

DIGNITY FUND OVERSIGHT AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 27, 2017; 3:00pm to 5:00pm

1650 Mission Street, 5th Floor, Golden Gate Conference Room

Minutes

Attending: Ramona Davies, Sandy Mori, Elinore Lurie, Edna James, Marcy Adelman, Beverly Taylor, Margy Baran, Chip Supanich, Allen Ng, Monique Zmuda, Melissa McGee (DAAS), Rick Appleby (DAAS), Cindy Kauffmann (DAAS), Rose Johns (Planning)

Call to Order and Welcome

Ms. Davies called the meeting to order at 3:05 and welcomed members, staff and guests.

Public Comment

- Ms. Davies acknowledged public comment was missed at the last meeting so allowing time for it now.
- Question from public: Are handouts for meetings available to public? Ms. McGee said yes.
Committee members noted that as a public meeting all documents are public.

Introductions

Members of the council and staff introduced themselves.

Rules of Order/Meeting agreements

Members of the Committee had a discussion of the rules of order for the meetings. Some rules are in the legislative language and some members suggested rules of order should be relegated to the bylaws in the future. Other members noted that other committees, e.g. Advisory Council, Commission have bylaws but also use Robert's Rules of Order as back up for anything not evident in bylaws. **Ms. Davies suggests members receive copies of the Advisory Council, Long Term Care Council and Commission on Aging bylaws for reference.** Perhaps the OAC would have a bylaws subcommittee in the future.

Review of Legislation

- Similar to children's set aside legislation.
- Members clarified terms of office for members: 2 years
- Members serve for the body from which they are appointed. Member relinquishes position on OAC if the member leaves the appointing body or the appointing body relieves them of the duty.
- Legislation does not address terms of office for Committee officers. Could be in bylaws as developed.

Service Providers Working Group (SPWG)

Membership and structure:

The description in information packet/legislation suggests that the OAC creates the Service Providers Working group but does not give detailed description of the Working Group: No certain number of members, only a broad spectrum of provider network. Ms. Mori suggests OAC select potential chairs from the list of interested providers developed at previous meetings. SPWG will provide additional input to OAC policy and service priorities. Ms. Davies suggests that the SPWG will add information for the needs assessment including recommendations. OAC Members discussed various issues related to SPWG format, membership, reporting requirements, officer selection. Some final notes:

- OAC will appoint initial Chairpersons, SPWG will select once group is established.
- **Ms. McGee will send out announcement about formation of SPWG soon (tomorrow?).** This announcement can be forwarded throughout the service network.
- SPWG members do not have to be DAAS contractors
- OAC has responsibility to appoint strong, skilled chairpersons and SPWG has responsibility for its own structure.
- Size of SPWG can be limited knowing meetings will be open to anyone including other providers who are interested and who may comment.
- **OAC members can recommend a SPWG Chairperson by next Monday.**

SPWG Meeting schedule

OAC Committee discussed the overall time line of OAC process and recognized that SPWG would have limited time to make an impact on the first year recommendations given March budget recommendation deadline. SPWG will decide their own meeting schedule then and play a role in needs assessment and recommendation for next year's process.

OAC Budget Recommendations Deadline

Ms. Davies reminded the group that budget recommendations have to be in mid-March. Members discussed the deadline as too soon for this new group to make adequate recommendations. Members asked if date is fixed by Mayor and why if City budget is still in development. OAC could say no and ask for a further extension. Cindy Kauffmann reported that the Mayor is asking for recommendation from OAC by the 15th, already beyond his deadline for Departments in recognition of fast turnaround for OAC. She reminded the Committee that we have previous needs assessments, recommendations from DAAS for member discussion and recommendation development. DAAS has met with Mayor's staff and this was the deadline offered. **Ms. Kauffmann will speak with Executive Director McSpadden for details on possible deadline postponement.** Ms. Davies pointed out documents for OAC and from Dignity fund describing service gaps, to review by next meeting.

Data Resources

Rose Johns (HSA Planning) recapped and clarified OAC request of her from last meeting: 1) Where seniors live and where services are located, 2) Family Caregivers in IHSS, 3) Services maps and what services are offered by senior centers. Committee can also get some information from DAAS needs assessment about people with disabilities. Ms. Johns responded to need for “equity” in Dignity Fund dispersal by reporting there is data on geographic distribution of services and race, age and ethnicity data. Issue can address in the larger OAC needs assessment as well. MS. Johns recognized that equity needs further assessment. Ms. Mori noted that “equity” won’t be resolved in first year. **For next week, Ms. Johns will do a presentation and the DAAS/Planning needs assessment link will be sent out.**

Ms. Mori asked about fund dispersal process. Ms. Kauffmann said that the usual City processes will be used: RFP, contract expansion, etc. Contract expansion is the easiest in some ways especially when we need more of something that already exists. Members discussed need for outcome measures to assist in determining which programs are effective. Members noted that DPH requires outcome measures. DAAS requires outcomes but different programs are more robust than others (i.e. CLF), per Ms. Kauffmann who also suggests that DAAS continues to look at outcomes that need to be collected. One suggestion is that OAC recommend outcome measure study and/or that we ask an academic institution to look at program effectiveness. Group noted that CBOs often don’t have sufficient staff to support effectiveness data or study data collection. Ms. Davies summarized and suggests that program evaluation may not be good recommendation in first round but in future can consider it. .

Public Comment:

- 1) Request meeting handouts. Per Ms. McGee, they were emailed.
- 2) Suggestion that \$6 million available this year, if not spent, could roll over to next year when OAC and SPWG has had more time to develop recommendations. Ms. Kauffmann responded that there are reasons we don’t want to do that including that the public is watching and expecting dispersal of funds, there are expressed needs so waiting is counterproductive, and waiting makes some political difficulties.

Adjourned: 4:45pm

Next meeting: Oversight Advisory Committee, 3/6/17, 3 to 5, Golden Gate Conference Room