

Sandra King
Director of Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles
Interviewed by Hannah Hamovitch
on (Date)
at (Place)

HAMOVITCH: Sandy, I know you began your professional career as a school teacher. How did you get from being a school teacher, and how did you enter into the field of social work?

KING: Actually, I spent a number of years teaching school right out of college and just after I was married, and when I began having children, I stayed home. I was home for a number of years, and when I was prepared to go back into something professionally, I — having had children of my own, I wasn't prepared to go back to facing a classroom where I knew that every child was filled with so many needs and all. I felt like I'd rather work with people one-on-one, which was my idea of social work. So I was very interested in a volunteer job which came up as being a volunteer opportunity --- which came up because I heard Barbara Kaplan speak about this little store front she had just started for Jewish Family Service. I thought of it as possibly a way of entering back into the work force, but I really didn't know anything about social work. Somehow I grew up --- when I was in Berkeley, it was an ivory tower — I didn't know anything about anything except my major was English, I was there to write the great American novel, and I went into teaching because I got married. My husband was still in law school, and I had to work. So it was all very far away from anything related to social work. I took the volunteer opportunity more because I was prepared to do something, but not quite ready to go back to work, and then I sort of learned what social work was from that experience from Barbara Kaplan and the Freda Mohr Center, which was this little walk-in counseling center for older people that she had just kind of conceived of, convinced JFS to start and had begun using volunteers very extensively. So I had

this volunteer experience as a case aid at Freda Mohr and learned about social work, was really taken with the idea of ---- at that time, I saw myself as working as a counselor and working one-to-one with people who kind of were in small groups, which is kind of my idea leaving teaching. It's funny because I never quite felt comfortable — during the years my kids were growing up, I worked as a substitute teacher one or two days a week, just to kind of keep in touch with the world, and I never wanted to give up that credential. I kind of kept it alive, paying \$25.00 every two years or something like that, because I thought, well, I like this idea of social work. But I volunteered for a couple of years, loved it, and then went back, decided to go back and get my MSW. I went back to UCLA. I just really felt very, very drawn to it, from the very beginning.

HAMOVITCH: As a volunteer, what kind of training ---- because you were in a different profession ---- what kind of training did you get now with the senior center? What kind of training did the Jewish Family Service provide?

KING: Well, that was really the beauty of it, and that's what attracted me, and I think to this day still attracts many of the volunteers that we have. The training was basically provided by Barbara Kaplan, who was everything at the Center. She designed the idea, and she also ran the Center, worked with clients, supervised volunteers. The training consisted basically of things like listening skills, lots of information on aging, working with people in groups and individually, the whole concept of the sort of the therapeutic relationship, ideas of what your role is as an active listener as the person offering what we used to call ---- it wasn't counseling. It was sort of — I can't remember what ----

HAMOVITCH: Maintenance?

KING: Maintenance or something. I mean, we didn't ---- in any case, it was working with people who brought in their problems, and we listened to them. So the training at that time ----

they had a beginning six-day course that was run centrally to the agency that actually Ethel Kass taught. She was a volunteer coordinator. Then we came back to the storefront, and we would sit in with an experienced case aid, Ruth Hager, who's still a case aid at the Freda Mohr Center, and I think Bernice ---- no, not Bernice, but Ruth and there were still a few other people who are still around. So we sat in on interviews with experienced case aids and worked with Barbara. Then we began seeing people, and someone would sit in with us to kind of provide the support. A very important part, I think, of the training is that we were given the feeling it was perfectly acceptable, in fact, desirable, to say to someone, "You know, I'd really like to get someone else's ideas on this because we want to be sure we're offering you the right information. So would you mind if I..." and at that very moment, we could go up and talk to Barbara, or we could ask Barbara to sit in on the interview, so that people felt ---- or even after the fact in reading the write-ups we did every day ---- if there was a question, we were encouraged to call and say, "You know, we've been thinking about this. We want....." So there was always the feeling of being open to amend or change. There was always the sense of you having the ability to kind of be as good as you could be on something, to try it out if it didn't work.

HAMOVITCH: Now, describe a little bit about the population, because it was kind of a unique population.

KING: It was a population that was ---- they were old. It wouldn't be considered very old now. They tended to be in their, I would say, 70's, some in their 80's, some in their 60's, pretty much an immigrant population, lots of them un-assimilated. In other words, even though they had been here for many, many years, many of them had Yiddish as their primary language or Hebrew, Russian. Lots of them spoke English, but it was still a very much sort of ethnically-focused population. They felt comfortable with a certain kind of setting, and that's what the Center was

designed to provide. They were literally all foreign-born. They didn't know from "counseling." I think — oh, that's what we called "supportive maintenance." So we tried to design it as ---- I remember Barbara used to talk about is as wanting to create a setting where the problems of aging were treated as kind of the normal and natural stages of the human condition and not something that you have to be ashamed of or want to hide, so that by design, it was an open setting and there wasn't the feeling you need to go to a room and whisper about something because you were having a problem that was related to getting old. That was very comfortable for people. In fact, Barbara designed the whole thing because people weren't coming to the traditional office setting on Vermont at that time. This population wasn't.

HAMOVITCH: Now, when you started, you were a volunteer. You went back to school and you got your MSW. You came back, and at what point did you become director of Jewish Family Service? (Laughter and talking together, I could not pick this next sentence up)

KING: Well what happened was, I went back to school, so I was gone for two years, although I think I volunteered in the summer, too. Just about the time I was ready to graduate, to get my MSW, Barbara was going back. I believe she was something like 60 then, but she was going back to get her Ph.D. at USC, so ---- maybe she was 55 — but anyway.....

HAMOVITCH: Let's not put that in.

KING: Oh, no, we won't put that in, okay, but she was ---- because she had started late in life, too. I think she became an MSW when she was about 50. Her accomplishments were really incredible. And by the way, I came because I heard about all this. I heard her speaking at a UCLA Extension program for people kind of finding themselves, going back into volunteering or the workforce or school, and I was so impressed with her. That's what started the ---- anyway, she was going off for her Ph.D. and so there was a vacancy. In that day it was called

“coordinator.” There were only two staff: one was the original professional staff and one secretary. Because there was that vacancy, I actually applied for ---- I had learned about something else first before I heard of this, and I applied for another job at UCLA that dealt with child abuse. It was a totally new field at that time, very exciting, and I had dealt with a case in my internship. But the grant didn’t come through, and so when I looked, this was by far the most appealing, and it was kind of coming home. So I was the coordinator at the Freda Mohr Center at that time. There was one other social worker and a receptionist, and we had about ten volunteers, no, maybe twenty volunteers.

HAMOVITCH: The other social worker was Stella Kleinbaum?

KING: No, no, it was Norma.....

HAMOVITCH: Cooper.

