Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Deaths

May 18, 2016
2:15 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.
Sierra Health Foundation

Meeting Outcomes:
1) Vote on Funding Recommendations for Community Incubator Lead (CIL) Organization in Oak Park
2) Vote on 7th RAACD CIL Meadowview Community RFP
3) Vote on Funding Recommendations for Evaluations Data Hub Manager and Participatory Action Team

2:15 p.m. Welcome and Updates:
Chet Hewitt & Dr. Natalie Woods Andrews
Co-Chairs, Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Deaths
• Approval of April 2016 Meeting Minutes

2:30 p.m. CIL Review Process and Funding Recommendations
Kindra Montgomery-Block
• Review of Charter
• Overview of CIL Oak Park Funding Review Process

3:00 p.m. Vote on Community Incubator Lead Funding Recommendations and 7 CIL RFP Meadowview Release
• Steering Committee Vote
  1. Oak Park
  2. Meadowview CIL 7th Community RFP

3:30 p.m. Review Selection Process: Data Hub Manager and Participatory Action Research Team
Leslie Cooksy
• Overview of Process: Data Hub Manager and Participatory Action Research Team

3:45 p.m. Vote on Evaluations: Data Hub Manager and Participatory Action Research Team
• Steering Committee Vote
  1. Data Hub Manager
  2. Participatory Action Research Team

4:00 p.m. Announcements: Important Dates and Events
1. June 2, 2016 – Sierra Health Foundations Children’s Innovation Awards Celebration
   Location: Mulvaney’s B&L – 4 p.m. – 7 p.m.
2. June 23, 2016 – Community Incubator Lead Launch Symposium
   Location: Sierra Health Foundation Bannon Island Room – 9 a.m. – 4 p.m.

4:05 p.m. Public Comment

4:15 p.m. Adjourn
Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Deaths

May 18, 2016
2:15 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.
Sierra Health Foundation
1321 Garden Highway
Meeting Summary Notes

Attendees:


A quorum of members was present.

Center Staff: Diane Littlefield, Kaying Hang, Leslie Cooksy, Kindra Montgomery-Block, Kim Maslaniak, Madeline Sabatoni

Guests: Yuuko Feletto (SCOE Infant Development Program), bel Reyes (Innovation Bridge), Julie Gallelo (First5 Sacramento), Lyn Berkley-Baskin

Not Present:
Steering Committee Members: Pastor Robert Jones, Leslie Moore, Wendy Petko

Excused Absence: Stephanie Bray, Diane Galati, Chet Hewitt, Aliane Murphy Hasan

Meeting called to order:
Meeting called to order at 2:25 pm

Steering Committee Updates:
Dr. Woods Andrews opened the meeting with an overview of the agenda.

Kindra Montgomery-Block presented the funding opportunity processes, including the number of grant and contract applications received, the process for review and the process moving forward. Please see attached power point slides.

Steering Committee members were asked to review the Charter and Roster, noting that certain members have weighted votes. Please see the attached Charter and Roster.

Steering Committee members were asked to review the Conflict of Interest policy. Please see the attached conflict of interest policy.

Steering Committee members were asked to declare their conflict of interest for the Community Incubator Lead grant opportunity in Oak Park and the Evaluation Data Hub and Participatory
Action Research Coordinator contract opportunities in writing and out loud. Please see the attached form that members were asked to submit related to the current funding opportunities.

**Declarations of Conflict:**
- Natalie Woods Andrews: none
- Kim Williams: conflict with Evaluation applicant LPC Consultants; recuse for both Evaluation opportunities
- Judge Barry Loncke: none
- Linda Fong-Somera: conflict with Evaluation applicant LPC Consultants; recuse for both Evaluation opportunities
- Dr. Ethan Cutts: none
- Tina Roberts: conflict with 4 Your Epiphany; recuse for Oak Park neighborhood
- Kim Pearson: none
- Captain Bobby Davis: none
- Debra Cummings: none
- Pastor Alice Baber-Banks: none
- Marlon Yarber: none
- Gladys Deloney: none
- Keith Herron: Board Member with ONTRACK; recuse for Oak Park neighborhood
- Dr. Olivia Kasirye: none
- Paris Dye: none
- Essence Webb: none

**Oak Park**
Recusals: Keith Herron, Tina Roberts
Review Committee’s recommended organization: A recommendation was not made
Summary: The Greater Sacramento Urban League submitted an application that was not reviewed, due to a clerical error. Because their application met all submission criteria, the Oak Park neighborhood applications were re-reviewed to include all applications.

