



Program & Grant Awards (PGA) Committee Meeting
Friday, September 16, 2022
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

IN-PERSON

First 5 Madera County
525 East Yosemite Avenue
Madera, CA 93638

AGENDA

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR ANY INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY: Pursuant to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disability Act of 1990, any meeting or function of the First 5 Madera County – Program and Grant Awards Committee - may request assistance, by contacting First 5 Madera County, 525 E. Yosemite Ave. Madera, CA 93638, telephone 559-661-5155.

1.0 ACTION	OPENING REMARKS 1.2 Call to Order 1.2 Roll Call	Deborah Martinez, Chair
2.0 ACTION	CONSENT AGENDA 2.1 Adoption of PGA Committee Agenda 2.2 Review and approve the August 19, 2022 Meeting Minutes	Deborah Martinez, Chair
3.0	PUBLIC COMMENT This time is offered for the public wishing to address the Commission on matters NOT listed on the agenda. Committee members may listen but not discuss matters not on the agenda.	Deborah Martinez, Chair
4.0 ACTION	DATA MANAGEMENT SERVICES AGREEMENT Review recommendations to enter into an agreement with Persimmony to provide data management services.	J. Monica Ramirez, ED Xochitl M. Villaseñor, Staff
5.0	STAFF UPDATE	Monica Ramirez, ED
6.0	ANNOUNCEMENTS	Deborah Martinez, Chair
7.0	NEXT MEETING October 21, 2022	Deborah Martinez, Chair
9.0	ADJOURNMENT	Deborah Martinez, Chair

First 5 distributes monthly agendas electronically. Please forward your email address to Xochitl Villaseñor at xvillasenor@first5madera.org to be added to the list.



Program and Grant Awards (PGA) Meeting
Friday, August 19, 2022
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

IN-PERSON

First 5 Madera County
525 E. Yosemite Ave
Madera, CA 93638

MINUTES

Present:	Deborah Martinez, Chair Karen V. Wynn, Ph.D., Vice Chair Nina Zarucchi-Mize	Director of the Department of Social Services Community Representative – Eastern Madera County Community Representative – City of Madera
Absent:	None	
Staff:	J. Monica Ramirez Xochitl M. Villaseñor Patricia Vega	Executive Director Program Manager Administrative Officer
Public:	None	

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Deborah Martinez, PGA Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda and Meeting Minutes as presented.

N.Zarucchi-Mize requested corrections in the May 20, 2022 minutes.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda and corrected Meeting Minutes made by N.Zarucchi-Mize. Motion carried by consensus.

Ayes: Zarucchi-Mize, Martinez, and Wynn

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Recused: None

Absent: None

3.0 PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

4.0 DATA MANAGEMENT SERVICES AGREEMENT

M.Ramirez reviewed the request before the PGA Committee. Staff is requesting to enter into a contract with Persimmony to deliver data management services. The contract amount requested is not to exceed \$10,000 per year for a two-year contract for a total not to exceed \$20,000.

M.Ramirez shared that data is used for both state and local reporting. Additionally, X.Villaseñor manually analyzes all the data for the quarterly reports presented to the Commission. M.Ramirez reminded the committee that an in-house evaluator was responsible for the data maintenance in the past, but the position was eliminated two years ago. Part of the savings from this position will be used for the data management services agreement. Given the cost amount and following the current procurement process, staff recommends moving forward with an informal procurement process for these services. The original intent was to gather three bids. However, staff conducted research within other First 5's and established that two leading companies were being utilized: Persimmony and Apricot 360. The current evaluation strategies are successful at delivering outcomes. However, there is an opportunity to improve the system for a more streamlined reporting process, plus provide more insightful data reports to the community.

X.Villaseñor shared the Persimmony and Apricot 360 background. X.Villaseñor highlighted the information presented in the chart, which reflected the various reporting needs. This served as a comparison between the two systems and how they were measured against evaluation needs. M.Ramirez added that implementing the system will minimize reporting errors since programs cannot accidentally remove formatting and/or formulas from the reporting documents provided to them. Additionally, this will reduce the reviewing process by X.Villaseñor. The data system also allows funded programs to run reports themselves since they would have access to their reports/data at any given time. Finally, X.Villaseñor shared the project timeline, which included training in September, project pilot by the FRCs and Special Projects, and launching with funded programs January 2023. It was clarified that during July 2022-December 2022, all programs would continue using the current reporting systems before going digital in January 2023.

