

**CHARLOTTESVILLE/ALBEMARLE COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 2, 2005
ALBEMARLE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING-5TH STREET, ROOM B**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Phil Campbell, Region Ten Community Services Board
Martha Carroll, 16th District Court Service Unit
Shirley Copeland, Albemarle Citizen Representative
Robert Cox, Charlottesville Dept. of Social Services
Madison Cummings, Albemarle Citizen Representative
Dr. Michael Dickens, Charlottesville Citizen Representative
Leslie Harris-Scott, Charlottesville Citizen Representative
Tracey Hopper, Albemarle Citizen Representative
Dr. Susan McLeod, Thomas Jefferson Health District
Linda Peacock, City of Charlottesville
Kathy Ralston, Chair, Albemarle Department of Social Services
Sterling Robinson, Albemarle Citizen Representative
Cathy Train, United Way-Thomas Jefferson Area
Roxanne White, Albemarle County
Danielle Wilcox, Charlottesville Citizen Representative

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Dr. Kevin Castner, Albemarle County Schools
Dr. Scottie Griffin, Charlottesville City Schools
Timothy Heaphy, Charlottesville Citizen Representative
Winx Lawrence, University of Virginia
Alia Stewart-Silver, Charlottesville Youth Representative

Noah Schwartz, Monticello Area Community Action Agency
Kim Walters, Albemarle Youth Representative

CCF STAFF PRESENT

Saphira Baker, Director
Gretchen Ellis, Planner

OTHERS PRESENT

Heather Kellams, TeensGive and Youth Service Work Group

HANDOUTS (prior to meeting)

Agenda for February 3, 2005 CCF meeting
January 5, 2005 CCF meeting minutes
Director's Report
JABA-CCF Sub-Committee Intergenerational Proposal
Outcome Measurement Work Group Report
Youth Service Learning Work Group toolkit
Charlottesville CSA Summary Financial Report
Albemarle CSA Summary Financial Report
CSA CART Cases
CSA Meeting Minutes
Copy of the letter sent to Legislators about recent cuts

HANDOUTS (during meeting)

None

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

K. Ralston, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and welcomed Commissioners and guests.

II. SPECIFICATION OF ITEMS TO BE ADDED TO AGENDA

No agenda items were added.

III. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No comments were made.

IV. MINUTES FROM THE CCF MEETING FOR JANUARY 5, 2005

A motion to approve the January 5, 2005 minutes was made by T. Hopper and seconded by M. Dickens. The following changes were made by L. Peacock:

- On 2nd paragraph on page 6, change County to committee
- On 5th paragraph on page 6, delete “be there and does”
- Page 12; Correct spelling of Yancey School in two places
- Page 12; correct the spelling of paradigm

◆ THE COMMISSION APPROVED THE AMENDED MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2005 CCF MEETINGS.

V. YOUTH SERVICE LEARNING MANUAL

M. Cumming provided background information on the Youth Service Work Group, which has been meeting for about a year to look at standardizing best practices for youth service locally. He introduced work group chair Heather Kellams. H. Kellams noted that the work group’s goals have been to broaden and improve service opportunities. To that end, the work group has compiled a manual, or “tool kit” for community use. The manual was written by work group members with assistance from two University of Virginia doctoral students. The manual provides definitions of service and service learning. It places emphasis on six core components of effective service: preparation, coordination, service, reflection, recognition and evaluation. The manual addresses a variety of different types of service without favoring any particular kind. The tool kit is designed for both teacher/leaders and service site staff. A future brochure for youth is planned. The tool kit will be launched at an event being planned for April, 2005. Lexis-Nexus Corporation has graciously donated formatting and printing to produce 1,500 copies of the report.

S. Copeland asked about how usage will be tracked. H. Kellams said the work group has started working on this. Members will track distribution and then develop follow-up methodology, perhaps using surveys through the schools and United Way. S. McLeod asked if the manual will be on line and H. Kellams confirmed that it will. B. Cox praised the document as a great explanation of service and recommended putting it on the website. L. Peacock noted that she particularly liked the “tips and tools”.

H. Kellams reported that the report will likely be completed in March. In response to a question from D. Wilcox, M. Cummings and H. Kellams said work group members will be available to make presentations. H. Kellams talked about providing in-service trainings at schools and service fairs. M. Cummings noted that Albemarle County Schools have made youth service a secondary priority. K. Ralston thanked the work group on behalf of the Commission.

VI. REVISED JABA-CCF RECOMMENDATION

M. Cummings and S. McLeod presented revised recommendations for intergenerational involvement. They, along with S. Baker, met with JABA staff after the CCF February meeting where a joint Human Services Agenda was discussed. This document was prepared as a “pared down” approach to working together on intergenerational human service issues. M. Cummings asked for approval of the five recommendations presented on the approval items:

- I. Ask CCF to convene its Partnership for Children, Assets for Youth and Service Learning Work Groups with JABA to provide information on needs and resources, and generate ideas where JABA or other elder groups could meet and provide for early childhood and out-of-school youth programs.

