Support Services) into one. The Family Support Services II range was also expanded with a Manger II component to include a stronger focus on supervisory duties. The table on page 2 was updated to reflect the consolidation as well as current job titles.
3. Updates to the sections outlining procedures for determining the Starting Salary for an Employee (page 5) and Job Classifications (page 9) to support salary administration in a mature organization with declining resources, and to clarify and allow for more flexibility in addressing individual situations.
4. Change to the Revision of Salary Ranges section (page 10) to set a revision schedule of every 3-4 years instead of every 2-3 years, consistent with our more conservative salary administration approach.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is minimal fiscal impact.

RECOMMENDATION

To review and approve the following revisions to the First 5 Alameda County Employee Salary Guidelines.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Janet Basta,
Human Resources Administrator

Mark Friedman,
Chief Executive Officer



PURPOSE AND GOALS

This document contains policies and procedures related to how salary levels are set and adjusted for employees of First 5 Alameda County. The guidelines have been developed to achieve three overall goals that are in the mutual best interests of First 5 Alameda County (F5AC) as an organization and the individual staff members. The goals are to:

1. Provide competitive market-based salaries to attract and retain high quality staff
2. Provide a fair and equitable system where compensation is commensurate with the level of responsibility and qualifications
3. Keep the compensation structure simple so it is clear, understandable and easy to administer

JOB CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

An internal job classification system is used by First 5 Alameda County in order to offer a coherent salary structure where a steady progression in compensation is tied directly to the level of responsibility and credentials required for each position. The job classification system consists of a hierarchy of jobs grouped by job level or grade. Job levels are not determined by specific duties, but rather by overall level of responsibility, complexity of job duties, and uniqueness of the credential or qualifications required.

This structure was originally developed through an independent assessment of all staff positions, and has been modified over time to reflect changes in organizational structure and program/functional requirements.

The following table on the following page shows how existing F5AC positions correspond to the levels in the job classification system.

LEVEL	EXISTING FIRST 5 POSITIONS ASSIGNED TO LEVEL
Director	Chief Executive Officer Deputy Director Director, Family Support Services Program
Senior Administrator	No positions currently assigned to this level Senior Administrator, Continuum of Care & Linkages Senior Administrator, Community & Provider Capacity Building
Administrator	School Readiness Program Administrator Early Care and Education <u>Program Administrator</u> Cultural Access Specialist and <u>Linguistic Responsiveness Coordinator</u> Family Support Services Program Administrator Specialty Provider Team Administrator <u>SART Help Me Grow Coordinator</u> <u>Help Me Grow Program Administrator</u> <u>Help Me Grow Prevention Coordinator</u> Local Child Wellness Coordinator (LAUNCH) Financial Controller Contracts and Grants Administrator Human Resources Administrator Community Grants Administrator Evaluation Specialist Information Systems Administrator Network Support Administrator Evaluation and Technology Administrator <u>Communications and Social Marketing Coordinator</u> <u>Communications Specialist</u> <u>Quality Rating and Improvement System Administrator</u> <u>Policy and Program Coordinator</u> <u>Program Administrator, Training @ First 5</u>
Family Service Manager II	Early Childhood Mental Health Manager II
<u>Manager II</u>/Family Service Specialist II	Mental Health Specialist II Early Childhood Specialist II Child Development Specialist II Lactation Specialist II <u>Help Me Grow Services Program Coordinator</u>

LEVEL	EXISTING FIRST 5 POSITIONS ASSIGNED TO LEVEL
Manager	Professional Development Programs Manager Quality Enhancement Programs Manager Early Care and Education Manager Specialist Quality Counts Senior Coach Improvement Coaching Manager Quality Counts Improvement Coach Budget and Contracts Manager Contracts Manager Office Manager Payroll Finance Manager Accounting Manager Community Grants Manager Program Officer School Readiness Program Manager Data Analyst Perinatal Program Services Manager Help Me Grow Community Liaison
Family Service Manager I	Pediatric Strategies Manager Hospital Outreach Manager
Family Service Specialist I	Child Development Specialist I Care Coordinator Pediatric Child Development Specialist I Early Childhood Specialist I (SART Linkage Line) Mental Health Specialist I Hospital Perinatal Health Outreach Coordinator Lactation Specialist I
Senior Associate	Senior Associate, Community Grants Evaluation, Technology and Communications Senior Associate, School Readiness
Associate	Administrative Associate Finance and Administration Associate Pediatric Strategies Associate
Assistant	No positions currently assigned to this level Reception/Administrative Aide

There are ~~ten-nine~~ job levels. The descriptions are intended only to serve as general descriptions to help differentiate the levels, using level of responsibility and supervision as the primary differentiating criteria.

LEVEL	DESCRIPTION
Director	Responsible for management of an entire operating unit (including the entire Agency) or multiple major Agency-wide programmatic or functional areas, including resource deployment within those areas. Member of the executive team <u>Agency Leadership Team</u> with significant duties in organizational planning and development. Three salary ranges are provided within the Director level to accommodate different levels of responsibility. May supervise any level.
Senior Administrator	Responsible for planning, management and oversight of multiple program or functional areas, including supervision of professional level employees. This classification differs from Directors because it does not exercise executive management duties and the breadth of oversight is smaller. May serve as an ad hoc or Member of the Agency Leadership, Program Leadership, and/or Program Administrator Teams. advisory member of the Executive Team. May supervise any level with the exception of Directors.
Administrator	Responsible for overall planning, management and support of at least one program or functional area. May serve as an ad hoc or a <u>advisory member of the Executive Team</u> an agency or program coordination level leadership team . When supervision is a responsibility of the position, strong management experience is required. May supervise Administrator, Family Service <u>Manager II</u> , Family Service <u>Specialist II</u> , Manager, Family Service Manager I, Specialist I, Associate and/or Assistant level positions. <u>Specific licenses, graduate degrees, or/or specialized experience may be required dependent on the nature of the work or services the position is responsible for.</u>
<u>Manager II/ Family Service Specialist II</u>	<u>Responsible for managing the day-to-day activities of at least one program or functional area, involving significant program and/or administrative responsibilities, including contributing to planning, combined with ongoing supervisory duties. May supervise Manager, Family Service Specialist I, Associate and/or Assistant positions. This level may also include positions that provide direct services to families where the nature of the services requires specific licenses and/or graduate degrees; these positions do not need to include supervisory responsibilities to be in this level.</u>

Manager	Responsible for managing the day-to-day activities of at least one program or functional area, often involving a combination of hands-on duties and directing the activities of subordinate staff requiring specific technical or content knowledge. <u>Supervisory duties are generally limited, but m</u> ay supervise <u>Family Service Specialist I, Manager,</u> Associate and/or Assistant level positions.
<u>Family Service Specialist I</u>	<u>Provides direct services to families without a requirement for specific licenses and/or graduate degrees. No supervisory duties.</u>
Senior Associate	Responsible for Manager level responsibilities of a defined, limited scope for an assigned program or functional area, generally not to exceed one-third of total duties, combined with a balance of Associate level responsibilities. Senior Associates must meet the educational requirements of the comparable Manager position. No supervisory duties.
Associate	Responsible for coordinating and performing the day-to-day activities within a program or functional area, requiring a moderate level of skills and prior experience. No supervisory duties.
Assistant	Responsible for performing day-to-day activities within a program or functional area, requiring a minimum to moderate level of skills and prior experience. No supervisory duties.