KING: Cooper, right. Norma was not an MSW. She was an experienced BA-level social worker who’d done a lot of work sort of over the years in different arenas and had worked with Barbara Kaplan.

HAMOVITCH: Okay, now I know that the Freda Mohr Center started as a little storefront.

KING: Tiny little.

HAMOVITCH: Very little. Everyone was free to come in and even feed their dog water and whatever. How do you see, I mean, what is the growth development that you have seen. Let’s do it kind of in increments because there has been a huge growth development, so let’s start with the Freda Mohr Center and when it became a multi-service center.

KING: Okay. What happened was that I was very fortunate starting to work at Freda Mohr at a time when it’s like the world was discovering that people were living longer and all of a sudden, there’s a recognition that older people did better if they got specialized services, that they were

getting lost if there were services for every age and they just had to take their share. So a few things were happening, and one of the things that was happening was that there was some federal legislation - the Older Americans Act - which was passed in 1965, I believe. Then the Administration on Aging was created, and it took a while, but what happened was that the allocations were made out of that money, first for meals, and there was a meals program - I had nothing to do with it, but it was small and it had just gotten started when I came to the agency. But there was also an allocation that came to the agency for a multi-service center. The City was creating - with this Older Americans Act money it had just gotten - it was creating a service center in every one of the fifteen councilmatic (?) district, and the councilman in our area approached us to see if we were interested in feeling that ---- apparently, they had approached federation or something ---- there was some question the first year, and so United Way ran it and there was a feeling that it needed to be in the area where all the older people lived and that was appropriate for JFS to be the sponsor, and so we took over the sponsorship of the multi-service center which connected us with the City AAA and the funding as one of the fifteen ---- now they're called "focal point" multi-service center kind of network in the City. So that was ---- it was an existing building that apparently the United Way in the first year had rented, which was down across the street from the Farmer's Market, which you remember well. We started out with those two centers, trying to use one for the services mandated by the AAA, and the other maintaining the model of sort of walk-in counseling. Barbara had created ---- then it got complicated because there was a third center which the Federation had run and had opened a number of years ago as an information and referral volunteer-run center which happened to be two doors down from the one across from Farmer's Market. I started in 1975. For two years, it was all calm and quiet, and we had this tiny little store next ---- fish market, and then we acquired in the same year, 1977, these

two other centers. There were some very hectic years where we actually ---- in fact I do believe ---- (ringing of telephone) — my supervisor at that time suggested I buy a skateboard because I was running up and down..... We had three ---- we had lots of storefronts, very little staff, as you remember, and we kind of ---- I'm reminding you because you were a very valuable employee at that time.

HAMOVITCH: What I remember also is that you needed for requirements for a multi-service center an activity director and you needed activities, so instead of just a counseling center, it became an information and referral and an activity center.

KING: Right. Information and referral we had always done before, but we had never done activities. And we had never done ---- we never kept records, remember? We were a long way from an MIS System, but I remember we tried different colors. As they came in for this, they got a brown file, if they came in for this, they got a red file. Remember that? It was very informal, but very practical. Also, we learned a tremendous amount from that, because it was basically our first grant, other than, as I said, the meals, which were handled ----- the meals grant was handled in a strange way in those days because it was actually managed by an accountant who somebody had ----- the agency felt like they couldn't run, apparently. I didn't know anything about it. There was a person running the actual meal, the delivery of the meals and all, and she contracted with the caterer, but all of the grants management was done by some accountant. It was ----- so it wasn't anything we had any experience with. So this was the first grant that we wrote and managed and renewed and we worked on. It was a very, very distinct learning experience.

HAMOVITCH: From that building that was temporary, across from the Farmer's Market, a new building was built.

KING: Right. We could see that the three buildings didn't work, and the three staff and the

three secretaries ----- (laughter) ---- and the three budgets ----- I mean it was — no. So in 1977, I think, at the end of '77, we found a building and got a grant to remodel an old bank that was sort of not exactly mid-way between, but it was closer to Fairfax and across the street ---- really sort of across the street from where we are now. We put all three centers together. That was a feat (laughter), as I recall. The biggest, the most difficult part of that whole thing was making sure that all three secretaries were happy. (Laughter) There was a person who was basically kind of a secretary but felt they were in ----- really ran each one of the three sites. So we had to find roles for each one of them.

HAMOVITCH: Oh, I remember that one.

KING: Yes.

HAMOVITCH: Okay. Outside of the secretarial obstacle, what other obstacles did you encounter?

KING: One of the ones that began just about that time ---- we were just about two years into it ---- was that there was ---- it was difficult to kind of know how to deal with the fact that there was so much work possibility in an agency that was in all other arenas, remaining fairly much the same; stable ---- a fair amount of growth, but not a great deal. So here's an agency which for a hundred and, in those days, thirty-some years now, a hundred and forty, a hundred and forty-five years, so it was a hundred and twenty years or something, or thirty years, had been basically a counseling agency, providing counseling and concrete services out of, in those days, I guess, three regional offices, maybe four, and also done resettlement, where suddenly, aging was kind of becoming so visible and had the potential of becoming so large. It was a very heavy time. We were very excited, and you remember that, I'm sure. A very exciting time. We felt we could do anything. All we had to do was do it well and know what we were doing and work very hard. It was very

exciting. There were wonderful people invested in it. We had a sense of excitement and the world was open to us.

HAMOVITCH: But you were very good, I remember, and kind of on the cutting edge of grants. I remember that there was outside of the grants for the multi-service center, it seems to me that you were talking grants all the time.

KING: Yes, because what happened was, the multi-service center grant sort of put us in touch with the world of grants. Once we got into that, we learned about like ----- at the same time ----- no not right then, but soon after that, we became aware of the home secure ----- the grant for home secure (Hannah, I'm not sure she's saying "secure"). Until then, I don't think that anyone had every figured that there was any avenue for money except United Way, United Jewish Fund, and donations. When we started realizing grants were a possibility, once we got over the hurdle of the Board and other leadership and staff of the agency and other directions being comfortable with this, which was a very long process, a long a difficult process. But the possibilities, once we got into that arena, were just endless, and a big next step after this one, came in the ---- I think it was in the beginning of '79, early maybe winter ----- January, February, '79 ----- there was an RFP that came out ---- actually a letter that announced the ideas that the State had to start the multi-service, MSSP, Multi-purpose Senior Services Project. That came out of what was happening in the 70's and 80's when the Federal government suddenly realized that if people were living longer, which they sort of realized in the 70's, and they continued to use nursing homes at the rate that they were using them, which at that time would vary ---- you know, the numbers aren't anything what they are now, but the sense of going into a nursing home was something that was considered very frequently because there were no alternatives. So a nursing home seemed to be a natural step for