In addition to CCF work group members, other early childhood and after-school program representatives (such as the new after school programs in Whitewood Village and Friendship Court) and interested school staff would be invited to this strategic session.

- II. Invite school representatives and members of both work groups above along with JABA and others (like the Senior Center) to a formally facilitated meeting to develop and prioritize specific strategies for intergenerational support in meeting early childhood and after-school service needs. JABA currently has about 15 volunteers involved in a program called Friends in School--Helping (FISH) active in the Albemarle County schools: Hollymead, Stone Robinson, Greer, Agnor-Hurt, Woodbrook, and Meriwether Lewis, grades K-5.
- III. Develop and distribute a joint research brief on a common trend or pressing community issue facing both the elderly and children and families.
- IV. Invite youth involved in the Assets' Youth Voices study to volunteer to serve on JABA's Intergenerational Advocacy Council for 2020 (IACT). IACT's goal is "To serve as a speakers bureau, advocacy group, and local 'eyes and ears' for concerns and issues related to the 2020 recommendations, specifically: To advocate for 2020 concerns before the General Assembly and governing boards in each locality; to educate local community groups, such as public and private organizations, employers, seniors, and school groups; to help collect local jurisdiction information for the 2020 Community Progress Report; to obtain feedback from local citizens about their ongoing needs and ways to improve the implementation process."
- V. Make a joint appeal to the business community and private funders to further support early childhood and out-of-school time programs.

C. Train asked whether other groups mentioned in Recommendation 1 have been approached. S. McLeod responded that they had not at this point, since the request was pending CCF action.

S. Copeland asked for more details about Recommendation #5 and S. McLeod noted that strategies have not been fully developed. She noted that CCF has approved a number of initiatives that require additional resources and the suggested strategy in recommendation #5 could be a way to increase resources.

C. Train suggested that the recommendations could be implemented in stages, with perhaps Recommendations 1&3 being addressed first, followed by Recommendations 2 & 4.

B. Cox suggested a first step would be for JABA staff to meet informally with work group Chairs and school staff to gauge interest – rather than all members of those groups. He was concerned about CCF capacity to manage a broader process. C. Train suggested that JABA or the Senior Center may have more capacity.

M. Cummings reflected back to pages 11-12 of last month's minutes and noted the following comments.

- *M. Dickens stated that, having advocated for children at the national and state level for years, he has always been struck that there is a dynamic competition between the advocates for elders and advocates for children. The elderly vote and politicians listen, and generally the advocates for the elderly will win the day. He stated that the Commission potentially has things to gain, and that it would be better to be in the same boat than compete as we all live in the same community. However, M. Dickens does not want CCF to lose sight that they are advocates for children and the need to be forceful about that. .*
- *K. Castner stated that he wondered if there was another way to look at this. He stated that the elderly is the fastest growing population, a population that sometimes has money to give. If we are talking also about intergenerational advocacy and the fact that they could be tutoring some of the same children we are having trouble with, how can we say that we don't have interest in the human services agenda, as this may be a communication agenda where we can see if there is a way to marshal resources? We are going to have to change the paradigm, that instead of setting*

it up as something they might provide, we might invite JABA and elders to come to the table and see what they might say. They will not know some of the issues we are dealing with if we don't consider that bridge. It may be something different than what they are asking but is it an opportunity we might want to look into?

M. Cummings believes that intergenerational collaboration presents potential benefits for CCF, and for the community.

L. Peacock supported Recommendation #1 using the methodology suggested by B. Cox. She does not support Recommendation #2 thinking it would lead to another duplicative study and strategic planning process. She supports Recommendations 3, 4 and 5 as future steps if resources allow. She noted there is no harm in asking youth if they want to join the JABA group, though that does not need to involve CCF time.

T. Hopper suggested that a meeting between JABA and CCF be held to clarify roles. D. Wilcox ascertained that JABA participated in and supports the proposal.

M. Dickens suggested testing the waters by coming up with a specific proposal to pilot the concept to see how it works. He recommended choosing one or two projects to pursue.

C. Train asked whether this concept arose a result of JABA having an excess of volunteers or because CCF had identified a need. S. McLeod said JABA brought the concept to CCF at its May meeting.

D. Wilcox endorsed M. Dickens concept of a pilot, but questioned whether CCF should convene.

K. Ralston suggested putting together a meeting CCF work groups and JABA and Senior Center staffs to discuss how the work groups could interact with elders in an intergenerational project.

L. Harris-Scott noted that there are grants that target intergenerational projects, particularly in the substance abuse arena, and suggested a search.

