FIRST THINGS FIRST

Ready for School. Set for Life.

Arizona Early Childhood Development & Health Board

Regional Boundary Task Force
October 25, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order

Co-Chair Dr. Judy Mohraz opened the meeting at approximately 8:05 a.m. on Thursday, October 25, 2012, welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Regional Boundary Task Force, and expressed the importance of this work. Introductions of the Task Force members followed.

Members Present

Co-Chair Jack Jewett, Co-Chair Dr. Judy Mohraz, Amy St. Peter, Patrick Contrades, Kevin Brown, Dr. David Daugherty, Anna Maria Maldonado, Patrick McWhortor, Gayle Burns, Stu Turgel, Bruce Liggett, Dr. Bob England, Cindy Hallman, Carol Wymer, Riley Frei, Sharri Moody, Hon. Cecil Patterson, John Lewis, Jane Kroesen, Kim Van Pelt

Members Absent

Esther Capin, Patricia Nightingale, Hon. Luis Gonzales, Dr. Richard Saran

Staff in attendance: Rhian Allvin, Michelle Katona, Alex Turner, Melody Bozza, and consultants Kristin Borns and Michele Walsh

Overview of Open Meeting Law

Alex Turner, Assistant Attorney General, presented a power point presentation overview of Open Meeting Law, as the Regional Boundary Task Force will be subject to the rules and regulations governing open meetings for the State of Arizona.

Call to the Public

Co-Chair Jewett made a call to the public however no members of the public were present. Co-Chair Jewett advised that for future meetings there will be a call to the public and that comments would be limited to 2 minutes per person.

Overview of the Purpose and Objectives of the Task Force

Co-Chair Mohraz introduced the purpose, objectives and timelines of the Regional Boundary Task Force. The Regional Boundary Task Force will be taking their recommendations to the Board in 2013, with any recommendations adopted by the Board taking effect in SFY15 and SFY16. After this initial meeting, staff will collect data, both qualitative and quantitative, and conduct an analysis as directed by the Task Force for the January meeting. Timelines and meeting objectives for the meetings in 2013 were reviewed. Information will be provided to the public at large and to all 31 Regional Partnership Councils so they are kept apprised of what is occurring at Task Force meetings.

Review of Background Materials

Michelle Katona, Chief Regional Officer, presented an overview of the background materials (attachments 3 through 6) provided to the Task Force.

- Attachment 3 - Map of the 31 Regional Partnership Councils and their current boundaries. There are 31 Regional Partnership Councils of which 10 of those are tribal regions. Tribes determine how they want their tribal lands designated, as a separate region or to remain part of a regional boundary. Boundary changes that may be recommended by the Task Force may affect how tribes make their decision to remain as part of a region or elect to become a separate region.
- Attachment 4 – Detail information on the individual regional council boundaries. Michelle Katona introduced Beverly Russell, Senior Director of Tribal Affairs, who works closely with tribes and has formal communication with tribal leaders to advise them of the work of the Regional Boundary Task Force and any proposed changes. Every two years the tribes are permitted to revisit their decision and make any changes. There have been no changes since 2008.

  As part of attachment 4, a pie chart illustrated how funding allocations are set for the regions. Allocations are based on three components with the first two being formula driven:
  1) Population of children 0-5 in the region,
  2) Population of children 0-5 who live in poverty in the region

  The third component of the allocation is the discretionary funding. The Board has distributed the discretionary funding in line with the formula distribution with the exception of a slight bump to two very small tribal regions and a frontier community adjustment for regions that have vast geographic distances to travel

First Things First expends funds according to the formula of 10% administrative, 9% statewide programs, and 81% regions. Based upon the2009 census and the most recent 2010 census for the population of children 0-5 and children 0-5 in poverty, there have been population shifts which have impacted allocations. A clarification was made that the poverty guidelines being used are 100% of the Federal Poverty Level.

Attachment 5 – This spreadsheet provided information on all the strategies funded by regional councils. This provides an example of what information can be provided to the Task Force. The amount a regional council puts into a strategy, such as the home visiting, is based on how they prioritize home visiting as a need. There is an average cost of services, but the specific model implemented affects those costs.