The top two applicants were The Greater Sacramento Urban League and ONTRACK.

**ONTRACK**
Summary: Ms. Montgomery-Block and members of the review committee provided a summary of the written proposal, including the proposed implementation plan, locations and ability to house MDTs. In addition, reviewers summarized their findings of the site visit. Partners named during discussion included: St. Paul Church, WEAVE, WellSpace, Oak Park Community Center, C-SECT

**Average Scores:**
Written Proposal: 39.4
Site Visit: 44
Composite: 83.4
Requested funding level: The request was for the full $300,000.

**Greater Sacramento Urban League (GSUL)**

**Average Scores:**

Summary: Ms. Montgomery-Block and members of the review committee provided a summary of the written proposal, including the proposed implementation plan, locations and ability to house MDTs. In addition, reviewers summarized their findings of the site visit. Partners named during discussion included: St. Hope, Sacramento City Gang Prevention Task Force, Women’s Civic Group, Father Keith McKinney Elementary School, Collette Perry, St. Paul Church

Written Proposal: 36.25  
Site visit: 45  
Composite: 81.25

Requested funding level: The request was for the full $300,000.

**Other Applicants:**

4 Your Epiphany

**Average Scores:**

Written Proposal: 27.25  
Site Visit: N/A  
Composite: 27.25

The discussion of the Oak Park Applicants’ proposals raised additional questions from the Steering Committee that could not be answered by the materials provided by the applicants. Due to the additional questions regarding the applications, the Steering Committee held a vote on whether to approve a grant for the Oak Park CIL RFP.

**Public Comment:** none

**Vote on CIL Funding Recommendations for Oak Park:**

The Steering Committee on the Reduction of African American Child Deaths decided to not vote on the community incubator lead for the Oak Park neighborhood.

**Vote:** 16 Yay. One (1) Nay. Two (2) Recusals

**Follow Up Item:** Center for Health Program Management staff are instructed to conduct secondary interviews for the Oak Park neighborhood community incubator lead.

**Valley Hi/Meadowview Split**
Staff recommends splitting the Valley Hi and Meadowview neighborhoods into two neighborhoods, each with their own Community Incubator Lead.

Please see slide for additional information.

This recommendation proposes that a separate RFP for Meadowview be released with a timeline specific to that neighborhood. South Sacramento Christian Center would remain the Valley Hi grantee.

Public comment: none

Vote on CIL Split for Valley Hi/Meadowview:
The Steering Committee on the Reduction of African American Child Deaths recommends to the Center for Health Program Management to split the Valley Hi and Meadowview neighborhood into two neighborhoods with two separate Community Incubator Leads.

Vote: Yes – Unanimous

Evaluation Participatory Action Research Coordinator Funding Recommendations:
Recusals: Kim Williams, Linda Fong-Somera
Review Committee’s recommended organization/company: LPC Associates

Clarification of terms: PAR: Participatory Action Research, which is community-driven evaluation. Community members will go and collect data.

Note: Both LPC Associates and UC Davis Center for Regional Change asked to submit for both Evaluation opportunities. Review was based on separate proposals for each opportunity, but one interview.

LPC Associates:
Summary: Leslie Cooksy and members of the review team provided a summary of the written proposal including main areas of strengths relative to the requirements of the PAR coordinator and TA provider. In addition, reviewers summarized their findings following the interviews. Average score: 125/140

UC Davis Center for Regional Change:
Summary: Leslie Cooksy and members of the review team provided a summary of the written proposal including main areas of strengths relative to the requirements of the PAR coordinator and TA provider. In addition, reviewers summarized their findings following the interviews. Average score: 107/140

Other Applicants
Valley Vision
Professor Nicelma King, UC Davis
Vote on Participatory Action Research Funding Recommendations:
The Steering Committee on the Reduction of African American Child Deaths recommends to the Center for Health Program Management to select the LPC Associates as the Participatory Action Research Coordinator.