a lot of people. Yet, what was happening was that only a few weeks after people went into nursing homes, they normally, even if they had gone in as private pay, they ended up on what we call MediCal. The government was beginning to realize this big chunk of money that was going to be spent on MediCal for nursing homes. So they began to look for alternatives. The alternatives to institutionalization became a kind of a catch word. One of the alternatives that was offered was taking a small portion of the money that was scheduled for nursing home beds, leaving those beds vacant, and spending it instead on community-based care. There was a special waiver, a 2176 waiver, which states could apply for to start up that kind of program. It was called a home and community-based waiver. They conceived of MSSP and decided ---- the California Department of Aging decided it would go for it. So in those days ---- I don't know how many cities went for it ---- now almost every state has that waiver, but at MSSP to this day, continues to be in my mind, one of the most successful programs that really does what it attempts to do. What happened is they sent out a letter of interest and said they were going to have this RFP coming out. Someone from the Federation got the letter and sent it out to Cedars, to us, to a number of other agencies, and said is anybody interested. They called a meeting, and I remember Roz ?????? was out of town, so I went, representing the agency, and nobody was very interested. Cedars was afraid of this, Federation said it didn't provide services. Nobody was really ready to pick up on it and I figured, why not? It was just a letter. So you could send a letter of intent, saying you're interested. So we did, and then we really got very interested. That was the kind of transforming grant, because it really ---- number one, we were an agency at that time ---- I don't think our budget was ---- the whole agency, I don't think, had a budget of more than maybe \$5,000,000 or maybe \$6,000,000. This was a \$2,000,000 grant. We called it a million dollar grant, because we didn't even know, but from the first day, it was a \$2,000,000 a year grant. It had a huge impact on the

agency, and it also made us both a recipient of grant money, but also, a provider of ---- I mean a contractor for providers, because we could purchase e services for others, you know, for our clients.

HAMOVITCH: The MSSP stands for multi-service.....

KING: Multi-purpose Senior Services Project.

HAMOVITCH: Okay. I just wanted to go back a tiny bit when you said that the Board was skeptical about grants and whatever. How did they accept such a big grant? I mean, was that an obstacle?

KING: There were a few sort of visionary people who could see the value of it, who could recognize that this would be a huge aid to people in our community, so the ---- I think the areas of concern were around the fact of would we lose our autonomy and would we have to begin doing things that ----- we'd been a very, our Board was very hands-on, very concerned about operations ---- would we become sort of a

HAMOVITCH: Indebted?

KING: Indebted to the State, right. That was number one. Number two, were we getting into unchartered waters that we didn't know what we were getting into, which was true. Number three, a big concern, was would we create expectations ---- this was a three-year demonstration --- would we be creating expectations and then grant is over and then what? Then the Jewish community would have to support it. In some ways, the fact that it was so large, the grant was so large, helped, because as I explained to I don't know how many people --- to this day, I keep making the same explanations, because there are still people who think that could happen --- that our entire allocation from Federation isn't as large as this one grant. There's no question in the world that if this grant ended, no one would turn to Federation to expect it to support it, because we

don't get that money for all of what we do in the community. But I guess people got more comfortable with it.

There were a few leaders on the Board who were as excited as I was, and I sort of used them to be sort of the spokespeople. There was a lot of difficulty that other staff had because they saw aging growing. I remember right after we'd gotten MSSP and Home Secure and AAA grants, someone made the statement that we shouldn't --- I can't remember --- that we somehow not acknowledge it or we would be seen as an aging agency. I remember saying to Arnold that this is a funny time to talk about it since we just got an obligation of I don't know how many million dollars of government money to provide services to aging. We can't pretend we're not. But it did go on for a long way. Then the answer always was, "Well, it's a demonstration. It's not permanent."

It took a long time until there was kind of an acceptance. The staff always felt sort like they received very temporary ----- the whole idea, I mean, even starting ---- I remember from my very first day when I came to my first staff meeting, and in those days the professional staff were about --- I don't think there were 50 people, maybe 30. It was in a small room at 590. One of the professionals came over to me and congratulated me for being hired. Then she said something like, "When are you going to go for a real job?" Working with aging was not seen as a real social work sort of gem. It was kind of what you took because there was nothing else. She said, "Are you going to sort of look around until something else comes up?" I said, "No. I'm interested in this." So I think it was true, agency-wise, for a long time, we talked about case management. But it's not (some kind of noise - shut off for a minute). The issue of how we sort of became more closely integrated into the agency as it was, was a major focus, I guess, of the middle 80's. Here

was this agency which in some cases was sort of developing a tail that was wagging the dog. What MSSP did, MSSP was different than anything that we had ever done because it number one, was a huge government grant. Number two, it not only provided a nurse and social worker who would work with each of --- in those days, I think it was five clients --- but it also allowed us to purchase up to a certain budget, services to those clients in their homes, so long as it didn't take more than what it would take to serve them in a nursing home. Remember, this was the waiver which allowed you to spend MediCal dollars on non-medical services. There was the idea finally realized that if, let's say, you get some transportation for this lady so she can go pick up her medicine, or you help bring in somebody to help her clean and cook, then that, as much as any nursing care difference, could keep her out of a nursing home. Sometimes it's non-medical care that keeps people out of nursing homes. There was a long list of categories that we were allowed to purchase, categories of care such as personal care, home cleaning, shopping, someone to cook, transportation, adult day care, and also there was something called special services where we could even come up with creative, special needs. I remember we bought a special chair that allowed sitting down and standing to be easier by pressing a handle that was kind of a push to sort of help them get out of the chair. We could build ramps to get people in their houses on Wilshire. There were a lot of leeways that we could use to purchase things for people.

Now these were people who were, number one, SSI level, MediCal level. Number two, they were people who, at the point they came on our program, had to be eligible for nursing home care. It was definitely an alternative to institutionalization. It wasn't costing the government anything, and we were trying to prove the point. The first three years, we learned a lot. The first thing, from my point of view, it was the most exciting time because what happened was, the State Department of Aging, which had the responsibility for developing the program, didn't know

exactly what it wanted to do. They awarded the grants to eight agencies throughout the State. They asked two people to be put on the payroll for a planning period. Those two people were sort of the representatives from that agency. We spent a good deal of the summer of '79 in State-wide meetings, planning what the MSSP would look like. I was exposed to people from other agencies. We were doing really very important --- I always laugh, because I remember saying to somebody how I felt responsible for every older person in the State until I finally, I met Barbara Sklar (?), who was my counterpart in San Francisco from Mt. Zion. She felt the same way, so we divided up the State. I only had to worry about Fresno and south (laughter), and she

HAMOVITCH: How many sites were there?

KING: Eight. Eight sites. The eight original sites ---- the two people --- and Jennifer Chapman was my partner --- she had actually just applied to the agency. She had just gotten her MBA and her MSW, and she applied to the agency for some fiscal, I think, some kind of temporary fiscal role, and I met her. She was very bright and very interested. So we were on a grand adventure. It was indeed a very heady time.