~~Within F5AC's program functions, four additional levels of Specialist are defined as positions that provide services directly to families, in addition to services to providers or fulfilling other organizational functions. Direct family service positions also may require graduate levels of education and/or specialized experience (i.e., Masters in Social Work, Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist, and so on). The Family Service Manager I and II levels focus primarily on program planning, development and management, but may also include some direct services to families.~~

LEVEL	DESCRIPTION
<u>Family Service Manager II</u>	Responsible for overall planning, management and support of at least one program or functional area. When supervision is a responsibility of the position, strong management experience is required. May supervise Administrator, Specialist II, Manager, Family Service Manager I, Specialist I, Associate and/or Assistant level positions. May also provide some direct services to families where the nature of the services requires specific licenses and/or graduate degrees.

Family Service Specialist II	Provides direct services to families where the nature of the services requires specific licenses and/or graduate degrees. May be responsible for management and support of at least one functional area. May supervise Specialist II, Manager, Specialist I, Associate and/or Assistant.
Family Service Manager I	Responsible for managing the day-to-day activities of at least one program or functional area, often involving a combination of hands-on duties and directing the activities of subordinate staff. May supervise Specialist I, Associate and/or Assistant level positions. May also provide some direct services to families without a requirement for specific licenses and/or graduate degrees.
Family Service Specialist I	Provides direct services to families without a requirement for specific licenses and/or graduate degrees. May Supervise Specialist I, Associate and/or Assistant.

An independent study was performed to define the salary range for each level in the job classification system. The study used salary data from hundreds of Bay Area nonprofit organizations and County of Alameda positions in order to develop competitive market-based salary ranges. Each F5AC staff position was mapped to the closest equivalent position contained in area salary survey data based on job duties and qualifications required for the position, such as required undergraduate/graduate degrees, licenses or certifications. Market salary data was then analyzed from several different perspectives in order to create competitive salary ranges for F5AC positions, with perspectives covering:

- County of Alameda government
- Nonprofit organizations with large budgets like F5AC
- Nonprofit organizations in a comparable field of service (e.g. foundation/philanthropy, health, child care/child welfare, education/research or social service)
- Nonprofit organizations located in Alameda County or other Bay Area counties
- Supplemental data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics was also included as a reference, where appropriate

Salary ranges for each level have been standardized across all positions except at the Director and Administrator levels. At the Administrator level, the salary ranges vary between program-oriented positions and positions demanding specific technical skills because of differences in qualification requirements and market compensation rates. Further, salary ranges for the technical positions at this level can vary depending on whether the focus of the position is evaluation, information systems or finance. The current salary ranges for each level are shown below.

LEVEL	SALARY RANGE
-------	--------------

Director	
Chief Executive Officer	\$118,889 - \$160,849
Deputy Director	\$96,590 - \$130,681
Director	\$82,730 - \$111,929
Senior Administrator	\$70,743 - \$104,960
Administrator	Base range: \$65,503 - \$88,622
	Finance/Evaluation Administrator: \$63,295 - \$97,185 (varies by position)
Family Service Manager II	\$65,503 - \$88,622
<u>Manager II/</u> Family Service Specialist II	\$61,281 - \$82,910
Manager	\$51,917 - \$74,181
Family Service Manager I	\$51,917 - \$74,181
Family Service Specialist I	\$48,315 - \$65,368
Senior Associate	\$47,753 - \$61,273
Associate	\$40,590 - \$54,916
Assistant	\$32,064 - \$43,381

Guidelines for Individual Compensation

This section contains guidelines for setting salary levels for individual employees. The guidelines are organized into four parts: determining the starting salary for an employee, cost of living adjustment policies and procedures, merit raise policies and procedures, and guidelines for changing the job classification of an employee.

DETERMINING THE STARTING SALARY FOR AN EMPLOYEE

First 5's standard procedure is that all vacant positions that are opened for recruitment will have a starting salary posted that is equal to the bottom of the salary range for the job classification level in which the position is classified. A position may be posted for recruitment at a higher salary within the range if at least one of the following tests is met:

1. F5AC has attempted to fill the position through open recruitment for at least three months without success (during either current or prior recruitment) and has information from those recruitment efforts that the posted starting salary is a barrier to getting qualified individuals to apply; or
2. Special conditions exist that make it urgent to fill the position as quickly as

possible **and** external data is available (for example, from job advertisements) to indicate that the starting salary for F5AC based on the standard salary range is less than the starting salary being offered by multiple other organizations currently recruiting for comparable positions; or

3. The position involves supervisory duties or other specialized duties not contained in the majority of positions within the job classification level and a reasonable case can be made that these duties require a higher starting salary to be posted in order to get qualified individuals to apply.

Any requests to post a position at a starting salary above the bottom of the salary range for the appropriate job classification level must be submitted in writing to the Human Resources Administrator with the proposed starting salary, rationale and supporting documentation included. Such requests must be approved by the Deputy Director and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) prior to posting of the position for recruitment.

Once a potential new hire has been identified, F5AC's standard procedure starts new employees at the bottom of the salary range (or the posted starting salary if it is set above the bottom of the salary range) for the job classification level they are hired into. A new employee may start at a higher salary within the range if at least two of the following criteria are met:

1. The number of years and level of previous experience exceed the requirements defined in the job description
2. The highest level of educational achievement and/or licenses and other credentials exceed the requirements defined in the job description
3. The position involves supervisory duties where other positions within the classification level do not (*note: supervisory duties do not automatically justify a starting salary above the bottom of the range*)
4. The person's current or most reasonably recent salary exceeds the bottom of F5AC's salary range and a management determination is made that the person should not be asked to take a reduction in pay in order to join the F5AC team. Documentation of the prospective employee's most recent salary is required, such as a pay stub. When feasible, the applicant's total compensation package, including salary and benefits, will be compared to F5AC's compensation package. This criteria may be sufficient on its own to set the starting salary at a higher point if recommended by the supervisor and ~~a Director or~~ Senior Administrator (if applicable) and approved by the Deputy Director and CEO as described below.

The starting salary (if different than the posted salary) for all new hires must be approved by both the Deputy Director and CEO prior to extending an offer of employment. In general, starting salaries are not set at a level higher than 5% above the posted starting salary, unless extenuating circumstances exist, such as a prolonged period of recruitment or an identified urgent need to fill the position. If, however, the person's current or most recent salary exceeds 105% of the posted starting salary, the starting salary can be set above this level so that the person does not have to take a reduction in pay. F5AC may or may not, at its sole discretion, elect to match current or most recent salaries when making an offer of employment.