Vote: Yes - Unanimous

Evaluation Data Hub Manager Funding Recommendations:
Recusals: Kim Williams, Linda Fong-Somera
Review Committee’s recommended organization/company: LPC Associates

Note: Both LPC Associates and UC Davis Center for Regional Change asked to submit for both Evaluation opportunities. Review was based on separate proposals for each opportunity, but one interview.

LPC Associates:

Summary:
Leslie Cooksy and members of the review team provided a summary of the written proposal including main areas of strengths relative to the requirements of the Data Hub Manager and TA provider. In addition, reviewers summarized their findings following the interviews.

Average score: 125/140

UC Davis Center for Regional Change:
Summary: Leslie Cooksy and members of the review team provided a summary of the written proposal including main areas of strengths relative to the requirements of the Data Hub Manager and TA provider. In addition, reviewers summarized their findings following the interviews.

Average score: 105/140

Discussion:
Concerns were raised about having the same organization collect the PAR data, as well as manage it. It was noted that both organizations would have separate teams to do the work. The Center Evaluation Director will be able to offer an independent check and ensure that quality control measures will be used. The applicants also committed to attending all Evaluation Workgroup meetings, which will provide oversight of the work of the contractors.

Other Applicants
Public Profit

Public comment: Lynn Berkely Baskin noted that most organizations would apply for both and would state that they would prefer to do both. Yuuko Feletto, who had participated in the review team, affirmed the staff report of the strengths of the recommended applicant.
Vote on Data Hub Manager Funding Recommendations:
The Steering Committee on the Reduction of African American Child Deaths recommends to the Center for Health Program Management to select the LPC Associates as the Data Hub Manager.

Vote: Nine (9) Yay; Eight (8) Nay; One (1) Abstention; Two (2) Recusals

Public Comment:
Lynn Berkely Baskin asked how people who were not selected for funding will be included in the work. It was noted that staff is continuing to reach out to those people with different opportunities for partnership, including joining the Community Leadership Roundtable.

Updates and Next Steps
Refer to slides (attached) regarding the funding opportunity timeline.

We will be piloting the multi-disciplinary teams in two sites at first: Arden-Arcade and Valley Hi.

Gladys Deloney noted that the County Crossover Youth Practice Model team would like to know more about the work of the Steering Committee and she will help make the connection.

Meeting adjourned
5:00 p.m.
Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Deaths

Steering Committee Meeting
May 18, 2016
Voting Process and Procedures
Community Incubator Leads
Evaluation Contracts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th><strong>Review Proposals: Individual review and rating of proposals (Review Team)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td><strong>Review Team Meeting: Discuss the top-rated proposals to determine which of those will be selected for interviews (Review Team)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td><strong>Proposer Site Visits/Interviews: Proposers clarify Review Team’s questions and provide more information on proposals (Review Team and MDT County Members)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td><strong>Develop Review Team Recommendations: Determine final funding recommendations based on proposal review, review team discussions and information from interviews. (Review Team)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td><strong>RAACD Steering Committee (SC) Funding Recommendation Meeting: SC deliberates on presented recommendations and develops final funding recommendations to the Center for Health Program Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td><strong>Grantmaking: A due diligence check is done on recommended proposers and the contracting process begins (the Center)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Term:** May/June 2016 to May/June 2019 – grant renewals in year 4/5
Consider the funding recommendations as brought forth by the review team

Make final funding recommendations based on:
- Merit of the statements, proposals and interviews in relation to goals of the funding opportunities
- Available funding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members by Category</th>
<th>Number of Voting Members</th>
<th>Number of Votes Per Category</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. County Public Health Officer</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>Dr. Olivia Kasirye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Bray (United Way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Ethan Cutts (Kaiser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Galati (Dignity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community Based Health Provider</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>Wendy Petko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Law Enforcement (Sheriff/Probation)</td>
<td>[ 2 ]</td>
<td>[ 2 ]</td>
<td>Robert Davis- Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marlon Yarber - Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judge Barry Loncke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Education</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aliane Murphy-Hasan-NAACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastor Robert Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris Dye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debra Cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Current Members = 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conflict of Interest

Rationale

Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Deaths members have a commitment to conduct all responsibilities of the RAACD in a manner consistent with the best interest of the RAACD mission. This requires that all decisions and actions of members on behalf of the RAACD must be made or taken solely with a desire to serve in the best interest of the community, rather than a desire to serve in the best interest of individual agencies.