Once we worked together and developed all these standards and developed all the processes and the procedures and set sort of what the format would be --- and they were constantly being evaluated --- then the program got started. There were lots of questions. They were putting together actually three funding sources, and the funding sources themselves, which turned out to be MediCal, some left-over money from --- what was the second one? --- and Title Three --- I can't remember was it ---- oh, City General Fund. MediCal, City General Fund and Title Three, and they wouldn't let us combine the money. So every time we spent any money, we'd have to identify what part of it came from Title Three, what part ---- I mean, it was ---- and we were really novices. As much as Jennifer had those fancy titles, we weren't computerized and we --- I don't

think there were computers, then. If there were, we didn't have them. We had to learn a lot. We did. We hired staff. For me, it was a big change, because I had to give up the Freda Mohr Center. So my job changed then in 1979 when I became --- I think I was given the title of Administrator of MSSP, but that was my State title because of my participation in the grant, but then I was given the title of Director of Senior Services. I needed to hire someone to direct the Freda Mohr Center, and I hired Sally Allen(?).

Many people, including you, kind of grew up with us in the organization. We started from various points. You were also Kaycees (?).

HAMOVITCH: I started with the Kaycees.

KING: Right, right. And then were Volunteer Coordinator, Activity Director. So I think what happened then with Sally coming on, and the MSSP taking form, sort of other grants kind of fell into place because we began having a presence, not only locally in the community, naturally, and locally, but also Statewide. The things that were different in the way we were operating, caused us to be feeling that we were sort of cutting edge. I remember giving a report to the Board that we had changed --- number one, that we were contracting for services with sub-contractors. So we were not only providing services, we were contracting, we were a funding source as well as providers of services. We were multi-disciplinary for the first time. We had never hired nurses before. So we had nurses on staff. We didn't know what to do with them.

I remember it was very hard getting the agency-wide, the person who was the agency-wide kind of personnel people, recognizing what we were doing, because we were seen as so far out. The other thing is that we --- because of the nature of MSSP, it doesn't separate program and fiscal the way the agency was used to doing. Traditionally, the agency had traditional social workers. We didn't have a clue what it cost to have the agency hire them to provide that service. In other

words, the directors, the district directors of the regional offices had no idea what their budgets were. They never knew what it cost for their offices to run. They never had to think in those terms. There was a fiscal department, which was one person, and that fiscal --- it was as though they were the professionals, they were the program people, they could think about social work thoughts. The fiscal responsibility was somebody else's. Certainly the counselors never thought about it. If the counselor charged someone a fee for counseling, it hardly mattered. It was not an issue in the same way that --- except in terms of what it meant to the person to pay that fee. It was a different time and place in terms of that. With MSSP, every social worker had to know what the budget was for their particular client, and they had to know how many services they could order. So they had to work very closely within a budget, and they were very conscious of that.

Meanwhile, as administrators of that, we had to be very aware of what the program was costing and what we were charging and if and how we contracted with a sub-contractor. Let's say we hired Dynamic Homecare to do services for our client. How much should we pay them? What was fair? We had to have a contract. We were in a totally different arena than we had been in before. So, then of course, just a couple of privates. We suddenly had a government to answer to. So all of those were wonderfully broadening experiences. (Laughter) But they took their toll in a sense of trying to get the agency, the total agency, the understand how it was changing as a result of this sort of addition to.....

HAMOVITCH: A dramatic change.

KING: Dramatic.

HAMOVITCH: And then what happened, it seems to me, the Freda Mohr Center, even though they were housed in the same building, the Freda Mohr Center was contained and then the MSSP on the other side of the building was contained. I know that we went.....

KING: I should mention, by the way, that ---- 'cause where we left this chronologically was we were in the bank building in 1979.

HAMOVITCH: Oh, you're right.

KING: After three years of that, we realized what had happened was the bank building could not contain MSSP. So MSSP was down on Beverly, first in one place and then, another. The ?????? Meals Program was off in another little building. The Home Secure was in another little building.

HAMOVITCH: Right.

KING: There was something else across the street in, was it, I can't remember. I mean, there were little.....

HAMOVITCH: But they were all.....

KING: They were all

HAMOVITCH:self contained.

KING: Right, right, right. And so what we decided was it really was time to get a building that would house us all. In 1982, that happened, and it really was a combination of funding: public, City, State, there was this Senior Bond Act that came out. We had private donation, we had Jewish Community Foundation donation, we had ---- I can't remember ---- the Ahmanson Foundation. There were any number of foundations that we had approached, so it really was putting it all together that made this happen. A couple of other things happened during the years from '79 to '82 that impacted our ability to talk in this broad spectrum. Number one, after we got MSSP and we were in that old bank building, UCLA got the idea that it needed to do more to educate geriatric health professionals, and they approached us and worked with us to develop a geriatric clinic as part of our sort of operation. At first it was in the MSSP building - one little room. Then it came into the Senior Services building when we moved, and it's there still. That

has made a big difference. It's now known as the Eichenbaum Health Center. Working with UCLA, again, expanded our horizon. We were able to link with health professionals in a way that was very beneficial to the client so that we could be not only a social service agency, but also, health services.

All this has led us to be in a good place in terms of the way the world changed with regards to aging, because it's almost as though we were forced into the cutting edge. Then the world kind of caught up, because a holistic approach is exactly what was necessary now. The combination of fiscal and program is mandated by managed care. The interdisciplinary approach, the idea of contracting, all those things now are sort of commonplace. As we kind of struggled with them, we got into the stream of that. There we were. so, in 1982, we moved into the building we're in now, and that solidified it.

HAMOVITCH: That's where I jumped the gun.

KING: With the advent of MSSP and then the Eichenbaum Health Center, which in those days was the Oshan (?) Sylvia Oshan Health Center. Other things came our way, and we began to be seen as a player so that we had the kind of unique position of both being on the street, providing services, and also being somewhat involved in the development of program and policy because of our participation in MSSP and our being so involved with the City and the County. By then we were also contracting with LA County for the City of West Hollywood. Also, we began contracting with the City of West Hollywood, itself, and eventually, also with the City of Beverly Hills, the City of Culver City, Burbank and a few others for various programs.

As a result of that, being in that position, we began to have new visibility. So other opportunities came along. One was, we had been very active, as you know, in board and care outreach, and together, as I remember, we recognized a real gap in services and a need for

additional services to people who needed more personal care, but not more nursing care, who were living in board and care, who wanted to stay there, their families wanted them to stay there, the board and care owners wanted them to stay there, but they needed more care that the SSI allocation could provide. So they would have to move to nursing homes, where they really would not be in the most desirable environment. We got some legislation written in conjunction with the California Department of Aging staff, who really supported it, and also authored by Bert Margolin, who was the local Assemblyman at that time. It allowed for a demonstration program with one in the south and one in then north to hire aids placed in board and care homes, where each aid would work with seven or eight clients and would be able to perform the kind of duties that would help that person stay in the (Hannah, here Sandy said stay in the nursing home, but I think she meant board and care home). For many, many years, that program continued, at least in our site, and was able to do what was accomplished. It eventually became absorbed into MSSP for all kinds of complicated issues, but the hope had been that that program --- what we could see, that program was accomplishing, would be recognized and would become kind of an enticement. We had very ambitious visions of it, which could have happened with a little more favorable administration at the State level, but at point, things changed, and there was never any money. It wasn't ever --- well, it was validated, but not funded. It was always clearly approved of, but never really went beyond the two sites and then got absorbed into MSSP.