SUPERVISION DIFFERENTIAL

It is expected that there will be a salary differential at the time of hire of between 5 and 10 percent minimum between the salary of a supervisor and supervisee, even when the employees are classified in the same job level, as long as this differential can be accommodated within the salary range for each employee's assigned level. This level of differential may not necessarily be maintained over time, dependent on merit increases and/or COLA adjustments that are granted to the supervisor and his/her supervisees.

SALARIES FOR TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES

Salaries for temporary and on call employees are determined on a case by case basis. Generally, the hiring supervisor will provide information to Human Resources regarding comparable salaries in the marketplace along with an assessment of where the temporary position would be placed in the F5AC salary structure if it was a regular position. An hourly salary is proposed that typically includes a 25-35% augmentation to account for the lack of benefits with temporary positions. All salaries for temporary positions must be approved by the Deputy Director and CEO before the position is posted or an offer of employment is extended.

Temporary employees are not eligible for merit raises or COLA adjustments as described below. Any adjustment to the salary of a temporary employee is handled on a case by case basis at the recommendation of the supervisor to the Human Resources Administrator. The Deputy Director and CEO must approve any adjustment of salary for a temporary employee.

MERIT RAISES

Employees are eligible for merit-based salary increases. Merit increases are awarded in recognition of solid job performance and hence are tied to the results of the annual performance evaluation review. A salary review and determination recommendation of whether to award a merit increase should be submitted with the annual performance review.

Merit raises can be up to 5% per year. The specific raise amount is based on the performance evaluation review results and the extent to which a person has fulfilled the expectations set forth for their current position. In general, employees must be performing at a "Meets Requirements Successful" rating or higher overall to be eligible for a merit increase. The supervisor who conducted the performance evaluation review is responsible for determining if a merit increase is justified and, if so, proposing the amount of the increase and documenting this on the performance review tool. All merit increases must be reviewed and approved by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or his/her designee before they are considered to be final.

Merit increases take effect during or by the pay period following approval by the CEO, as long as the time period between merit increases is a minimum of one year. No retroactive pay increases will be awarded. To ensure that performance evaluations are given timely, supervisors will receive notice of anniversary dates two months prior to the dates and reminded one month prior. Supervisors will be held accountable for conducting performance evaluations reviews and submitting merit increase

recommendations in a timely fashion.

Employees who have reached the top of the salary range for their job classification level are not eligible for further merit increases but will continue to receive cost of living adjustments **when those are granted**. Employees are also not eligible for a merit increase at the time of their six month review.

The ability to provide merit raises may be restricted or suspended at any time based on budgetary considerations and decisions of the Commission.

COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENTS (COLA)

First 5's primary funding source is a declining tobacco tax. There is no guarantee that a COLA will be available each year. The presence of a COLA, as well as the amount, is subject to the decision of the Commission based on economic and budgetary factors.

COLA amounts are recommended and set annually. The Human Resources Administrator in conjunction with the CEO develops a proposed COLA amount based on local consumer price index (CPI) changes, which must be approved (and may be modified) by the Commission for adoption as part of the annual operating budget.

Any COLA approved by the Commission will be applied to all regular staff positions effective January 1 each year, with the exception of any positions that have been "red circled" (see Job Classification Changes for explanation). The COLA is applied to the current salaries of each employee, but is **not** applied to the salary range set in the job classification system.

JOB CLASSIFICATION CHANGES

Job classification changes may include promotions to the next level in the job classification system, lateral moves to a different position within the same level, and demotions to a level lower in the job classification system. Each of these types of changes is described below.

Classification changes involving promotion to the next level will be considered based on significant and overarching increases in job responsibilities of a scope sufficient to warrant reclassification. In order to be promoted, a person must meet the qualifications for the position at the next level, including:

- Educational requirements
- Experience and skills necessary to perform the duties of the position, and
- Any other licenses and other credentials listed as requirements in the job description

The first step is to determine the position and job classification level that the person is moving into. If necessary, a new job description will be created for the position. Next, a starting salary must be set within the range for the new position and/or classification level, using the same criteria that would be applied to a new hire. An exception is that employees will not be required to take a reduction in pay if the classification change is a promotion to a higher level and their current salary is higher than the low end of the salary range for the new level. In this case, however, reclassification does not

guarantee a salary increase; each situation is looked at on a case-by-case basis.

Lateral moves to a different position within the same level may result from vacancies or the creation of new positions, from reassignment of duties based on organizational or program changes, or from consolidation of positions due to organizational restructuring. In order to move laterally, employees must meet the requirements for the new position documented in the job description. In general, employees making a lateral move are not eligible for a salary increase unless the new position involves a significant increase in the level of responsibility.

Classification changes involving a demotion to a lower job level may occur:

- Due to an employee's poor performance,
- At the request of an employee desiring a job with a lower level of responsibility, or
- Due to reclassification of a job based on an evaluation of the level of responsibility currently required for the position.

When a demotion occurs, the employee's salary is reassessed relative to the salary range for the new position. If the employee's current salary is higher than the top of the range, and the reclassification is due to poor performance or at the employee's request, the salary is reduced to a level within the new range appropriate for the employee's performance and qualifications. If the reclassification is due to a job evaluation, the employee's salary is generally "red-circled" and no salary increase (~~including other than~~ COLAs) is granted until such time as the salary range for the new position exceeds the employee's current salary. The CEO, in conjunction with the Human Resources Administrator, has the discretion for determining when an employee's salary is "red-circled".

All classification and resulting salary changes must be documented in memo format and reviewed and approved by the CEO.

In the event of a promotion or reclassification to a higher level that results in a salary increase, the employee will receive a 6 month performance evaluation (no merit increase is available at this time) and performance evaluation-review one year from the date the promotion or reclassification became effective. A merit increase may be granted at the one year review, consistent with the Merit Raises section of these guidelines.

CHANGES IN DUTIES WITHIN THE SAME JOB DESCRIPTION

Periodically, a substantial change in duties within the same job description may require a change in salary. In this case, a proposal and rationale should be brought by the supervisor to the Human Resources Administrator and Deputy Director or CEO. All proposals must be approved prior to offering or discussing with the employee. All salary changes of this nature must be documented in memo format and reviewed and approved by the CEO.

OTHER SALARY-RELATED GUIDELINES

JOB DESCRIPTIONS

F5AC is an evolving program and as such the job descriptions are structured broadly, allowing room for changes of duties within the broad range. Changes in functional duties, within a broad range, are expected. It is recommended that supervisors review job descriptions annually with employees and to discuss with the Human Resources Administrator if duties have changed to such an extent as to require a revision of the job description. The status of job descriptions is also documented on the annual performance review.