With this information, the RAACD can take action to ensure there is an impartial decision-making process. In such a case when there is an apparent or perceived conflict of interest, action may consist of one or more of the following:

- RAACD member will recuse himself or herself from the discussion
- RAACD member will recuse himself or herself from any vote regarding the specific matter
- RAACD member will recuse himself or herself from the review and rating of grant proposals
Conflict of Interest

Definition of Actual or Potential Conflict of Interest

The following is provided to identify the types of volunteer activities that may create actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

- Directly or indirectly influencing the allocation of funds based on a personal or family interest in or an affiliation with specific agencies

- Current affiliations or past affiliations within the prior two years present a potential conflict of interest if a RAACD member or a family member has:
  
  An affiliation that is inclusive of, but not limited to, service as an employee, board member, advisory committee member, volunteer, intern, consultant, advisor and/or client with an organization that is seeking a RAACD grant
Members who have a conflict of interest as defined by the Fair Political Practices Act, AB 1797 (January 1, 2003) and any other applicable state law must do the following:

1. Announce the conflict;
2. Describe the nature of the conflict; and
3. Recuse themselves and leave the meeting room until after disposition of the item giving rise to the conflict.
### Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Deaths

冲突利益声明-投票程序 2016年4月20日

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicat</th>
<th>Check The Box If There Is a Conflict With This Applicant</th>
<th>Describe the Nature of the Conflict</th>
<th>Name Signature and Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organization Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RAACD Neighborhood: Oak Park

- Review Conflict of Interest
- Discussion
- Public Comment
- Vote
ONTRACK

- Average scores: 83.4 total
  - Proposal: 39.4
  - Site visit: 44
- Sacramento-based CBO with established feasible plan for engaging CILs and youth
- Team includes consultants with extensive expertise/experience in training and capacity building for mental health
- Site Visit Team: Dr. Cutts, Bobby, Kindra and Madeline
- Challenge: Currently committed to working 2 days a week in Oak Park (No Permanent Space)
- Challenge: Currently No Co-location Space for MDT’s
Recommendation for Oak Park CIL

Greater Sacramento Urban League

- Average scores: 75.375 total
  - Proposal: 36.25
  - Site visit: 39.125
- Sacramento-based CBO with established relationships in community, job training and workforce development
- Targeted plan for engaging community and youth
- Team includes expertise/experience in schools, health and gang prevention
- Site Visit Team: Gladys, Bobby, Kindra and Madeline
- Challenge: Currently in DPH – Moving to Oak Park if awarded the CIL Grant
- Budget modifications necessary
VOTING – 7th CIL Meadowview

- Recommendation
- Discussion
- Public Comment
- Vote
  - Majority vote approval
Currently the Valley Hi/Meadowview neighborhoods are combined into one focus community in the RAACD implementation plan. Compared to all other RAACD focus neighborhoods.

The Valley Hi/Meadowview area ranks at the top of the RAACD list experiencing more disproportionate African American child deaths (kernel density distribution.)

The geographic service area that is covered by these two neighborhoods also outranks all other RAACD targeted neighborhoods.

Splitting the communities in two will promote stronger neighborhood-centric resources and provide a stronger access connection for residents.
1. The 7 CIL grantees would receive $120,000 per year for the first three years, then $90,000 a year in years 4 and 5.