Staff included budgets from the two data management systems: Persimmony and Apricot 360. Subsequently, D.Martinez inquired about the data conversion costs for each of the systems. Whereas Apricot 360 clearly stated the cost of data conversion, Persimmony's estimated budget did not and this matter would need to be clarified before entering into a contract. The concern is that data conversion is a costly service; if not included in Persimmony, the estimated cost would not be a true cost. Staff was directed to get clarification from Persimmony as to whether data conversion is included in the estimated budget.

Additionally, it was unclear to the committee the formula used by staff to determine Apricot's estimated costs. Staff was directed to follow up with Apricot and request a cost breakdown to validate Apricot's costs. Staff was informed of the importance of demonstrating that, all things being equal, Persimmony is the best vendor for this agreement.

Commissioner D.Martinez indicated that the not-to-exceed amounts do not match the budget submitted by Persimmony and recommended that staff match these totals in order to proceed with a formal agreement.

Commissioner K.Wynn made a motion to move the item for full Commission consideration during the September Commission Meeting, contingent upon the cost validation for Apricot 360. Motion carried by consensus.

Ayes: Zarucchi-Mize, Martinez

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Recused: None

Absent: None

5.0 YEAR-END PROGRAMS PROGRESS SUMMARIES

X.Villaseñor shared that the program summaries presented reflected the following points:

1. Summaries close out the 2021/2022 FY
2. YTD Columns reflect progress made for the entire FY
3. Progress Summary narratives reflect progress made between Jan-June
4. COVID continued impacting service delivery, yet programs were persistent in meeting their goals and objectives

Additionally, an expenditures chart was included and reviewed. The chart reflected annual budgets, year-end expenditures and anticipated unspent balances within three categories: community-initiated programs, the Family Resources Centers (FRCs), and Special Projects program. It was noted that the Year-to-Date Expenditures and Anticipated Unspent Balances

for both the FRCs and Special Projects were estimates, but the funded program totals were final. D.Martinez offered that the YTD Expenditures are actually Year-end Expenditures since they are final numbers, and no other bills are expected. She recommended this change be made to the document. D.Martinez also requested clarification as to why the Unspent Balances were anticipated and not actual. M.Ramirez offered that funded programs and Special Projects expenses were final; however, the FRC totals are anticipated because First 5's books have not yet closed since the audit has not been completed. D.Martinez recommended this column include an asterisk noting that the balances are unaudited and that staff work on finalizing financials before presenting this item to the full Commission.

K.Wynn inquired about the unspent funds and how these would be used in the future. D.Martinez added the importance of having audited final expenses in these summaries so that the Committee can have discussions on how any unspent funds might be used. This topic will be further discussed at a later meeting.

K.Wynn commented Reading and Beyond had almost 45% of unspent funds and advocated for monthly reporting to mitigate learning this at the end of the year. X.Villaseñor shared that the challenges associated with the program's unspent funds included staffing difficulties and the inability to provide services in person, which affected the mileage and workshop line items. X.Villaseñor also shared that invoices are reviewed quarterly and that programs are informed of over- and under-expenditures. While staff offers flexibility to programs, in order to maintain the integrity of the intent of the application, there are limits to the flexibility, resulting in fewer funds being spent.

D.Martinez shared that a grievance was shared by Exceptional Parented Unlimited (EPU) regarding First 5's strict invoicing processes. X.Villaseñor shared that staff follows the current contracting systems that include three distinct thresholds as per line item and that the Commission does not currently allow for the 10% categorical variances most agencies are accustomed to. EPU is under contract with this system and staff reviewed all invoices based on this system which resulted in occasional invoice revisions by the program. X.Villaseñor reminded the committee that it approved a new invoicing system where a categorical variance of no more than 10% is allowed beginning July 1, 2022.

Motion to table the item for the September PGA Meeting. Motion carried by consensus.

Ayes: Zarucchi-Mize, Wynn

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Recused: None

Absent: None

6.0 2020-2024 STRATEGIC PLAN INVESTMENTS PROGRESS

M.Ramirez shared that this was an informational item meant to update the Commission on the progress made to the 2020-2024 Strategic Plan. M.Ramirez shared that the strategic plan serves as an investment blueprint, and as such, the included progress chart reflects how investments have supported the goals and objectives identified in the plan.

M.Ramirez referenced the systems work many First 5s are focusing on due to diminishing funds and the impact systems work can have. M.Ramirez offered that the approach being implemented by F5MC is to have more of a presence in community meetings and bring First 5 funds available when appropriate.