REVISION OF SALARY RANGES

F5AC management intends to review and update (if the data gathered so indicates) the salary ranges for each job classification level approximately every ~~two to~~ three to four years, unless rapidly changing market conditions require more frequent review or F5AC's funding experiences a significant decline necessitating a more financially conservative compensation approach. The purpose of the update is to keep the salary ranges competitive with local market compensation levels.

If salary ranges are revised upward, employees with a salary level below the low end of the range for their job classification level will receive an increase to the low end of the range upon approval of the revised ranges by the Commission. Employees who were at the top of the salary range before the adjustment but are not once the adjustment is made will be eligible for a merit increase at the time of their next performance evaluation review, with the salary adjustment not to exceed the top of the revised salary range.

AMENDMENT OF COMPENSATION GUIDELINES

The Commission reserves the right to amend these guidelines at any time and for any reason. All changes that are made to the guidelines will be communicated in writing to all employees in a timely manner.

No oral statements or representations can in any way change or alter the written policies and procedures presented in these guidelines.



To: First 5 Alameda County Commission

From: Mark Friedman, CEO

Date: December 12, 2013

Subject: 2014 Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) Recommendation

ACTION REQUESTED

That the Commission review and discuss the recommendation for an employee Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA).

BACKGROUND

Per the Salary Guidelines approved by the Commission in May 2004, it is the Commission's decision to grant a COLA to employees. If awarded, COLAs are granted to all regular employees, both full and part-time. Typically, COLAs are implemented to ensure that employees' wages do not lose real value due to increases in the costs of goods and services. Competitive salaries are an important recruitment and retention strategy.

Consumer Price Index (CPI)

The Bureau of Labor Statistics determined that the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco – Oakland – San Jose metropolitan area has increased 1.6% over the last 12 months on a not seasonally adjusted basis according to their latest news release on November 20, 2013.

Given the long range financial plan and the fact that 61 % of staff are capped out and ineligible to receive any merit raises, we think a fair recommendation is to grant all employees a 2% COLA.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact of granting a 2% COLA for the six month period of the current fiscal year and the first six months of the next fiscal year will be \$101,278. With several unfilled positions that are on the books we should be able to absorb the impact on the 2013-14 budget easily.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission review and grant a 2% employee Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) to take effect in the coming year of 2014.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Mark Friedman
Chief Executive Officer

Janet Basta
Human Resources Administrator



To: First 5 Alameda County Commission
From: Janis Burger, Deputy Director
Date: December 12, 2013
Subject: FY 2012-13 First 5 Annual Report to First 5 California

ACTION REQUESTED:

To review and approve the F5AC FY 2012-13 Annual Report to First 5 California.

BACKGROUND:

First 5 Alameda County is required to submit FY 2012-13 data, fiscal and narrative sections of the State Annual Report to First 5 California by November 1, 2013. The report also contains a narrative summary of evaluations completed during FY 2012-13.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Commission review and approve the FY 2012-13 Annual Report to First 5 California.

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Janis Burger,
Deputy Director

Mark Friedman,
Chief Executive Officer



Annual Report Form 1 (AR-1)(Page 1 of 5)
County Revenue and Expenditure Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Revenue Detail

1. Tobacco Tax Funds	\$	13,646,783
2. CARES Plus Program Funds	\$	226,270
3. CSP, RFA 1	\$	0
4. CSP, RFA 2		0
5. School Readiness Program Funds	\$	0
6. Small County Funds	\$	0
7. Other Funds (Specify Source Below)	\$	1,730,622
Federal Sources		
Long Foundation		
Miscellaneous		
8. Grants (Specify Source Below)	\$	2,364,380
Federal appropriation for SART program		
County Grants		
F5 Contra Costa		
9. Donations	\$	0
10. Revenue from Interest Earned	\$	103,719
11. Total Revenue	\$	18,071,774

Results and Services - Expenditure Details

Result 1: Improved Family Functioning (Family Support, Education and Services)

12. Behavioral, Substance Abuse and Other Mental Health Services	\$	0
13. Adult Education and Literacy for Parents	\$	0
14. Community Resource and Referral	\$	0
15. Distribution of Kit for New Parents	\$	0



Annual Report Form 1 (AR-1)(Page 2 of 5)
County Revenue and Expenditure Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

16. Family Literacy Programs	\$	0
17. Provision of Basic Family Needs (Food, Clothing, Housing)	\$	0
18. Targeted Intensive Parent Support Services	\$	0
19. General Parenting Education Programs	\$	2,358,312
20. Other Family Functioning Support Services (please describe below)	\$	0
21. Total	\$	2,358,312

Result 2: Improved Child Development (Child Development Services)

22. Preschool for 3 and 4 Year Olds	\$	0
23. State School Readiness	\$	0
24. Comprehensive Screening and Assessments	\$	0
25. Targeted Intensive Intervention for Children Identified with Special Needs	\$	0
26. Early Education Programs for Children (Other than SR and Preschool for 3 & 4 Year Olds)	\$	0
27. Early Education Provider Programs	\$	3,437,505
28. Kindergarten Transition Services	\$	1,140,806
29. Other Child Development Services (please describe below)	\$	297,489
Race To the Top- Early Learning Challenge		
30. Total	\$	4,875,800



Annual Report Form 1 (AR-1)(Page 3 of 5)
County Revenue and Expenditure Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result 3: Improved Health (Health Education and Services)

31. Breastfeeding Assistance	\$	0
32. Nutrition and Fitness	\$	0
33. Other Health Education	\$	0
34. Health Access	\$	0
35. Home Visitation for Newborns	\$	3,492,342
36. Oral Health	\$	0
37. Prenatal Care	\$	0
38. Primary Care Services (Immunizations, Well Child Checkups)	\$	0
39. Comprehensive Screening and Assessments	\$	2,815,112
40. Targeted Intensive Intervention for Children Identified with Special Needs	\$	0
41. Safety Education and Intentional and Unintentional Injury Prevention	\$	0
42. Specialty Medical Services	\$	0
43. Tobacco Cessation Education and Treatment	\$	0
44. Other Health Services (please describe below)	\$	0
<input type="text"/>		
45. Total	\$	6,307,454

Result 4: Improved Systems of Care

46. Service Outreach, Planning, Support and Management	\$	1,531,727
47. Provider Capacity Building, Training and Support	\$	231,255
48. Community Strengthening Efforts	\$	651,652
49. Total	\$	2,414,634



Annual Report Form 1 (AR-1)(Page 4 of 5)
County Revenue and Expenditure Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Expenditure Detail

50. FY 2012-2013 Program Expenditures	\$	15,956,200
51. FY 2012-2013 Administrative Expenditures	\$	1,009,933
52. FY 2012-2013 Evaluation Expenditures	\$	1,051,944
53. Total Expenditures	\$	18,018,077
54. Excess (Deficiency) Of Revenues Over (Under) Expenses	\$	53,697

