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COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Good afternoon, everybody.

We probably should get started. We have a -- we flipped the menu a little; so we're going to start off with the dessert and then have the entree. And after saying that, we're starting off with strategic planning and then we'll get into our regular business, because our consultants need to take off on a flight.

So as we always do, let's start with introductions. I'm Duane Dennis, and I chair P and P.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Marv Southard. I'm the co-chair of P and P.

COMMISSIONER YBARRA: Joseph Ybarra, Los Angeles County Office of Education.

MS. IIDA: Hi. Elizabeth Iida, Director of Program Development at First 5 LA.

MS. GARCIA: [Inaudible]

MR. LAFRANCE: Steven LaFrance, Learning for Action, Strategic Planning Consultant.

MS. NUNO: Teresa Nuno, Acting Chief of Programs and Planning, First 5 LA.

MR. WAGNER: John Wagner, First 5 LA.

COMMISSIONER AU: Nancy Au, Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Susanne Bostwick, Department of Public Health.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Trish Curry, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL: Caroline Howell, Commissioner.

MS. BELSHÉ: Kim Belshé, First 5 Los Angeles.

MS. BELL: [Inaudible] Bell, First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: Amy Lone, First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: Public affairs, First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: First 5 LA.

MS. CERVANTES: Hi, I'm Ellen Cervantes. I'm COO of Child Care Resource Center in Northern LA County.

MS. MOONEY: Holly Mooney, counseling [INAUDIBLE].

SPEAKER: First 5 LA.


SPEAKER: [INAUDIBLE] Dawn Cartellia.

MS. VO: Linda Vo, Secretary for First 5 LA.

THE REPORTER: Heatherlynn Gonzalez, shorthand reporter.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Neal Kaufman, First 5 Commissioner.

MR. ORTEGA: Raul Ortega, First 5 LA.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: Commissioner [INAUDIBLE].

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right. Anybody else?

MS. KACZMAREK: Jessica Kaczmarek, First 5 LA.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. If we didn't get you, could you speak up now?

All right. Commissioners, we have meeting notes. Are there any edits, corrections, or deletions? Not hearing none, we will receive and file the notes and then we'll start off with our strategic planning discussion, and we'll have Teresa and Jessica to lay the foundation.

MS. KACZMAREK: So this is just a quick intro to the conversation today. So good afternoon, Commissioners.

Today's work -- we have been working very closely with our consultant partners from Learning for Action, and thinking through how we can begin to dive deep into the questions around what are the outcomes for this strategic plan.

And this work is imperative to the further development of the plan, as well as leading up to our board retreat, which is scheduled for next Monday morning.
And I know all of you are scheduled to participate in that retreat. So this work that we do today will definitely lay a foundation for our conversation next Monday.

So just a quick intro. And now I'm going to pass it off to Steven, who will be walking us through the conversation this afternoon.

MR. LAFRANCE: Thank you very much, Jessica. And good afternoon, commissioners, staff, and members of the community.

Our work today is to do a couple of important tasks. We're going to first review an update on the process, where we are, and discuss the criteria for prioritizing outcomes to get commissioner agreement on them. They are not new criteria. You have seen them before. But we want to have an official agreement on them; so that we are clear about how we're prioritizing outcomes.

We'll review some new inputs into our prioritization process, which include an analysis of the policy and funding landscape, as well as results from the community and staff survey that we've conducted as part of this process.

We'll take a look at how, when you apply the criteria to the outcomes that emerged in the May 19th Program and Planning Committee Meeting, how -- how that
exercise suggests a set of priority outcomes rising to the top. And, ultimately, what we're hoping for is consensus on the emerging priority outcomes. And we'll see where we get to today.

But you'll note that our work today does feed into the retreat that is scheduled for next Monday, June 30th, in which we'll get to final approval of the priority outcomes, if that's not achieved today.

If it is achieved today, we'll add some time back into other conversations on the 30th. The other aspects of the work for the retreat next Monday, though, will include looking -- approving the entire framework for impact, and I'll review what that includes in a moment.

But, essentially, today is the discussion about outcomes. We're building on the conversations we've been having about outcomes, hopefully getting to consensus. And then the retreat will be focusing on pathways to make progress on those outcomes.

In the retreat, we'll also discuss mission statement and values for First 5 LA. The values conversation in particular is grounded in work that staff have been doing to discuss organizational values.

So that is what we're doing today, what we're driving towards. To ground us -- it's actually quite exciting to be sharing this next set of slides with you,
because this is really your emerging strategic plan. We have a strategic imperative. It guides us to think hard about how to maximize commission investments and defining a very clear focus.

We've articulated home positions on levers for impact. And they are here. Again, they have been a touchstone for us as we've been making our way through the process to filter conversations and decisions through, and become one of the inputs into outcome prioritization as you'll see.

If we pull the lens back just for a minute and see how the imperative and home positions build towards where we are right now, with the framework for impact, as I mentioned, the outcomes, finalizing prioritization of them, and then getting into pathways to achieve the outcomes will round out the framework for impact.

And that kind of top of the pyramid, you'll see, is the -- kind of at the highest level, the last piece of the puzzle, and that is kind of the strategies and objectives that will be the -- essentially, the implementation of the plan, the manifestation of the policy guidance. And that is work that will continue after the retreat on the 30th.

So we've seen this before. But I just wanted to review, quickly, the framework for impact has the high
level vision, articulating the future desired state if you're very successful in the long future time period and the target population is the basis, guiding us to understand who the ultimate beneficiaries of the work are.