L. Peacock asked about whether the relatively small number of volunteers in FISH program indicates a lack of interest or volunteer capacity among seniors. M. Cummings noted that this program has been launched recently.

K. Ralston said it is important that there not be a new CCF work group created to address intergenerational issues, but rather suggested that existing work group(s) could incorporate intergenerational strategies into work plan(s).

BY CONSENSUS, THERE WAS AGREEMENT TO PURSUE RECOMMENDATION#1 WITH SMALL MEETING OF WORK GROUP LEADERS WITH JABA AND SENIOR CENTER STAFF TO GAUGE NEED, INTEREST, AND CAPACITY.

S. Baker was asked to contact JABA and work with them to arrange this one-time meeting. It was hoped that the work group members and JABA could proceed on their own after this initial meeting, and that CCF staff would not remain in a convening role. Should this not be the case, the issue could be brought back to the Commission.

VII. OUTCOME MEASUREMENT WORK GROUP

D. Wilcox provided background information on the history of the work group and summarized the Outcome Measurement Work Group February 2005 report. She presented the two priority recommendations (Option 1) and a secondary recommendation (Option 2).

She noted that Work Group members were at a crossroads and sought guidance from CCF members as to their preferred next steps. Work group members had been fortunate to have the assistance of able graduate students last year and these students are no longer available to complete the Focus Areas project as envisioned. Thus, to continue with the Work Group's charge CCF will require additional resources. She described the options, which were summarized on an "Approval Sheet" as:

Option I:

Pursue Recommendations 1 and 2

1. Keep focus areas data current and relevant -- The Focus Areas project is a compilation of over 54 reports, based on a review of data collected by CCF between 2001-2003. Like *Stepping Stones*, new trends and information change annually and should be updated to show trends, changes and new areas for focus. The cost for this is estimated at \$1500 for a graduate intern. Additional input by stakeholders and evaluation of the impact would bring the total to an estimated \$3600.
2. Create a human services budget to understand and summarize human service investments -- In order to make sound recommendations regarding human service programming and funding gaps, a corresponding document that measures overall public human service investments, or assets, is needed. The Focus areas documents lists needs, but does not take into account the full range of human services offered outside of the 25-30 non-profits funded by the City and the County. A Human Service Budget -- or the development of a "child and family budget" -- was recommended to CCF in 1999, but no resources were available at that time to support it, nor was there sufficient staff capacity. The estimated one-time cost for this is \$12,000 for consultation services, and an ongoing cost of approximately \$8-12,000 to compile this annually.

Option II:

Continue the Outcome Measurement Work Group in "maintenance mode" which will include: Reviewing *Key Findings on Child and Family Needs* on an annual basis; evaluating and monitoring the agency application process/form and assessing agency training needs, and addressing other issues that might arise from tonight's report.

D. Wilcox noted that, if Option 1 were to be approved, work group members and staff would need to fund raise.

T. Hopper asked whether the \$8,000-\$12,000 for developing a Human Services Budget would relieve any of the work burdens on ABRT. D. Wilcox said that while Recommendation 2 would generate more information for reviewers, she did not believe that this would decrease the work load for the ABRT. B. Cox and K. Ralston agreed.

S. Baker stated that CCF is charged with making recommendations to the localities about investments in child and family services, beyond the scope of the Agency Budget Review Team, so the information would have broader benefits. She noted that at today's CCF presentation to the Albemarle Board of Supervisors, she was asked about whether and how CCF identifies gaps and priorities in addition to community needs. She was also asked as to whether CCF's analyzed public human services investments as well as the work of non-profit applicants to the City-County.

S. McLeod asked about why it would take the time and money projected to compile readily available data. She also noted that gathering the requested information could be costly for organizations.

B. Cox wondered whether there is adequate support from the non-profit stakeholders -- some who have been lobbying Council this year, in part, in response to projected budget shortages. He thought it would be critical to get explicit support from Council that they would use this information and support this direction.

S. Baker noted that she believes that agencies would like broader information about the level of local support for human services beyond non-profit organizations. She noted that the human services budget came out of these discussions at the Outcome Measurement Work Group regarding the need to understand “assets” as well as “needs” before making any type of recommendation for priorities.

C. Train asked whether there is an interest in #2 among governmental and quasi-governmental agencies along with local leadership. S. Baker noted that the idea came out of the Outcome Measurement Work Group, and had been seen as worthwhile by that group. R. White noted that the concept has been around for a long time. She thinks that the study would be valuable and would help local governments. She notes that if the work group were to increase the focus on priorities, she would recommend that the work group should provide information but not recommend priorities; rather priorities should be established at the Commission level. L. Peacock agreed that there needs to be a “big picture” before priorities can be set. She estimated that the City total investment in human services is approximately \$11 million, exclusive funding provided to the Department of Social Services and Parks and Recreation.