Other Financing Sources

55. Sale(s) of Capital Assets	\$	0
56. Other: Specify Source Below	\$	-5,272,905
Purchase of a Capital Asset - Office Building		
57. Total Other Financing Sources	\$	-5,272,905

Net Change in Fund Balance

58. Fund Balance - Beginning, July 1, 2012	\$	39,768,324
59. Fund Balance - Ending, June 30, -2013	\$	34,549,116
60. Net Change In Fund Balance	\$	-5,219,208

FY 2012-2013 Fund Balance

61. Non Spendable	\$	1,514
62. Restricted	\$	0
63. Committed	\$	34,547,602
64. Assigned	\$	0
65. Unassigned	\$	0
66. Total Fund Balance	\$	34,549,116



Annual Report Form 1 (AR-1)(Page 5 of 5)
County Revenue and Expenditure Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Expenditure Notes: Please use this space to document any issues with the information provided on this spreadsheet and to explain any significant variances from prior year's expenses that is not related to revenue growth. Please identify if any line includes significant capital expenditures. If yes, identify the line and the capital amount included.

Line 56: \$5.27 million Capital Expenditure on purchase of an Office Building for the use of First 5 Alameda.

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Mark Rasiah
Phone 510-227-6913
Email mark.rasiah@first5alameda.org



**AR1/AR2 Summary Report
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)**

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result Area	Service	Status	Total Dollars Spent	Total Number of Children Served	Total Number of Parents/Other Family Members/Providers Served
Improved Child Development	Preschool for 3 and 4 Year Olds	In Progress	\$0	0	0
Improved Child Development	Early Education Provider Program	Submitted	\$3,437,505	0	1,303
Improved Child Development	Other Child Development Services	Submitted	\$297,489	0	17
Improved Child Development	Kindergarten Transition Services	Submitted	\$1,140,806	679	42
Improved Child Health	Home Visitation for Newborns	Submitted	\$3,492,342	1,228	1,228
Improved Child Health	Comprehensive Screening and Assessments	Submitted	\$2,815,112	3,121	3,151
Improved Family Functioning	General Parenting Education Programs	Submitted	\$2,358,312	5,957	7,199
Improved Systems of Care	Provider Capacity Building, Training and Support	Submitted	\$231,255		
Improved Systems of Care	Service Outreach, Planning, Support and Management	Submitted	\$1,531,727		
Improved Systems of Care	Community Strengthening Efforts	Submitted	\$651,652		
TOTAL			\$15,956,200	10,985	12,940



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 2)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Systems of Care

Service: Community Strengthening Efforts

Most Compelling Service Outcome

--

Benchmark/Baseline Data

--

Outcome Measurement Tool

--



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 2)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Systems of Care

Service: Community Strengthening Efforts

Who was the primary audience for the service?

Policy makers, funders of early childhood programs, pediatric providers, early care and education providers, mental health services staff, families.

What were the types of services provided?

Launch to make Help Me Grow available to the broader community. Ongoing coordination meetings with other county, school district and community-based support agencies to develop a shared Birth to 8 Children's outcomes. Communication support for local grantees to network and build relationships with each other and with funders.

What was the intended result of the service? What was the community impact of the service?

This is the first year F5AC is intentionally focusing on community strengthening through policy, advocacy and communication strategies. The desired impact is to offer greater opportunities for knowledge and resource sharing, and for building a movement for a set of common children's outcomes across the county.

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang
Phone 510-227-6923
Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Comprehensive Screening and Assessments

Provide the most recent compelling service outcome available for this service.

- o One of the pediatric sites was the first site to start screening at all three of the American Academy of Pediatrics recommended developmental screening intervals (9, 18, and 24 months). In addition, this site, though a larger community clinic, often screens and refers the most children out of any pediatric site.
- o One of the pediatric sites who has been a developmental screening partner, experienced some changes in their staffing which resulted in a decline in the number of screens and referrals received from the site. The technical assistance staff retrained providers, within the next couple of months the site's screenings and referrals immediately increased by nearly half.
- o One ECE site screened 100% of their children at their site, with an additional three ECE sites screening more than 85% of children and the two FCC sites screening more than 90% of children within their programs.
- o Referrals to Help Me Grow increased from 883 last year to 1196 this year.

Provide the comparison data used to determine whether the service outcome was an improvement and specify the origin of the data.

Typically pediatric sites start developmental screening at the 18 month well-child visit and then increase to additional intervals as they become more comfortable with implementing developmental screening within their site. 1 in 5 children screened exhibit some developmental concern. 49% of children seen in participating pediatric sites have at least one issue that deserves monitoring. In participating ECE sites, 35% of children have at least one issue that deserves monitoring.

Describe the measurement tool used in the evaluation to measure the outcome.

ASQ and ASQ-SE, MCHAT, referrals to Help Me Grow Linkage Line.



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Comprehensive Screening and Assessments

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the following demographic categories.

1. Children Less than 3 Years Old	2,259
2. Children from 3rd to 6th Birthday	858
3. Children - Ages Unknown (birth to 6th Birthday)	4
4. Parents/Guardians/Primary Caregivers	3,121
5. Other Family Members	0
6. Providers	30
7. Total Population Served	6,272



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 3 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Comprehensive Screening and Assessments

Provide breakdown of the population served by ethnic or racial category. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
8. Alaska Native/American Indian	0	0
9. Asian	105	105
10. Black/African-American	171	171
11. Hispanic/Latino	648	648
12. Pacific Islander	0	0
13. White	50	50
14. Multiracial	0	0
15. Other- specify:	173	173
<input type="text" value="0"/>		
16. Unknown	1,974	1,974
17. Sub Totals	3,121	3,121
18. Total Population Served	6,242	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 4 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Comprehensive Screening and Assessments

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the language that they primarily speak at home. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
19. English	1,431	1,431
20. Spanish	1,154	1,154
21. Cantonese	103	103
22. Mandarin	8	8
23. Vietnamese	11	11
24. Korean	2	2
25. Other- specify:	23	23
Mam		
26. Other- specify:	17	17
Arabic		
27. Other- specify:	40	40
All other		
28. Unknown	332	332
29. Sub Totals	3,121	3,121
30. Total Population Served	6,242	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 5 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Comprehensive Screening and Assessments

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang

Phone 510-227-6923

Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



**Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)**

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Early Education Provider Program

Provide the most recent compelling service outcome available for this service.

Provide the comparison data used to determine whether the service outcome was an improvement and specify the origin of the data.

Describe the measurement tool used in the evaluation to measure the outcome.



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Early Education Provider Program

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the following demographic categories.