There were a number of other programs, and we became very active, for example, in adult day health care, which we still are. That was also a challenge when we first started. I remember the first adult day health care center that we started at Valley Storefront. By the way, Valley Storefront grew up in many of the same ways as the Freda Mohr Center. After I'd become Director of Senior Services, I remember a lot of the new programs that Dorie Grabwell (?), who

was Director of Valley Storefront, instigated, or that we learned about. It seemed right for the Valley Storefront, among them, Family Friends, which came from grants from the National Council on Aging, Robert Wood Johnson, and other programs that came as a result of our being as active in developing this continuum of service; adult day health care, as I mentioned before, being one of them. Adult day health care, when we first started it --- I think it required five different distinct grants from different funding sources. I remember somebody introduced it to the Board, and someone said, "You mean to say you have to, you think you're to get all five of those?" It turns out, we did. We became active in the adult day health care kind of movement because it is clearly a very important wave, I think, that will continue in the future. Then following that, we developed the Alzheimer's Day Care Center. We have now that at the Valley Storefront, and we have adult day health care in town, and also in West Hollywood, and are just got funded for an Alzheimer's Day Care Center there too.

So the sort of beat goes on, but in each case, I think, positioning ourselves has been as important as anything else in terms of being able --- we see the need so clearly, and have developed more credibility, I think, in trying to see where those things can get funded.

HAMOVITCH: I've heard all the successes, all the wonderful programs. I know that each agency has many successes, but also has something that they're not happy about. What would be off the cuff kind of failure that you felt didn't work? And why?

KING: Okay. I think --- let me call it a challenge.

HAMOVITCH: Okay, not a failure. A challenge.

KING: I think one of the issues that we are really struggling with now, has to do with the fact that all this wonderful growth, and the growth is real and is extremely important in terms of what we're able to offer clients when we think of how we were in that tiny little storefront and what we

had to kind of scramble for and what we had to say no to and what is really available for older people now. That feels very good. But part of the reason we were able to develop all these programs is that we've had actually very, very, very challenging and dedicated staff who sort of bought into each of these programs that was kind of the person --- I mean, you remember where you were when we did CPF(?) I mean, you were being that kind of involved in order to make that happen. So we developed all of the very, very strong individual programs and by design, the professional leadership has created a very de-centralized system, because we feel that it, and we have always felt, and Paul Castro, the Associate Director and I have both felt very strongly that the de-centralized approach allows people to develop on their own, to buy into it, to own it, make it theirs, and therefore, they'll work very, very hard to make it work. What's happened now is that we almost find ourselves like in a position where we wonder should there be more central control, where we hear somebody not wanting to give the name of a volunteer because some other unit might steal them or very real circumstances we have to negotiate as to who will apply for certain foundations for grants. We are so large now, we have 42 distinct programs. One of the issues that we constantly struggle with is how de-centralized should we continue to be, how much do we have to kind of reign in, and you lose something when you do that. On the other hand, we're able to provide support agency-wide, now, in grant development and fundraising and P.R. and marketing and certainly, in fiscal, that we couldn't before. There's something that people gain by that. But that's really a challenge to us right now.

There are others, too, because we're now --- the question of our role in the Jewish community is a challenge. It feels as though there's, I would say, constant explaining necessary in order for people to understand who we are. People used to say we were the best kept secret. Now I think people think we're one thing, because it's like ????? the elephant(?) they're looking

at. If I say to somebody ---- I used to say if you ask people like the City of LA who JFS was, they'd say oh, they're the aging agency in certain areas. If you ask the State Department, they'd say, oh, they do the resettlement. If you ask the County, they'd probably say, we have a meals program, but we work a lot with family violence. And if you ask the Jewish community, the Federation, they'd say we're the Jewish social service agency. Well, the fact is, we're all those things, which leads me to one other problem, actually, issue I would say we've dealt with, and that has to do with our being sectarian or non-sectarian. We started out as a sectarian agency, and for years, we were. I don't think we ever refused service to anyone, certainly not in any agency I was involved with, but there was an understanding that we were there to serve the Jewish population. That changed, and largely as a result of all the grants, and we now operate under Jewish values and traditions and we have a Jewish heritage, but we are clearly a non-sectarian agency. What that allows us to do is to use a lot of externally funded programs to provide for the Jewish community, but we also provide, with those externally funded programs, a lot of services to non-Jewish people. While that's clearly the policy of the agency and the intent of the agency, it requires constant interpretation, first to remind the Jewish community that we are serving the Jewish community, because that is lots of times questioned, and then to make it clear to the general community that we are not sectarian. Sometimes I find myself feeling that ---- we've gotten --- in the same day, I'm re-assuring people in the opposite situation, but both are true. I feel very comfortable, and I believe that the people running the programs who really know the way our services are offered, feel very comfortable with the fact that both are true, but the reality is, people really do see one part of the elephant. I would say that --- I don't know how well we've done that in every arena.

We've been, I think, incredibly successful in being able to maintain programs that were --- we've --- people have asked me --- every time this comes up, we're trying for grants, it's a

one-year grant, particularly like to the Jewish Community Foundation, the community people will say, “Well, what are you going to do when it’s over? You’re increasing expectations? Remember the famous issue when MSSP was a demonstration program.”

What I started to say was we look at our history. I can’t remember when a program was shut down, with one exception because the funding ended, and we couldn’t continue. I mean, there were things like Emma(?) starting CCSP, the clients were phased into MSSP and get the same clients. There have been times when we’ve had to cut down staff or change hours or something like that because funding --- you know, there were periods during the early 90's, particularly, where some of the funding sources were cut: United Way, significantly, and Federation. But programs continue. So all the new things we started, with one exception, and this brings me over to the other part of the agency, which I need to sort of bring.....

HAMOVITCH: Okay, but before you do that, because you’re still Director of Senior Services, and we’re going to move on to your growth as well as the agency’s growth. All right. Let’s move on from your being Director of Senior Services to becoming --- what was your next.....