C. Train suggested that there needs to be a commitment by the localities to act on the recommended priorities. L. Peacock noted that she believed Council would have an interest in this information. T. Hopper noted that ABRT recommendations have almost always been accepted by the Board and Council.

S. Baker believes that the costs of producing a human services budget are not “sunk costs”, but the information will help the localities and organizations to leverage more funds – as many of CCF’s research and data projects have in the past – as well as to advocate for attention in selected areas.

S. McLeod asked whether the costs projected in Option 1 have been submitted in this year’s budget. S. Baker noted that the CCF budget requests a new planner/grants analyst, and that, if this position were funded, a person in that position could easily complete the human services budget; however, she is not optimistic that this will be funded, so funds likely would need to be raised from other sources.

P. Campbell asked about the focus of Recommendation 2, whether it suggests a child and family budget or a human service budget. From Region Ten’s perspective, a human service budget would need to information beyond local funding, such as Medicaid.

T. Hopper asked whether there are communities have created human service budgets that look at all of the funding sources. K. Ralston noted that there are other communities that have done so. S. Baker provided an example from Philadelphia (Philadelphia Safe and Sound). S. Baker noted that other communities use this information to guide investments, coordinate and avoid duplication, and as an advocacy tool. C. Train asked whether such studies would include a review of services provided by both public and private providers. Typically, these annual budget summaries only look at those that are governmentally funded. B. Cox suggested it is important to gather information on private providers.

T. Hopper noted that creating a human service or child and family budget requires use of data that can be skewed and criticized based on research flaws. CCF would need to be prepared to address these concerns.

K. Ralston suggested that there may not be enough capacity within CCF to take this project on and simultaneously move forward on other priorities.

S. Baker said that she views CCF as having a dual role, a research agenda focused on system reform (Stepping Stones/Outcome Measurement) and an action agenda to move forward priority areas (Child Advocacy Center, Youth After-school programs.) She feels it is critical for CCF to continue investing in these core research and data collection areas in order to retain the solid information, credibility and reliability needed to be effective on the other front. Without a solid foundation in research and understanding of local services, she noted that CCF’s advocacy won’t be differentiated from other

organizations such as Just Children. It is important to continue to invest in both “research and development” component of CCF, as well as promoting our specific projects that we push forward as a result of that research.

K. Ralston drew attention to the full report and noted that it indicates that there were recommendations made over the years that could not be acted on due to capacity. L. Peacock noted that the work group prioritized the recommendations, and explained that that is way not all previous recommendations were included in this request to CCF.

S. McLeod suggested that there is a need to talk with the other organizations (governmental and quasi-governmental) that receive local funding about the recommendations to obtain their buy-in.

S. Copeland noted that, at today’s Board of Supervisors presentation, Supervisors wanted concrete information on duplication of services and wanted recommendations on how to invest funds. She suggested that the elected bodies should be asked what they want from the Commission. B. Cox agreed and said it is critical to know whether the Council and Board will support CCF recommendations. R. White said the original charge to CCF was to look at human service needs. She noted that there is a need for more analysis of needs beyond creation of a budget. She noted that it would help, in gathering support from them for this recommendation, to have CCF member’s support of the idea.

T. Hopper noted that CCF has many charges and is concerned about capacity to meet all of these.

M. Cummings noted that he views the United States current policies “penny wise and pound foolish”. He believes that the localities are not in this situation, but are at risk of making unwise investments. He stated that CCF has done research on community needs and he stressed that it is incumbent on Commissioners to advocate with elected officials and the private sector, and urged members to reconsider the niggardly endorsement of funds, and to advocate for spending money for what we know is needed.

S. McLeod moved to pursue Option 2 and table Option 1 until the City/County budget process is completed and to bring Option 1 back to the Commission after that decision is made. The motion was seconded by M. Cummings.

After discussion, S. McLeod withdrew her motion.

P. Campbell suggested that, regardless of capacity, CCF should begin to collect the information about current services and budget to children and families.

D. Wilcox moved approval of Option 2, and approval of Option 1 contingent on availability of funding from the City, County, and/or other funding sources. The motion was seconded by M. Dickens.

On a hand count the motion was approved: Aye: 14; No: 1

- ◆ **THE COMMISSION APPROVED THE MOTION TO APPROVE OPTION 2 AND APPROVE OPTION 1 CONTINGENT ON THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING FROM THE CITY, COUNTY, AND/OR OTHER FUNDING SOURCES.**

D. DIRECTORS REPORT

Deferred.

DI. MEMBER’S COMMENTS

None.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

**THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION WILL BE
MARCH 2, 2005
IN THE ALBEMARLE COUNTY 5TH STREET OFFICE BUILDING
CCF CONFERENCE ROOM**