1. Children Less than 3 Years Old	<input type="text" value="0"/>
2. Children from 3rd to 6th Birthday	<input type="text" value="0"/>
3. Children - Ages Unknown (birth to 6th Birthday)	<input type="text" value="0"/>
4. Parents/Guardians/Primary Caregivers	<input type="text" value="0"/>
5. Other Family Members	<input type="text" value="0"/>
6. Providers	<input type="text" value="1,303"/>
7. Total Population Served	1,303



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 3 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda
Result: Improved Child Development
Service: Early Education Provider Program

Monday, December 09, 2013

Provide breakdown of the population served by ethnic or racial category. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
8. Alaska Native/American Indian	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
9. Asian	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
10. Black/African-American	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
11. Hispanic/Latino	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
12. Pacific Islander	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
13. White	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
14. Multiracial	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
15. Other- specify:	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
<input type="text" value="0"/>		
16. Unknown	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
17. Sub Totals	0	0
18. Total Population Served	0	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 4 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Early Education Provider Program

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the language that they primarily speak at home. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
19. English	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
20. Spanish	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
21. Cantonese	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
22. Mandarin	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
23. Vietnamese	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
24. Korean	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
25. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
26. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
27. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
28. Unknown	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>
29. Sub Totals	0	0
30. Total Population Served	0	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 5 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Early Education Provider Program

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang

Phone 510-227-6923

Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



**Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)**

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Family Functioning

Service: General Parenting Education Programs

Provide the most recent compelling service outcome available for this service.

Neighborhood partnerships, in the first 18 months, expanded parent-child services in 13 parks and recreation and library sites to bring in previously underserved families. Combined, all community grants directly served

573 parenting classes and support groups, 782 parent-child activities

1405 parents in parent education classes or support groups, 1649 in parent-child activities

60% of children in Neighborhood Partnership programs whose parents were surveyed were not enrolled in licensed child care

84% of parents report using what they learned

93% reported they play more with their child

87% reported they feel more confident as a parent

8 agencies had limited experience serving families with young children, and 25 grantees focused on enhancing their general family support practices in the areas of health, mental health/child development screening and referrals, school readiness and parenting.

Provide the comparison data used to determine whether the service outcome was an improvement and specify the origin of the data.

In 2012-13, grantees referred 83 out of 99 children who screened of concern using the ASQ or ASQ SE to developmental supports. 80 of the 83 (96%) children went on to received referred services. Among the same grantees in 2011-12, when 96 out of 122 children who screened of concern were referred for developmental supports, and 76 (80%) eventually received the referred services.

Describe the measurement tool used in the evaluation to measure the outcome.

Grantee reports using client satisfaction survey, participant rosters, narrative stories. Developmental screens used ASQ and ASQ-SE.



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Family Functioning

Service: General Parenting Education Programs

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the following demographic categories.

1. Children Less than 3 Years Old	2,913
2. Children from 3rd to 6th Birthday	3,044
3. Children - Ages Unknown (birth to 6th Birthday)	0
4. Parents/Guardians/Primary Caregivers	6,702
5. Other Family Members	0
6. Providers	497
7. Total Population Served	13,156



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 3 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Family Functioning

Service: General Parenting Education Programs

Provide breakdown of the population served by ethnic or racial category. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
8. Alaska Native/American Indian	9	18
9. Asian	505	914
10. Black/African-American	893	1,040
11. Hispanic/Latino	1,709	1,907
12. Pacific Islander	62	66
13. White	402	750
14. Multiracial	280	300
15. Other- specify:	111	106
<input type="text" value="0"/>		
16. Unknown	1,986	1,601
17. Sub Totals	5,957	6,702
18. Total Population Served	12,659	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 4 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Family Functioning

Service: General Parenting Education Programs

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the language that they primarily speak at home. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
19. English	2,052	2,764
20. Spanish	1,339	1,527
21. Cantonese	133	320
22. Mandarin	42	58
23. Vietnamese	60	126
24. Korean	9	12
25. Other- specify:	16	16
<input type="text" value="Japanese"/>		
26. Other- specify:	13	14
<input type="text" value="Tagalog"/>		
27. Other- specify:	197	197
<input type="text" value="All others"/>		
28. Unknown	2,096	1,668
29. Sub Totals	5,957	6,702
30. Total Population Served	12,659	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 5 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Family Functioning

Service: General Parenting Education Programs

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang

Phone 510-227-6923

Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



**Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)**

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Home Visitation for Newborns

Provide the most recent compelling service outcome available for this service.

90% of all families served by F5AC home visiting programs are screened for depression. This year, 24% of families screened with the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Screen screened positive for depression.

Provide the comparison data used to determine whether the service outcome was an improvement and specify the origin of the data.

Maternal depression is a significant risk factor affecting the well-being and school readiness of young children. First 5 Alameda County works closely with providers, encouraging them to screen caregivers using standardized depression screening tools and providing regular trainings on screening and referral processes. Over the years, our home visiting program has consistently found a positive correlation between caretakers scoring positive for depression and children scoring positive for developmental concerns. Among families who receive home visiting services, 1 in 4 screen positive for depression.

Describe the measurement tool used in the evaluation to measure the outcome.

EPDS and contractor reporting on home visit summary forms every 6 months and at the closure of each case.



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Home Visitation for Newborns

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the following demographic categories.

1. Children Less than 3 Years Old	885
2. Children from 3rd to 6th Birthday	184
3. Children - Ages Unknown (birth to 6th Birthday)	159
4. Parents/Guardians/Primary Caregivers	1,228
5. Other Family Members	0
6. Providers	0
7. Total Population Served	2,456



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 3 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Home Visitation for Newborns

Provide breakdown of the population served by ethnic or racial category. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
8. Alaska Native/American Indian	1	1
9. Asian	75	75
10. Black/African-American	191	191
11. Hispanic/Latino	704	704
12. Pacific Islander	5	5
13. White	62	62
14. Multiracial	68	68
15. Other- specify:	43	43
<input type="text" value="0"/>		
16. Unknown	79	79
17. Sub Totals	1,228	1,228
18. Total Population Served	2,456	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 4 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Home Visitation for Newborns

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the language that they primarily speak at home. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
19. English	845	845
20. Spanish	301	301
21. Cantonese	15	15
22. Mandarin	4	4
23. Vietnamese	6	6
24. Korean	0	0
25. Other- specify:	16	16
Mam		
26. Other- specify:	11	11
Arabic		
27. Other- specify:	22	22
All other		
28. Unknown	8	8
29. Sub Totals	1,228	1,228
30. Total Population Served	2,456	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 5 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Health

Service: Home Visitation for Newborns

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang

Phone 510-227-6923

Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



**Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)**

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Kindergarten Transition Services

Provide the most recent compelling service outcome available for this service.

Provide the comparison data used to determine whether the service outcome was an improvement and specify the origin of the data.

Describe the measurement tool used in the evaluation to measure the outcome.



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Kindergarten Transition Services

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the following demographic categories.