KING: I think it was Associate Executive Director. What happened was that because of the way the agency was structured, I was Director of Senior Services, but after we opened that big building, and it was clearly recognized that aging was here to stay, and that we were who we were, I was given the title of Associate Executive Director. There were two of us who were Associate Executive Directors. One person, Ethel Taft, was responsible for the non-aging part of the agency, and I was responsible for aging. That continued for a period of six years, and it --- I guess that was the time that was the most difficult in terms of integrating all of what we were doing into the agency, because it could no longer be the tail of the dog. The dog was different; it wasn’t a puppy anymore. The dog was a very fat dog, and so, that took a lot of changing. It took a lot of

changing of systems. The fiscal system that the agency used did not work, did not provide an audit trail that the government was satisfied with. For many years, we maintained two systems because the agency and the Federation mandated that we continue to be part of theirs, obviously, the agency. The Federation wouldn't change, and we needed a different system, a totally different system for the government audit. So we had two fiscal systems, which was absurd. That kind of struggle led to gradually the leadership of the agency recognizing that there had to be an integrated system. MSSP was no longer a demonstration program, we were here to stay. In many ways we were no longer an agency just of social workers. In the first place, we had a number of people who had grown to levels of management who were social workers who were either big level people or people with all kinds of life experience. We had nurses, we had gerontologists, we had people with masters in public health, we have people in various specialties that come with their own kind of degrees. So we had to recognize that we're different than we used to be. Our staff development had to be recognized, all kinds of things. Even insurance and licensing and the way we represent ourselves. So that was a period, I guess I would say we struggled with and went through in the middle '80's.

In 1988 there was a restructuring of the agency. The person who was the other Associate Executive Director left to take a job as Executive Director of another agency, Jewish Vocational Services. The Board restructured what was the operational --- the person who had been my fiscal director, was appointed to be fiscal director of the whole agency. Then there was kind of a --- there were three of us who were generally responsible agency-wide: Arnold Saltzman, who was the Executive Director, I was Associate Executive Director, and Paul Castro, who now is Associate Director, was then fiscal director. That's the leadership the agency had in creating the single management, the three of us, was to bring to the style of management that we had developed

in the senior side. The system was re-organized and computerized and set up in much more of a functional system. I began working with the regional directors and the directors of the specialized programs and began introducing the ideas and approaches that were fairly standard in terms of the way the senior side of the agency had developed. We began looking at what our budgets were, directors of all the units became responsible for their own budgets. This was interesting. We began talking about things like productivity. We began trying to develop a MIS, that system that taught us, that told us something. There was a very elaborate MIS system, which had been developed by the previous person. It took a lot of time on the part of the workers, but it wasn't really being used to manage the units in a way that was productive. So we began trying to approach what was happening there, and trying very hard to use what we had learned about grant development, to be able to satisfy some of the needs that were able to be satisfied in the regional programs or the specialized programs.

In addition to what I called sort of adult-children service, the name changed, somehow, to protect everybody, but we began identifying ourselves as Senior Services, Adult and Children's Services and Resettlement. Resettlement was an extremely active part of my responsibility at that time because there was a huge wave of immigrants from 1988 until maybe the middle of the '90's where that one year, I remember we got 2,500 people in one year. There were lots of issues that took a lot of time in terms of people coming from the former Soviet Union and people coming from Iran. The way the grants were going to be handled -- that was one, if I was asked -- going back to a problem that was ever solved, I would say that the management of the Resettlement Program, that was a problem. I guess I had an unconscious ----- it was never solved to my satisfaction. Not from our internal management. I think our Director does a magnificent job. But because of the way, historically, the program was divided up, the grant comes to Federation, is managed by

Federation, and Federation, instead of just giving the allocation to the agencies, pretty much manages in on a line item monitoring so that the agencies are not really free to run the program in a way they might most creatively and most functionally. So there's kind of the sense that we have the responsibility without the control and not the ability to be as creative as we've been in all of our grants. I think we've become ----- one thing I'm proud of is that we really manage grants well. We satisfy the requirements, and we use the money in the most productive, creative way. We have a history of it. But because we're not allowed to do that, it feels like our strings are being pulled. That's an area of frustration to me, and I don't ----- lots of times, I feel like we've not been able to do as well as we should be doing in that program, because whenever we start something that seems creative and that we think is going to provide a tremendous service and that has the ability to do this, this, and this, then as happens so often, if the numbers go down for one month, then we're told to let staff go, even though the next month, the numbers may go up and you might have hire staff and you can't find anybody who speaks Farsi or Russian or whatever. So there's not the long-range view of things that we have taken with the grants that we manage. So it's been an area of frustration to this day, because we're satisfying another organization's agenda.

HAMOVITCH: Sandy, now, at this point, are you Executive Director?

KING: Right, right.

HAMOVITCH: Okay, let me ask a question, because I realize in talking about Senior Services, we didn't include what that Senior Services, the umbrella, what comes out of Senior Services, like all the different programs. Also, with Jewish Family Services and you being the Executive Director, what programs are under that? I think we haven't defined those.

KING: Okay. Starting with Senior Services, Senior Services are provided and ----- I don't need to do this chronologically?

HAMOVITCH: No.

KING: Okay. Senior Services are provided out of four multi-service centers. The one that you've heard the most about and you know the most about is the Freda Mohr Center. The Valley Storefront developed equally in terms of growth and variety. It has different programs, but huge variety where it has the meals site, it has the walk-in counseling, it does a lot of telephone response, a lot of groups, even more groups with intergenerational where they do even your aging parent groups. There's also a Bet Sedek unit in their building. They have an Adult Day Health Care Center and an Alzheimer's Day Care Center. They also have a Family Friend's Program which matches senior volunteers with the families of children who are either disabled, terminally or seriously chronically ill, and the Family Friend acts as kind of a support to both the child, providing respite for the parents, but also sometimes support for the siblings, a true relationship that's very, very valuable to the volunteer as well as ---- it's one of our really most appealing programs.

Another area where I think I could say where I've been struggling, but haven't found ongoing funding for that program. It started about 13 years ago with a 3-year grant from Robert Wood Johnson. We kept it alive, but it doesn't take a lot of money. As we speak, I'm working on legislation, possible legislation, but at this point it looks very disappointing. We're running into a snag. I haven't found ongoing funding. We keep fighting for little pieces of funding to keep it alive. So that's one that's still one ---- the program's a gigantic success. In fact, the most interesting part came a few years ago where UCLA medical students ---- we get a lot of referrals from the families and the kids from UCLA ---- but the medical students asked if they could be Family Friends for a short period of time and spend some time with the families and learn the impact of this kind of illness has on a family, out of the clinic, out of the hospital, so that they could

respond better when they're dealing with it as physicians. That's been a very valuable piece of experience for them and also, it's been very interesting for us. So we've done that a few years, and a few other residents have asked to join into that. All of that takes place at the ?????? at the Valley Storefront.