2. Held meetings with 5 CIL’s to: Congratulate, review SOW, Request Update Budget and Implementation Plans.

3. Grant Agreements are in progress.
Participatory Action Research (PAR) Coordinator and TA Provider

- Responsibilities
  - Provide training and technical assistance for community participatory action research
  - Coordinate PAR within and across neighborhoods
  - Ensure PAR data is entered into the data hub

- Funding: $150,000 paid over two years; possibility of renewal for another two years
Data Hub Manager and TA Provider

- Responsibilities
  - Create system for compiling data from multiple sources
  - Analyze data and provide reports in easy-to-use formats
  - Build capacity in the communities to collect and use data

- Funding: $135,000 paid over two years; possibility of renewal for another two years
RAACD Evaluation Funding Review Process

- Request for Qualifications – Issued 3/11, due 3/29
  - 3 Data Hub Statements of Qualifications submitted
  - 4 PAR Statements of Qualifications submitted

- Invitation to Submit Proposal – Issued 4/6, due 4/29
  - 2 applicants invited to submit proposals

- Invitation to Participate in Interview – Issued 5/6, completed 5/13
  - 2 applicants invited to participate in interviews
RAACD Evaluation Application Review Team

- Yuuko Feletto, Evaluation Workgroup Member
- Linda Fong, Steering Committee and Evaluation WG Member
- Keith Herron, Steering Committee and Evaluation WG Member
- Gina Roberson, Evaluation WG Chair
- Jamie White, Evaluation WG Member (representing Dr. Kasirye)
- Leslie Cooksy, Center for Health Program Management, staff to Evaluation WG
VOTING

- Recommendation
- Discussion
- Public Comment
- Vote
  - Majority vote approval
Vote on Recommendation for PAR Coordinator

- Review Conflict of Interest
- Summary of Recommendation
- Discussion
- Public Comment
- Vote
Recommendation for PAR Coordinator

LPC Associates

- Received highest average scores in all 3 phases (statement of qualifications, proposal, interview)
- Sacramento-based company with established relationships in community
- Feasible plan for engaging CILs and youth
- Team includes consultants with extensive expertise/experience in coaching and PAR
Vote on Recommendation for Data Hub Manager

- Review Conflict of Interest
- Summary of Recommendation
- Discussion
- Public Comment
- Vote
LPC Associates

- Received highest average scores in all 3 phases (statement of qualifications, proposal, interview)
- Plans user-friendly data management system
- Demonstrated knowledge of relevant data sources
- Visually appealing reports
RAACD Evaluation Contracts Timeline

- May 18, 2016 – Steering Committee final selection
- May 19, 2016 – Notify approved and denied applicant
- June 1, 2016 – Appeal deadline
- June 10, 2016 – Appeal decision (if applicable)
- Late June 2016 – Agreements signed
May 20, 2016 – RFP Meadowview CIL
Deadline June 17

June 2, 2016 – Children’s Innovation Awards
Mulvaney’s B & L – 4 p.m. – 7 p.m.

June 23, 2016 – CIL Launch Symposium
Sierra Health Foundation 9 a.m. – 4 p.m.
Steering Committee Charter
Reduction of African American Child Deaths
Sacramento County

**Purpose:** The purpose of the Steering Committee is to provide coordination and oversight of efforts, create a strategic plan, monitor implementation, evaluate, and report on progress towards reducing the disproportional number of African American child deaths in Sacramento County.

**Authority:** Board of Supervisors, Resolution #2013-0728, dated October 22, 2013.

**Sponsor/Convener:** Department of Health and Human Services.

**Scope of Work:** The Steering Committee will carry forward the recommendations developed by the Blue Ribbon Commission to Reduce African American Child Deaths, as supported by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors on May 7, 2013. The scope of work will include, but not be limited to the following items:

1. Serve in a public leadership role to engage and mobilize the community to make sustainable change to achieve a reduction in preventable African American child deaths.
2. Organize an infrastructure for the coordination of county-wide efforts.
3. Build mechanisms to facilitate on-going community outreach, education, and involvement.
4. Create a strategic plan.
5. Develop and monitor an implementation plan.
6. Develop and monitor a data collection and evaluation plan.
7. In collaboration with the Child Abuse Prevention Council, provide annual progress reports to the Board of Supervisors.
8. Advise participating entities on public education campaigns, direct service delivery and policy matters.
9. Seek funding to sustain the effort.