Attachment 6 – This attachment provided a summary of the three previous boundary reviews that have been conducted. The initial and 2nd reviews were conducted by Linda Cannon. The initial 2007 review was presented to Board in December of 2007, and provided guidelines about how to think about and establish boundaries, and the importance of how families view boundaries. This led to changes during the second review based upon the feedback received from regional councils and communities. While consolidation was raised during this review it was determined that this was not the direction to go because the regional councils had just established funding plans and put out grant applications, and there was not enough information to determine if the boundaries should change.

In addition to the background materials provided, clarification was provided on the allocation process, how the Board sets the budget which then determines available funding for the regional councils, and guidance provided to the regional councils to develop their 3-year strategic plan using the prior year revenue figures.

Rhian Allvin, CEO, also explained the 10% budget allocation to administrative costs, and that this percentage is fixed per statute, and that the statute is based on revenue, not expenditures. Of revenue accumulated, 10% is set aside in an administrative account. Historically administrative costs stay at 10% or less and excess is moved into the program fund.

Approximately six regions saw significant population shifts that affected their SFY14 allocations, and while some lost, others gained. Regional councils also have carry forward dollars that stay within the regions. Over the next two years regional councils will focus on spending down their carry forward so in SFY16 the Board can take a fresh look at what the tobacco revenue is and set a budget based on revenue. Contracts will be ending in SFY15, and because the Board will hear the recommendations of this Task Force in June of 2013, there will be a year and half to prepare for any proposed changes.

Another concern of boundary changes is the human capital aspect, specifically regarding the pool of community members available to serve on regional councils. This has always been a concern for certain councils that have had ongoing vacancies, and compounding the issue are possible conflicts of interest that leave only a few council members to make decisions. Filling philanthropy seats are challenging, especially in rural areas, and within tribal regions. The health and business seats have also been difficult to fill as well as the faith seat in some regions. First Things First developed a matrix for the last three years that reflects what seats are filled, and which seats turn over to get a clearer picture of any

patterns that may develop. The 11-member regional council make-up is prescribed by statute, and cannot be altered and it is strongly recommended that this issue be considered as part of the decision making process.

Member Kroesen and Member Hallman requested that staff provide data on what each council is funding in the way of programs and services across regions to better understand the impact of any proposed boundary changes.

The Regional Boundary Task Force members were encouraged to take the time to review the information provided.

Define Issues and Key Focus Areas

Attachment 7 defined the Issues and Key Focus areas that the Task Force has been asked to address.

1) Recognizing that the structure is largely serving its mandate, but there are challenges in practice. The regional councils are working together and allowing communities to move at their own pace and focus on the community. Civic engagement doesn't happen overnight, and requires intentional focus and time to develop.

2) Assess more closely the desirability and feasibility of consolidating urban regions (Maricopa, Phoenix and Pima). This creates an issue for providers in that there may be RFGAs across numerous regions and the coordination involved. This takes time, desire and intentionality to accomplish without losing sight of the rural areas contained within urban regions.

3) Continue to review the rural regions to assess if boundary changes are needed to better align service delivery and increase opportunities for capacity building. A specific example would be many families in La Paz County travel to Lake Havasu for service delivery. In another example, Queen Creek is one of the few cities divided across a regional boundary.

4) Tribal considerations – There has been overwhelming feedback from tribes that partnerships are strong and respectful of recognizing their sovereignty. For tribes that have stayed within a region there has also been significant positive feedback that regional councils are working with the tribes and almost every regional council with a tribe has an agreement with the tribe for services, though some are still in development. Any changes could affect how tribes make their decisions and needs to be taken into consideration.

5) While we are seeing collaboration across regions and between tribes, we are also getting feedback that boundaries can cause silos and hinder collaboration. While this may be attributable to First Things First still being relatively new, and collaboration takes time, others feel that the sheer number of regions may not lend itself to effective coordination.