A number of other programs ---- an interesting one is a Spanish-speaking support group for older people which was located at a center where we had a contract for a number of years and didn't repeat the contract ----- we didn't apply again. We felt it was too close to Valley Storefront. It wasn't a population that was eager to participate in a service center. They were looking primarily for activities. But there was this group of Hispanic older people who wanted to continue to meet under our auspices, so they continue. They're still part of us. The person who heads that does a lot of outreach to Spanish-speaking seniors. So that's what goes on at the Valley Storefront.

HAMOVITCH: You have Home Secure and Aids to the Elderly.

KING: Home Secure and Aids to the Elderly are almost citywide ---- well, Home Secure is almost citywide now. The Home Secure we mentioned at Freda Mohr now goes to 11 of the 15 councilmatic districts. There's an office in the Valley and at Freda Mohr. Aids to the Elderly has been an interesting period of growth because Aids to the Elderly which matches Home Secure, provides kind of devices for safety devices, locks, grab bars within the home, and also provides an information aid who brings information about other services for the home. The Aids to the Elderly is in an interesting phase. I'm a volunteer at Freda Mohr. We have big books. People who needed help in their home would sign up in the book, and then people who were interested in picking up a few dollars as an aid, and that was all they knew how to do, or that was what they liked to do, would sign up, and a volunteer would match them. That grew into a program where

we would recruit and train aids and then provided the matching. The older person still employed the aid. Then it was called Aids to the Elderly.

We expanded on that because with MSSP, our ability to purchase services, some of the services we'd want to purchase from Aids to the Elderly, because we thought we had the best aids. So the State allowed us to do that so long as they weren't the exclusive group that was used. We started like a mini employment agency where we employed the aids. We sold that to MSSP in the sense of contracting with Aids to the Elderly. We never could really develop a unit for a long time in the Valley. There weren't enough aids. It was very hard to staff. So we tried for awhile and gave up. And then it was started on sort of an informal basis, and it developed under a different name ---- and this is sort of a classic example of how organizations work. Here we had Aids to the Elderly, which had a certain rate and different hours and kind of operating principles. Then we had, out in the Valley, this other program developing which was called A-Plus Personal Care. It charged different rates and operated totally differently. We decided that didn't sound right, so my idea was to put them together. But guess what? They didn't want to. Each one, again, de-centralized. We had given them the go-ahead. We said ??????, and they did, so they thought they were doing just fine. And it was working. I mean, it was working. So magically, Sally ??????, who was part of the Freda Mohr Center, got a grant to enhance in home care; a one-year grant, was able to hire someone who could work as a sort of an intermediary and could also do P.R. outlet community for one year. What we put as her mandate was to present to the general community, both parts of the program. That was very valuable. Also, we could offer them a program with a little help in recruitment for staff to interview and some clerical assistance. The program had to cooperate by agreeing to agree on one price, one name, da da, da da, da da. So over a period of a year, with many, many discussions, many meetings, we now combined them

into one pattern. We still had have two directors, but we have one pattern which fits both of them. It is now called A-Plus Personal Care in total.

HAMOVITCH: No longer Aids to the Elderly?

KING: No longer Aids to the Elderly - A-Plus Personal Care. That's an example of how the de-centralized has both advantages and disadvantages. Now those two centers, the Valley Storefront and the Freda Mohr Center are the largest of service centers where most of the services are centered. We have two other Storefronts: one is Pico-Robertson, sort of a baby, which came as a result of an existing information referral service, which was run by B'Nai Brith, which was about to close, approached us and wanted to know if we could help them keep it alive, which we did and we then took on, and it's now operating as a totally separate Storefront, although it's a lot of work with Freda Mohr. It has it's own kind of programs, it's own population. The Holocaust Survivors grant, which we administer for the Claims Commission, which is an international organization that received money from Germany for survivors. That operates out of this Pico-Robertson Storefront, and so does the B'Nai Brith Case Management --- I mean the Beverly Hills Case Management Program. So that's one Storefront.

The last Storefront is the West Hollywood Senior Center, which is actually the Senior Center for the City of West Hollywood, which they asked us to operate. We serve primarily Russian elderly. It's open to everybody, but we serve primarily Russian. In some ways it reminds us of what Freda Mohr Center used to be like in the old days, because it's a large walk-in crowd, a lot of help with concrete services. The Freda Mohr Center has changed somewhat in that the people who need help in that area are very, very old now.

HAMOVITCH: Very frail.

KING: Very frail, very old. A lot of help is needed in-home. There's fewer people who can

walk in and ask ----- I mean, a lot of them still do, but there's a lot of need for in-home services. There's also a lot of need for specialty services where staff are needed to provide it. Much of the work is done by volunteers, and more is done by the specialty programs such as MSSP or certainly, transportation

HAMOVITCH: Case management.

KING: Case management, right. And case management has become a very strong part of it. What I would hope ---- and by the way, the City AAA Program has expanded to include case management. Now we have case management. We have about five levels of case management. That's good for our clients, because if they don't fit into one program, they're recommended to another. One of the things that I think has been an issue there is that when ---- wait, I lost my train of thought ----

The four Senior Centers have sort of as a partners ---- on the other side of the agency, I talked about senior services. Now let me talk about adult and children's services. I've also talked about resettlement, which by the way, has now come down, although the interesting thing is we're resettling Kosova, most recently a small group from there. But generally, resettlement is less of an activity because fewer people are coming now. Adult and children services, when we began working with them, as I mentioned before, we began looking at opportunities for grants and for expansion. There has been expansion in the specialized services. Family violence has gotten to be a major demand, family violence programs. We have a 24-hour shelter, we put up a transition house, and we put up an out-patient program. That grew out of, really, a very small beginning where we had some students who noticed that some of their cases were real ---- these were HUC students who said that some of their cases were really the result of family violence, and at first our Board said, not in this community. There couldn't be batterers. Then finally, they

accepted it. We started an out-patient program, which we had for a number of years. Then there was the realization that there needed to be a shelter and there was some grant money available, so we opened a shelter. So we have the shelter. There's also a homeless shelter, which was started before I began working. That was the one area, I think, where as part of regional services, now known as Adult-Children Services, there was a grant available, and so a program developed. That Gramercy Shelter is a shelter for families. We keep the family unit intact. We just expanded it.

HAMOVITCH: How many does that house?

KING: I think we have now 44 beds. They tend to be pretty much single-parent families. At this point, there's probably 20 to 25 children there. We try to have our child care program more responsive, and beef it up, and we've gotten a grant to do that. We're constantly kind of working on that.

Our other specialized programs included ADAP which is Alcohol and Drug Action Program, our Aids Response Program, our Orthodox Counseling Program, Habberim, which came to us because it's a program for developmentally disabled young adults, and it was kind of looking for a home. It was part of Hillel that went to the Jewish Homes for the Aged, because they thought they had some residential houses that could be used as group homes. But that somehow didn't work, so they asked if they could associate with us. And they did.