There was conversation regarding how this information can be helpful in future funding opportunities even, perhaps, through utilizing unspent funds by funded programs.

The committee reviewed the chart and offered feedback on clarifying language before presenting it to the Commission in September.

7.0 STAFF UPDATE

M.Ramirez shared that an automated financial system is being researched that would streamline various processes and save time. D.Martinez offered that having an in-house system will be beneficial, improve tracking of outstanding invoices,

and help in running timely reports. K.Wynn inquired whether First 5 would ever be completely independent of the county and M.Ramirez responded that the agency could never be 100% independent due to statutory regulations.

8.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

N.Zarucchi-Mize inquired about the LeapFrog project and whether all devices had been distributed. X.Villaseñor offered that approximately 10 devices are still on-hand to be distributed to families when needed. The FRC took the lead in distribution and was successful in partnering with WIC, tribal partners, and other agencies to achieve this.

9.0 NEXT MEETING

PGA Meeting scheduled for September 16, 2022

10.0 ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

DRAFT



TO: First 5 Madera County Program and Grant Awards (PGA) Committee

FROM: Monica Ramirez, Executive Director
Xochitl M. Villaseñor, Program Manager

SUBJECT: Contract Agreement Recommendation with Persimmony to Provide Data Management Services

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Review and approve to move forward for full Commission consideration a recommendation to enter into a two-year contract agreement with Persimmony in an amount not to exceed \$18,495 for the two years - \$9,995 for Year One and \$8,500 for Year Two to provide data management services.

BACKGROUND

The PGA Committee reviewed this item during August 19, 2022, meeting and requested additional information.

First 5 Madera County (F5MC) has funded programs that support children ages 0-5 years of age for the past 22 years. As part of the Prop 10 funding requirements, every First 5 must implement data collection and evaluation strategies that demonstrate funds' effective and proper use. As such, F5MC collects quarterly data from funded programs and projects, reflecting deliverables reached and outcomes.

F5MC staff aggregates data, evaluates progress, and manually prepares the agency's annual report for the First 5 California Commission. Staff has implemented a spreadsheet reporting tool and invoicing process that is updated yearly and individually tailored for each program and project - a time-consuming process requiring constant monitoring and corrections to ensure accuracy.

After eliminating the Evaluation Officer position, the Commission allocated in the 2022-2023 Budget a total of \$10,000 for a Data Management System. That aligns with the rest of the First 5 Commissions' use of an automated data management service. An automated data management service will provide the Commission with insightful data, advanced reporting, and data analytics that can better tell the story of the Commission's work.

The proposed data management system will be used by all funded programs providing direct services to children and families in the county. The system will become the primary mechanism for inputting client-level data and program-level services for county and state reporting requirements.

Procurement - Following the F5MC Contracting and Procurement Policy and Procedures Manual, staff conducted an informal procurement to seek a qualified vendor to provide data management services to meet the Commission's reporting requirements. A total of two (2) quotes were secured, given the specialized services to generate First 5 reporting.

Staff began the research process by checking with other First 5 Commission for guidance and narrowing down the number of vendors since only a handful provides the specialized data management tailored for First 5. Staff met with two (2) possible database providers over the past couple of months to become acquainted with each system and the features offered.

Staff reviewed and compared the proposals, see attachments, and recommended contracting with Persimmony for data management services as their quote meets the Commission's needs, as outlined below:

- Cost – Within the budget.
- Technical Support – Person-to-person and quick turnaround resolution.
- Customization – Given that the current evaluation and reporting system consists of various Excel and Word tools, the system must be able to provide a seamless transition.
- User-Friendly – Based on reviews, the system is reportedly user-friendly for First 5 staff and funded programs.

Projected Implementation Timeline:

1. Agreement Development and Execution – October 2022
2. System Training I – November 2022
3. Internal Pilot – November 2022
4. System Training II – April 2023
5. Full Implementation – July 2023

The chart below provides an at-a-glance comparison of the database systems’ features and estimated costs. The additional cost verification and breakdown, requested by the PGA committee, can be found in the attachments, along with a detailed description of the prices and services.