1. Children Less than 3 Years Old	0
2. Children from 3rd to 6th Birthday	679
3. Children - Ages Unknown (birth to 6th Birthday)	0
4. Parents/Guardians/Primary Caregivers	0
5. Other Family Members	0
6. Providers	42
7. Total Population Served	721



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 3 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Kindergarten Transition Services

Provide breakdown of the population served by ethnic or racial category. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
8. Alaska Native/American Indian	1	0
9. Asian	113	0
10. Black/African-American	67	0
11. Hispanic/Latino	334	0
12. Pacific Islander	8	0
13. White	63	0
14. Multiracial	14	0
15. Other- specify: <input type="text" value="0"/>	10	0
16. Unknown	69	0
17. Sub Totals	679	0
18. Total Population Served	679	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 4 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Kindergarten Transition Services

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the language that they primarily speak at home. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
19. English	679	0
20. Spanish	0	0
21. Cantonese	0	0
22. Mandarin	0	0
23. Vietnamese	0	0
24. Korean	0	0
25. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	0	0
26. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	0	0
27. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	0	0
28. Unknown	0	0
29. Sub Totals	679	0
30. Total Population Served	679	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 5 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Kindergarten Transition Services

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang

Phone 510-227-6923

Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



**Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)**

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Other Child Development Services

Provide the most recent compelling service outcome available for this service.

Provide the comparison data used to determine whether the service outcome was an improvement and specify the origin of the data.

This is the first year of Alameda County's participation in the Bay Area Consortia of Race To the Top Early Learning Challenge grant.

Describe the measurement tool used in the evaluation to measure the outcome.



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Other Child Development Services

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the following demographic categories.

1. Children Less than 3 Years Old	<input type="text" value="0"/>
2. Children from 3rd to 6th Birthday	<input type="text" value="0"/>
3. Children - Ages Unknown (birth to 6th Birthday)	<input type="text" value="0"/>
4. Parents/Guardians/Primary Caregivers	<input type="text" value="0"/>
5. Other Family Members	<input type="text" value="0"/>
6. Providers	<input type="text" value="17"/>
7. Total Population Served	17



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 3 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Other Child Development Services

Provide breakdown of the population served by ethnic or racial category. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
8. Alaska Native/American Indian	0	0
9. Asian	0	0
10. Black/African-American	0	0
11. Hispanic/Latino	0	0
12. Pacific Islander	0	0
13. White	0	0
14. Multiracial	0	0
15. Other- specify:	0	0
<input type="text" value="0"/>		
16. Unknown	0	0
17. Sub Totals	0	0
18. Total Population Served	0	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 4 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Other Child Development Services

Provide a breakdown of the population served by the language that they primarily speak at home. Report children separate from Parents, Guardians and Primary Caregivers.

	Children	Parents/ Guardians/ Primary Caregivers
19. English	0	0
20. Spanish	0	0
21. Cantonese	0	0
22. Mandarin	0	0
23. Vietnamese	0	0
24. Korean	0	0
25. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	0	0
26. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	0	0
27. Other- specify: <input type="text"/>	0	0
28. Unknown	0	0
29. Sub Totals	0	0
30. Total Population Served	0	



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 5 of 5)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Child Development

Service: Other Child Development Services

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang

Phone 510-227-6923

Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 2)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Systems of Care

Service: Provider Capacity Building, Training and Support

Most Compelling Service Outcome

--

Benchmark/Baseline Data

--

Outcome Measurement Tool

--



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 2)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Systems of Care

Service: Provider Capacity Building, Training and Support

Who was the primary audience for the service?

Home visitation providers, mental health specialists, early childhood mental health consultants, early childhood agencies, pediatric providers, early care and education (specifically Family Child Care) providers from East Oakland.

What were the types of services provided?

Trainings, workshops, one-on-one consultations with providers. Several learning communities convened to focus specifically on provider practices during mental health support intake and implementing culturally and linguistically competent services.

What was the intended result of the service? What was the community impact of the service?

Greater integration of best practices for screening, referrals and treatment for social-emotional concerns and development delays. Expected community impact includes sharing a common language for early identification, needed supports and treatment services that is easy to understand and navigate for both providers and families. Capacity building and training efforts made significant investments in sharing pathways to the Help Me Grow telephone linkage line. Additional trainings focused on violence- and trauma-informed care.

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang
Phone 510-227-6923
Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 1 of 3)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Systems of Care

Service: Service Outreach, Planning, Support and Management

Most Compelling Service Outcome

Project LAUNCH, a grant program of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), is providing a learning laboratory to explore new approaches to meet the needs of families, build the capacity of service providers, and align and integrate systems of care. These promising new approaches are intended to guide local and state-level policy improvements and systems change. Working with parents in their homes, home visitors support effective parenting skills and strengthen family functioning, emphasize safety in the home, promote maternal and child health, provide referrals and ensure access to needed services. Screenings and referrals can occur within a regular home visit, and clients are connected to individual counseling or supportive groups in a streamlined and client-friendly way.

Benchmark/Baseline Data

Very few home-based supports include integrated mental health treatment and crisis interventions for families and home visitors. Yet, a recent review of studies revealed that between 28.5 and 61 percent of mothers enrolled in home visiting programs were identified with depression. In Alameda County, 58 percent of mothers enrolled in a county public health department home visiting program screened positive for depression. Prior to Project LAUNCH, a new mom was required to personally call a county "Behavioral Care Access Line" in order to arrange a formal mental health assessment, which could lead to a referral for office-based therapy or other services.

Outcome Measurement Tool

Case study, literature review.



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 2 of 3)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Systems of Care

Service: Service Outreach, Planning, Support and Management

Who was the primary audience for the service?

Families and children who are at risk for mental health, social emotional and behavioral concerns.

What were the types of services provided?

Home visiting services with mental health supports, consultations to family support providers, parent cafes, community cafes, school based mental health consultations and classroom supports, web-based resource directory of developmental supports, social marketing campaigns, co-learning communities. An out-growth of community building was the planning for an early childhood hub in East Oakland to create a place where families can come for resources, playgroups and other supports.

What was the intended result of the service? What was the community impact of the service?

Project LAUNCH, a grant program of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), is providing a learning laboratory to explore new approaches to meet the needs of families, build the capacity of service providers, and align and integrate systems of care. These promising new approaches are intended to guide local and state-level policy improvements and systems change. Early Connections, another SAMSHA grant, expanded the implementation for Family Partners into mental health support settings with the goal of advancing family-driven care and co-learning between families who are the recipients of services and mental health service providers. A goal of both projects include finding policy and funding tactics to sustain, improve and expand the pilot strategies. Additional thinking and structural supports are being developed to foster a cohort of family leaders who can help guide and lead the county's planning and programs that support family mental health.