So we have a number of programs that respond to the needs of special populations. That's one of, again, though it's not a ---- it's got both very good sides to it. It also has challenges, because when groups associate with us in that way, they're, those programs are extremely important to that population, yet they have to then compete with all the other groups in terms of the opportunities that come up to JFS for additional funding. Not every population sees itself in the order of importance that maybe others might see. That's the advantage and disadvantage.

What's happened to the agencies --- in 19 ---- I mentioned that in 1988, we --- the Board developed a single structure, and then in 1991, very, very surprisingly, the Executive Director, Arnold Saltzman, left to take another position, and I was offered the position of Executive Director. I had different titles, but..... Then Paul became Associate Executive Director, and we established a somewhat different management game where I didn't replace myself. I guess I had been in the position of probably COO, Chief Operating Officer. The programs reported to me for the department head, reported to me under Arnold. I basically was involved with the Board and with Federation, United Way, and what I decided is ---- in the first place, those were very lean times when I took over, and there was a feeling that ---- this was the fall of '91 --- there was a feeling that department heads that had worked directly with me were so experienced that I didn't see any sense in replacing myself and having someone between them and me. What I did was basically carve up the position of chief operating officers so they each got a piece of that and were responsible not only for the department theory, not only for the department phase, but also joining with Paul and me for the whole agency. And so we set up what was called the agency management team. We had all the department heads and also the person who does fundraising and P.R., the grant specialist, fiscal, etc. Basically, as a team, we meet once a week and run the agency.

The agency now, I think, is probably more complex than the average social service agency because we have these 42 distinct programs. We have about, I think at last count, 36 funding sources at any point in time. That's also the fun of it all. It's very, very ---- and what's very interesting is that each of these specialized programs relates to a whole different world. We're very active in the domestic violence movement through our Family Violence Program; very much involved in homeless, FEMA, the group that works with homelessness; I'm on the group that

works with NCOA. We're very involved in aging in all aspects. We've been involved on the Board of the Statewide Adult Day Health Care Program. Our director has been involved in that, and Linkages director is the head of the Statewide Directors Group. So we've been in a lot of these different levels of organization where we can look at both policy and also are very involved in practice. We now focus a great deal on both keeping it all going, but positioning ourselves for what's coming next, because it's all changing.

HAMOVITCH: Sandy, you know, I'm sitting here thinking about the little storefront next to a fish market where people just walk in, maybe just for a drink of water, just for some TLC, and you're describing the agency now. You have been so - I don't know how to describe it - but you have been so important in the agency. Before we close, I can't ---- I'm sitting here just in awe, because

KING: You were a part of it.

HAMOVITCH: Just a part of the beginning when it first started.

KING: But a very important part of the change, of the growth, of certainly, board and care, of that special program, ACAP. I remember when we started to court the board and care owners, the staff development - remember the administrator.....

HAMOVITCH: Right. Continuing education.

KING: I mean, just ----- and there's lot's of little, lots of times things will come to me when this started and I feel very good.

HAMOVITCH: I know. It's like a huge, giant puzzle that is all put together and forms a beautiful picture.

KING: There's a few liiiiiiiiitle slivers that I.....

HAMOVITCH: Yes, need to work out, but I know before you leave, you'll.....

KING: ...work out.

HAMOVITCH: I would just like to ask you, because I know that people influence people, and I know that you were a very important part in my life. You were my mentor. So I know how important other people could be in your life. Who were the people that were influential in your life, in your growth?

KING: I would have to start with Barbara Kaplan, because she introduced the concept of social work to me, and the whole concept of the Freda Mohr Center and case aid. She created the whole idea of the walk-in counseling, and she was very much a mentor and a role model. When I came to work for the agency, I think Roz Benites (?) was the person ---- number one, she was my supervisor, she was the Associate Executive Director. The Executive Director was new, had just come when I did, so Roz hired me. Roz is that ---- she had the vision of much of what could come in terms of aging expansion, and she both gave me the freedom to sort of be as good as I could be, in the same way Barbara did to many of the volunteers, but she also created the environment, allowed it to happen. It took a certain amount of manipulation because various committees and groups of people didn't understand. I remember she organized this meeting for the members of the Board. I think they were the Committee on Aging at that time --- a special meeting to look at the idea of creating a multi-service center where there would be what she called "one-stop shopping." I think from that idea, a lot of the sort of sanctions for much of what came later, was created. I remember how disappointed I was when she announced she was leaving. It was like just a couple of weeks after we learned we had gotten the MSSP grant. I sort of had hoped that she would be joining me in all of the new stuff, and I felt like when she was leaving, I was there by myself. I mean, I worked closely with Arnold, but he was not as focused on the aging part of the agency at that time. I would say that what I learned from her ----- the other piece of my

development as a social worker in terms of the two years that I did counseling was really enhanced by her being my supervisor, because I had the ability to carry cases and get clinical supervision as well as administration supervision. That gave me a kind of foundation which felt very comfortable in future years. Certainly, she was a major force.

In recent years, I would say the people I worked with. Incredibly, Dorrie Gradwall, Sally ??????, you (laughter), so many of the people, Charell (?), Jennifer Chapman, who was sort of my partner in the MSSP development, now Perry, Joan Mithers, who kind of struggled through so many ---- and definitely, Paul Castro, who we sort of feel like ----- although I have a few years on him, but we kind of grew up together in the agency. One of the reasons that I think my experience is as positive as it is is that that relationship worked so well. As Exec and Associate, we really do share the management of the agency. And now we have new people, people who have come and have stayed, so that whether its Steffie Winter with grant development who has grown into far more than just writing grants, and Lisa Brooks now doing all of the fundraising and P.R. and marketing, and the newer, I mean, Vivian Sawyer. There's so many people who have been a real part of it.

There are also parts of the development of the agency in lots of ways that I haven't had a chance to mention, but people who worked more within the Jewish community like Sally Weber, who developed really creative programs on the adult and children's side of the activity. The recent one is Jewish Single Parent Program, which has a lot of importance, I think. So there's any number of colleagues that have really made a difference. I've said this before, in many ways, we have a unique Board, incredibly unique Board. Everybody kind of has the same agenda of making things work, and so I couldn't begin to list the Board presidents. But the ones I've worked directly with during my time, and even before that, have really made an incredible

difference. I've learned so much about business, about how you manage to keep yourself legally out of trouble. Also about the Jewish community and about just the sort of management of groups of people who have one common agenda, yet coming from various perspectives. I think that's made a huge difference.

HAMOVITCH: Sandy, I know for a fact you've been my role model, and I know how you have operated and how you have led the people that have worked for you. You give them so much autonomy. I think that the programs, with your help, have really developed beautifully, and I think that watching you grow from one spot to another.....

KING: Watching me grow old is what you're talking about.

HAMOVITCH: No. It is absolutely awesome, and I thank you very, very much for a wonderful interview.

KING: Thank you.