Co-Chair Jewett thanked staff for outlining such an expansive program of work and appreciated the provision of the draft for discussion by the Task Force. He then asked the Task Force if they were

comfortable with the scope of work and issues as defined in the draft, with no further questions or changes he asked if they were ready to vote on adopting these key issues and focus areas as the guidelines for the work of the Task Force.

Member Turgel motioned to adopt the key issues and focus areas as outlined.

Member McWhortor seconded the motion, with none opposed, the motion carried.

Define Data Collection

With the approval of the key issues and focus areas of the Task Force approved, the Task Force moved on to the data collection process to discuss what data collection methods were available and what information the Task Force felt they would need in order to make recommendations to the Board.

The following data and collection methods were discussed:

1) Developing and releasing targeted surveys and conducting key focus groups and stake holder meetings to gather input.
2) Providing an overview of region to region demographics.
3) Quantifying services by provided data on funded strategies across regions.
4) Identifying successful mechanisms for cross-regional collaboration.
5) Looking at documented cases of cross-regional collaboration that are currently working.
6) Developing systematic measures of stakeholder satisfaction and barriers to service.
7) Using area case studies on who is being served, who is being turned away, and who is requesting services.
8) Conducting a cost study to describe the resource costs of multiple regions.

Regional councils could, and should be queried with respect to their points of view and to provide valuable input on possible consolidation of regions and boundary changes, and would it be possible to do this at upcoming regional council meetings. In order to sit down with the regional councils, and given the current timeframe and overall timeline, discussions with the regional councils would need to occur during their November meetings.

One option to query the councils would be to send a survey to the regional councils prior to their scheduled November meetings in order to provide structure to the boundary conversations at their meetings, and invite open discussions and feedback to the Task Force.

Staff were instructed to develop the specific questions and parameters, based on the methods of data collection, that need to be answered by the councils to provide information for the Task Force by the January meeting.

A balanced approach to data collection, in conjunction with public input, would provide the most beneficial data, and ensure that all regional councils and the communities they serve will have an opportunity to be heard during this process.

It is important to recognize the difference between input and data when reviewing the results of the data collection. The regional councils have recently completed their Needs and Assets reports, and some of the desired data may be available in those reports, as in the previous Regional Boundary Task Force reports.

Because FTF is bound by a strict interpretation of the statute, there is less flexibility than with a private organization. Because guidelines require funding by population, there are very stringent rules regarding sharing money across boundaries and may not be feasible within the statute.

The eight point summary of what data the Task Force would like to review:

1) Focus specifically on certain regional areas based on urban issues and consolidation

2) Important to obtain a regional perspective upfront from council members

3) Where are the gaps in services based on the needs of the regions

4) List of the pros and cons for consolidation, and what the mitigating factors may be

5) Impact to families in a region if consolidation were to occur

6) Broad overview of a demographic analysis of differences in poverty

7) Service provider perspectives and views on consolidation

8) Administrative cost analysis

Co-Chair Mohraz asked the Task Force if there was agreement to adopt the 8 point summary of data to be collected, and instruct staff to use their best judgment in defining the parameters of how it is to be collected, in order to report back to the Task Force at the January meeting.

Member McWhortor motioned to adopt the 8 point summary of data to be collected, and instructing the staff to define the parameters in order to report back to the Task Force at the January 2013 meeting.

Member Turgel seconded the motion, with none opposed, motion carried.

The final item brought forth by Co-Chair Mohraz was to provide an overview of the timeline and schedule for developing recommendations and gathering public input. Beginning in January 2013 the Task Force will examine the data collected. In February 2013, the Task Force will develop a draft set of recommendations with the March meeting slated for approval of the recommendations. March and April of 2013 will be slated for public input, including presentations to regional councils, community meetings and focus groups in key communities and possible tribal consultations. Service providers in these communities will also be invited to participate in the focus groups.

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting of the Regional Boundary Task force will be held on January 7, 2013 at the Burton Barr Library, 1221 N. Central Ave., Phoenix AZ 85004

Adjourn

Co-Chair Dr. Judy Mohraz adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:32 p.m.

Co-Chair Jack Jewett

Co-Chair Judy Mohraz