Annual Report Form 2 (AR-2)(Page 3 of 3)
County Demographic Worksheet
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Result: Improved Systems of Care

Service: Service Outreach, Planning, Support and Management

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Chris Hwang

Phone 510-227-6923

Email chris.hwang@first5alameda.org



Annual Report Form 3 (AR-3)(Page 1 of 5)
County Evaluation Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

Provide a description of the evaluation activities completed during the fiscal year

(1) Systems and Policy Changes

Review pediatric providers' experiences with integrating developmental screening into primary care, ASQ screening and referral data from the 26 sites, and conduct interviews with 30 providers from 21 practices

A telephone interview was conducted with 13 grantees to learn a) about their plans for sustaining their programs after F5AC funding ends and b) whether they were interested in receiving further training/support from F5AC to support their sustainability efforts

An online survey of community members and key informant interview to help shape F5AC's new strategic plan.

(2) High Quality Providers and Supports

Evaluate the capacity of Alameda County's child-serving agencies in the East Oakland area to develop strong positive relationships with families and to promote optimal childhood social and emotional development using the Touchpoints framework

(3) Children Ready to Learn

Track the use of promising practices five city libraries and park and recreation departments receiving Neighborhood Partnership grants to provide school readiness programs in underserved neighborhoods, and collect parent surveys and child observation data. Interview each grantee to elicit their feedback/ suggestions regarding Partnership trainings and consultation.

Continuation of the School Readiness Assessment of entering Kindergartners in select school districts and classrooms throughout the county

A Special Study to test the relationship between children's readiness for Kindergarten and their neighborhoods schools' access to community resources and mental health supports in East Oakland

(4) Family Support

Assess the needs fulfilled by the Help Me Grow program in supporting family navigation, referring families to community supports and triaging children to early intervention treatment services

Describe the evaluation findings reported during the fiscal year

(1) Systems and Policy Changes

Pediatric practices have the potential to reach a large population of children. Among children screened at 21 practices, 23% resulted in scores "of concern" in at least 1 of the 5 domains, with a range by practice of 6-35%. Providers encountered a number of barriers to making referrals including families' lack of access to existing services and family-related challenges, but a majority of providers (70%) reported that they had made referrals to the Help Me Grow Linkage Line. Providers found the Linkage Line quick and responsive and liked the feedback they received



Annual Report Form 3 (AR-3)(Page 2 of 5)
County Evaluation Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

updating them on the status of the referral.

Some 2011-13 grantees have engaged in planning for sustainability, while others have not for various reasons. Grantees expressed interest in receiving further training and support.

Community members noted their desire for F5AC to focus its resources on outcomes that align with Strengthening Families concepts, to facilitate collective systems change in the county, to serve as a “thought leader” for the community with an emphasis on evaluation, policy, research and communications.

(2)High Quality Providers and Supports

68 providers working in the East Oakland Project LAUNCH neighborhood completed Touchpoints training and pre and post – tests in July 2011, February and April 2012. As many as 79 - 92% of the trainees reported “some” or “a lot” of change in the content areas covered by the training. The results of pre and post-knowledge scores showed improvement of 1 to 5 points on the 32-point scale.

Focus group participants described how Touchpoints improved the quality of their relationships with clients, improved communication, enabled them to provide stronger more compassionate services, made them more accepting of challenging situations, makes it easier to identify strengths in children and provide positive feedback to parents, increased their opportunity to meet other providers and affected their interactions with other providers:

(3)Children Ready to Learn

During the first 18 months, Neighborhood Partnership grantees provided services at 13 sites in high-need neighborhoods. 1,000 families were served; 28 different languages were spoken at home by families surveyed. 60% of children whose parents were surveyed were not enrolled in licensed child care. 80% of surveyed families were “very satisfied” with the program. Families reported doing more to support their child’s school readiness, and staff and families reported positive changes in children’s school readiness skills. Based on observations of 50 children age 4 and older, staff noted that children improved in their ability to participate successfully in circle time, write their own first name, work and play cooperatively with peers, and stay focused during activities.

Results from the School Readiness Assessment mimic studies from prior years, showing children who are healthy, whose families access early learning activities in the community, and whose parents show positive parenting attitudes tend to transition into Kindergarten more smoothly than others. Readiness levels are also higher for children who have preschool or Summer Pre-K experience.

Children and families in the East Oakland special study experience much more stress and isolation than other communities studied through SRA. Most East Oakland school principals feel disconnected from early childhood resources, including ECE in their communities. Child participation in Special Education services also range widely across schools.



Annual Report Form 3 (AR-3)(Page 3 of 5)
County Evaluation Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

(4)Family Support

A review of Help Me Grow Linkage Line activities showed that staff are capable of accurately triaging families to early treatment, thereby reducing the need for an intervening “clarifying assessment” step in the referral pathway. Very few children who need treatment supports are without insurance coverage; the few who utilize treatment supports require intensive and expensive supports

Describe the policy impact of the evaluation results



Annual Report Form 3 (AR-3)(Page 4 of 5)
County Evaluation Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

(1) Systems and Policy Changes

Help Me Grow expanded training and TA to additional pediatric sites, with a focus on interpreting ASQ results and clarifying the role of the Help Me Grow Linkage Line. Ways of documenting the extent to which universal screening has been achieved are under consideration as well as how the new AAP Maintenance of Certification requirements may impact provider incentives to screen.

Two additional sustainability trainings for grantees are planned for 2012

The F5AC strategic plan for FY2013-17 is underway with new logic models that articulate F5AC roles as a funder, a catalyst, a collaborator and a trainer & capacity builder across strategies.

(2) High Quality Providers and Supports

Touchpoints trainings will be expanded to support providers in the Hayward Promise Neighborhood project, Public Health Black Infant Health and Improving Pregnancy Outcomes Program, and child care providers.

A follow-up reflective group will be offered to Touchpoints graduates to support ongoing improvements in provider skills and practices.

(3) Children Ready to Learn

Successes from the Neighborhood Partnership were shared at a "stakeholder's convening" in October 2012 in Oakland with the goal of cities' agencies continuing to sustain the services. Neighborhood Partnership grants to city libraries and park and recreation departments will be offered again in the 2013-15 grant cycle.

A larger School Readiness Assessment to establish a countywide baseline of children's K-readiness is planned for Fall 2013.

Project LAUNCH in East Oakland shifted focus to disseminating resource information for providers through a web-based (Craigslist-type) early childhood resource guide. A concerted focus will aim to streamline the community processes for early identification, referral and entry into development and mental health supports for children and for primary caregivers.

(4) Family Support

Resources for "clarifying assessments" will be discontinued as will "No Wrong Door" funds. Family navigation will explore a wider range of support models to meet diverse family needs. Help Me Grow will incubate an ASQ monitoring program that parents can access directly.



Annual Report Form 3 (AR-3)(Page 5 of 5)
County Evaluation Summary
for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013)

County: Alameda

Monday, December 09, 2013

I hereby certify the information submitted herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have the authority to submit this information. I make these certifications via my name, phone number and e-mail address entered below. I acknowledge that the data in this submission may be subject to verification at a later date.

Name Janis Burger

Phone 510-227-6911

Email janis.burger@first5alameda.org