**Membership:** The Board of Supervisors will establish and appoint a 31 member Steering Committee. Members will serve two-year terms. There is no limit to how many consecutive terms a member may serve.

Members in seats representing Civic Groups, Faith-Based Organizations, Parent Representatives, Youth Representatives and Advocates will have two votes each. All other members will have one vote each. Regardless of the category a member may belong to, a member’s vote(s) is unique to that member and may not be cast by anyone besides that member.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members by Category</th>
<th>Number of Voting Members</th>
<th>Number of Votes Per Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Department of Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Department of Human Assistance</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. County Public Health Officer</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. First 5 Sacramento Commission</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community-based Health Provider</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MCAH Advisory Board</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Education</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Workforce Development</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
<td>[ 1 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Youth Representatives (up to age 25)</td>
<td>[ 2 ]</td>
<td>[ 4 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process to Fill Member Seats:** Interested parties must complete an application form and indicate which category/categories of membership they are qualified to represent. A Nominations Committee will review applications, conduct interviews as needed and make recommendations to the full Steering Committee. Recommended appointees will be approved by the Board of Supervisors. New members must submit a Conflict of Interest Form 700 to the Clerk of the Board within 30-days of approval and on an annual basis thereafter.

**Absenteeism:** Steering Committee members who miss more than 25% of meetings (unexcused absences) and 50% of meetings (excused absences) in subsequent years will be automatically removed from the committee.

**Meetings:** The Steering Committee must meet at least monthly during the first year of operations and at least quarterly thereafter.

**Meeting Rules:** All meetings will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act. All meetings will have a published and posted agenda. Topics not on the agenda will not be discussed or considered but may be placed on a future agenda. Actions will be made by majority rule of members present with an established quorum. The presence in person of a majority (50% plus one) of the appointed membership shall constitute a quorum. All matters submitted for determination shall be decided by a majority of those voting. Members may call in but cannot vote according to the Brown Act. Continuity of the discussions is essential to the success of this effort therefore alternates will not be seated. Additional staff members of any organization may certainly attend any meetings as the meetings are public. Content experts
may be invited to speak and will be placed on the agenda. Public attendees will be allowed to comment prior to any action on an item.

**Conflict of Interest:** Members who have a conflict of interest as defined by the Fair Political Practices Act, AB 1797 (January 1, 2003) and any other applicable state law must do the following:

1. Announce the conflict;
2. Describe the nature of the conflict; and
3. Recuse themselves and leave the meeting room until after disposition of the item giving rise to the conflict.

**Chair/Vice-Chair/Secretary:** The general membership will select a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary on an annual basis. The Chairperson shall preside over meetings and maintain orderly procedures as guided by the Brown Act and Robert’s Rules of Order. The Vice-Chair will preside over meetings in the absence of the Chair. In the absence or inability to act of both the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson, the members present shall select one of the members present to act as temporary Chairperson.

**Reporting:** The Steering Committee will produce a written report on progress to the Board of Supervisors on an annual basis. In addition, a public presentation highlighting progress will made to the Board of Supervisors on an annual basis.

**Changes to the Charter:** Any proposed changes to the Charter, including modification of the categories of membership, may be considered with a majority vote of the appointed members. The changes must then be approved by the Board of Supervisors.
### Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Deaths
### March 2016 Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members by Category</th>
<th>Number of Voting Members</th>
<th>Number of Votes Per Category</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. County Public Health Officer</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>Dr. Olivia Kasirye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community Based Health Provider</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>Wendy Petko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Law Enforcement (Sheriff/Probation)</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>Robert Davis- Sheriff Marlon Yarber - Probation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 32 | 44 | Current Members = 24 |
Steering Committee on the Reduction of African American Child Deaths

Conflict of Interest Policy

Introduction
This policy applies to the volunteers who serve as members of the Steering Committee on the Reduction of African American Deaths (RAACD). It is intended to define actual and perceived conflicts of interests in relation to RAACD members’ role in the review and selection of grant proposals.

This policy is not intended to inhibit, prevent or discourage agencies affiliated with RAACD members from applying for RAACD grant funds. The purpose of this policy is to ensure an impartial development of the RAACD local community services RFP and the review and rating of RAACD grant proposals.