Vendor	Evaluation Reports	Compatible with F5CA Annual Report	Customization (Templates, SOW)	User Friendly	Technical Support	Mobility (Web-based, Cell, Tablet, Browser-Neutral)	Compatibility/Integration with other Software	Annual Cost
Persimmony	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Y1: \$9,995 Y2: \$8,500
Apricot 360	X	X	X		X	X		Y1: \$25,800 Y2: \$12,000

FISCAL IMPACT

The Commission allocated a total of \$10,000 for a Data Management System in the 2022-2023 Annual Budget – Accountability Systems. The recommended agreement with Persimmony of \$9,995 for year one and \$8,500 for year two is within the allowed amount.

CONCLUSION

If approved, this item will move forward for Commission’s approval. Staff will then finalize the agreement with Persimmony to provide a data management system, ensuring the agency will have an efficient and reliable data collection method to meet the requirements. If not approved, staff would seek guidance from the Committee on moving forward with a data management system.

Persimmony Budget Estimate

Service	Price	Description	Year 1	Year 2
License Cost per User	\$600 Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual user licenses are required to access the data system. Staff requested 10 licenses and costs reflect this. 	\$6,000	\$6,000
Training	\$2,500 One-Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a one-time expense during Year 1; and includes support costs. Training is offered to all first-time users with no limit on the number trained. Lead – One staff person must be identified as the lead who will receive additional security training at no additional cost. The lead will also train new users. Additional Training – If there are specific trainings required that cannot be met through online trainings, these can be curated specifically for First 5 at an additional cost. 	\$2,500	\$0
Support	\$2,500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This expense is charged separately in Year 2 and would be charged at this amount in subsequent years. Support is offered M-F/9am-5pm by a live person. There are no thresholds/limits to this support. Support is also offered via “help search” covering various topics. These can be accessed as short narratives or on-demand videos. 	\$0	\$2,500
Data Conversion	\$1,495 One-Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversion Costs are included as part of the one-time Initial Setup and Data Integration costs. 	\$1,495	\$0
Annual Cost			\$9,995	\$8,500

Apricot 360 Budget Estimate

Service	Price	Description	Year 1	Year 2
License Cost per User	\$780 \$650 Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual user licenses are required to access the data system. Original proposal included a \$780 cost per license. The license cost was reduced once staff followed up with questions from the PGA. Apricot requires a 10-user minimum and total costs reflect this. 	\$6,500	\$6,500
Training	\$1,000 One-Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training is offered as either an End-User or Advanced Administrator Training Subscription. End-User Training. A one-time training charge for 15 users but no one is a “train-the-trainer”. The script and support materials will not be offered to any trained staff. A lead would be identified and would train any new people. Advanced Training Subscription. Available at a higher cost that allows for administrative-level access to all licensee information. This person becomes a train-the-trainer. This subscription requires an annual cost. This option is not included in the current quote. Staff determined the End-User was sufficient. 	\$1,000	\$0
Support	Starting at \$5,500 Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support is offered as two separate services. General TA support. This is a tiered service. At Tier 1, there is no additional cost that allows for 60 cases per year. This can be understood as 60 times staff can connect with support staff for help. Additional cases will be charged at \$50 per case. Advanced Support Consulting. This option offers deeper support services such as customization of documents. Based on conversations, Apricot 360 has recommended the Gold Package which allows 24 hours a year of support. These are billed in 15-minute increments. Anything over the 24 hours will be billed at \$230 per hour. There is a dedicate person that can either teach users to do something or Apricot 360 can do it for the agency. Considering the limited time under the Gold Package, it would be beneficial to have Apricot 360 complete tasks rather than have First 5 staff complete them. Apricot 360 also offers a “help search” feature that offers letters and videos to provide support. 	\$5,500	\$5,500
Data Conversion	\$12,800 Time & Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversion Costs are determined based on F5MC needs. Through discussions, Apricot 360 estimates the cost at \$12,800. 	\$12,800	\$0
Annual Cost			\$25,800	\$12,000

The table below compares the systems' reviews as per other users.

Vendor	Review
<p>Persimmony</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users reported being able to customize quickly using existing help features and direct technical support from Persimmony. • Users shared that the platform is scalable with many options. • Users shared that the platform is easy to use.
<p>Apricot 360</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users expressed that the support services are challenging when it comes to both customization and general support. While there is a dedicated support person, this person was mostly available via a chat box, which would result in long wait times. • Users felt that the support offered for customization required more work from staff than from the vendor. Many times, staff would need to create documents and figure out on their own how to incorporate their needs into the system to avoid added costs. • Users stated that the conversion process has been challenging, with one county stating that they have not been able to fully integrate into the system because they have been waiting months for the conversion to finalize.