Rationale
Steering Committee on The Reduction of African American Deaths members have a commitment to conduct all responsibilities of the RAACD in a manner consistent with the best interest of the RAACD mission. This requires that all decisions and actions of members on behalf of the RAACD must be made or taken solely with a desire to serve in the best interest of the community, rather than a desire to serve in the best interest of individual agencies.

Since the RAACD Steering Committee members are volunteers who are committed to the Steering Committee’s purpose, it would be a challenge to recruit community representatives to the RAACD who would be free from potential conflicts of interest on the RAACD. It is understood that there is the potential for RAACD members to have some apparent or perceived conflict of interest.

With this information, the RAACD can take action to ensure there is an impartial decision-making process. In such a case when there is an apparent or perceived conflict of interest, action may consist of one or more of the following:

a. RAACD member will recuse himself or herself from the discussion
b. RAACD member will recuse himself or herself from any vote regarding the specific matter
c. RAACD member will recuse himself or herself from the review and rating of grant proposals

Definition of Actual or Potential Conflict of Interest
The following is provided to identify the types of volunteer activities that may create actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

a. Directly or indirectly influencing the allocation of funds based on a personal or family interest in or an affiliation with specific agencies.

b. Current affiliations or past affiliations within the prior two years present a potential conflict of interest if a RAACD member or a family member has:
   i. An affiliation that is inclusive of, but not limited to, service as an employee, board member, advisory committee member, volunteer, intern, consultant, advisor and/or client with an organization that is seeking a RAACD grant.
Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest
RAACD members will be asked to disclose any potential conflicts of interest related to them and their family members. Disclosures should encompass current affiliations as well as affiliations within the prior two years.

RAACD members will be provided with a disclosure statement attesting that:

1. S/he understands and agrees to comply with the Conflict of Interest Policy and;

2. Except as specifically described in the disclosure statement, neither s/he nor, to the best of his/her knowledge, any of his/her family members has during the past two years been engaged in any conduct that may be a potential conflict of interest.

Recusal from RAACD Grant Development and Proposal Review Process
RAACD members with an actual or perceived conflict of interest will be asked to recuse themselves from the RAACD grant proposal review and rating process.

Failure of Recusal
In the case in which there is an actual or perceived conflict of interest between an agency and a RAACD member, and the RAACD member has not recused himself or herself from the review and rating of RAACD grant proposals, the agency that applied for funding is not eligible to receive respite services funds.

Capitalized terms used in this Disclosure Statement have the meaning(s) set forth in the attached Conflict of Interest Policy.

I, ______________________________, certify that:

1. I understand and agree to comply with the attached Conflict of Interest Policy.

2. Neither I nor, to the best of my knowledge, any of my Family Members has, during the past 24 months, been involved in any activity or circumstances that constitutes a Conflict of Interest, except as specifically described below:

   Identify any current or past affiliations within the prior two years that would present an Actual or Potential Conflict of Interest for you or your Family Member(s). Attach additional pages, if necessary. If none, so state.

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

   Fully describe any facts or circumstances that you wish reviewed in order to determine whether or not such facts or circumstances constitute a Conflict of Interest. Attach additional pages, if necessary. If none, so state.
3. The name and address of my principal organization or occupation is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>My Job Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNATURE: _________________________________

NAME: _________________________________

(PLEASE PRINT)

DATE: _________________________________
### Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Deaths

**Conflict of Interest - Vote Procedures May 18, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAACD Target Neighborhood</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Check The Box If There Is a Conflict With This Applicant</th>
<th>Describe the Nature of the Conflict</th>
<th>Name Signature and Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park (CIL)</td>
<td>1. ONTRACK Program Resources, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Greater Sacramento Urban League</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 4 Your Epiphany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Hub Manager</td>
<td>LCP and Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UC Davis Center for Regional Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Action Research</td>
<td>LCP and Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UC Davis Center for Regional Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If you checked a box – you will be asked to recuse yourself from the discussion and vote regarding this grant/contract applicant or group of applications. (Please leave the room when the applicant comes up for vote)