When we begin to narrow from the very broad-level vision, we have the ultimate impact and then the goals that achieve the impact and the outcomes that achieve the goals. This feels like the leg bone connected to the hip bone, but this is how we're forming a cohesive, healthy, functioning in mind, body, and spirit, First 5 LA. And as I mentioned, the pathways are how we implement against achieving progress on the priority outcomes.

What is really fun is to start seeing how this actually works in what -- what some might see as kind of high-level theory of change, if you will. We have our vision statement that we adopted in the last meeting, that throughout Los Angeles diverse communities, all children are born healthy and raised in a safe, loving, and nurturing environment, so that they grow up healthy in mind, body, and spirit, are eager to learn, with opportunities to reach their full potential.

The target population statement is here at the base of this graphic depiction of the emerging framework for impact. It's that First 5 LA will work on behalf of all children to survive in their families in Los Angeles
County, but will focus on those who face significant risks and challenges to achieving their maximum physical and socioemotional health and learning potential.

Our ultimate impact statement is here that children under kindergarten are ready to exceed in school and life. The three goals that help us get there frame the work in terms of physical health, socioemotional health, and cognitive development.

And the last piece of the puzzle is really where we're working today, and that is with respect to priority outcomes.

To clarify language just for a moment, when we think about systems-level outcomes, what we're talking about is improvements in efficiency, access, quality integration. These kinds of outcomes that are about the system itself, that are intended to ultimately show up as improvements at the population level that you see to the right, and the population level is really county-wide. I mean, that's your entire target population in the county.

But taking us back to the left, where we have -- under systems level, what we've named on this slide is program level outcomes. But it's really -- what we're talking about here is participants in the programs that First 5 LA may support in the future, which, as you'll recall, based on the home lever positions, will have the
intent to understand, demonstrate what works in partnership from the start with others to support sustainability and scale, and -- and take those participant level outcomes to the advantage of the population of children and families in the county who are your target population.

So that is what we have as our emerging framework for impact, and as I said just a moment ago, to clarify the language about the outcomes at different levels, is that it's important for us to be clear about as we have this conversation today.

Another important point to underscore as we come into the conversation today is that there have been a total of six steps in the process of refining and prioritizing outcomes. Today, we're at step five of six. So there's been a lot of groundwork laid to get to where we are today from commissioners generating the initial list of outcomes and then that becoming the basis of further analysis and exploration into, kind of, testing whether they resonate and are consistent with the guidance the board has articulated to date, what the community and staff reactions are to them, how they hold up against the policy and funding landscape, et cetera.

And so here we are today. If we make it from -- we are here on step five to being here on step six today,
all the better. If not, we will reserve conversation for the retreat to take care of any loose ends with respect to prioritizing outcomes.

And to remind the board that we looked at the initial list of outcomes and identified that there were a set of refinements that was needed to them, things like making sure that they're constructed at the same level and at the right level; if they are cross-cutting, that we are depicting and thinking about them in that way; and that we also need to assess them against some additional criteria for which we have not had the inputs until today.

And so what I want to share with you at this point is that, as we make our way through the conversation today, you'll see a proposed set of priority outcomes that actually take into account these critiques of them up front. So I'm just foreshadowing that we will get there over the course of the conversation.

But, really, today, what we're asking you to do, in addition to agreeing to and discussing the criteria, absorbing and incorporating the new inputs, essentially to, you know, test, gut check what is emerging as a set of priority outcomes. And we'll help guide the conversation in that way. But it's -- it's to say that we've been through a lot of work together with you and have brought in a lot of the additional community and staff expertise
into the conversation we'll have today.

One key aspect of the conversation today will be to ensure that we're keeping the discussion of outcomes at the right level, at the board level. And the touchstone for us is the question of what is the policy guidance that the organization needs from the board to understand what outcomes are the priorities for decision making.

And what we're showing here in this illustrative example is that if we take the increased family protective factors priority outcome, which is one of the emerging priority outcomes, that is developed and prioritized by the board or -- maybe, if it makes its way through today's conversation, on the other side.

There are many indicators that impact the understanding and progress towards increased family protective factors. And what we're showing here to the right is that some of those indicators would be measured at the systems and participant levels that have to do with accessing services, participating in programs, stress that parents experience, again, among participants in the programs that would be supported by First 5 LA. Others are monitored at the population level. And those are -- that have come up in our conversation, these are not random examples. These are examples that have come up in our conversations today about children visiting the ER for
suspected maltreatment or substantiated reports of maltreatment out of home placements.

Those -- what we're suggesting here or really guiding in the conversation is that when we had our last discussion in the full commission meeting and heard commissioners' input with respect to substance abuse, for example, for parents and access to that service being critically important, we are paying attention to all these conversations that you're having. And we are, you know, filing them into the appropriate part of the process where they will rise to importance, given where we are in the conversation.

But the substance abuse, parent access to substance abuse treatment is an important example of the -- of a level down of detail at which we oughtn't have the conversation today in terms of policy guidance for outcomes.

And what I'm getting at is, that if we have policy guidance that family protective factors -- increasing family protective factors is what this board wants the organization to pursue in the upcoming strategy cycle, staff in their, you know, full-time role and us as your consultants, and our knowledge of the field will do the work of unpacking, what that means and looks like, having heard and understood the conversations that you've
had along the way today.

But what we don't need to do as a board is to have deliberations about what these outcomes mean. There is a lot of experience and literature to bring to bear on that question. And so we're just offering this illustrative example to drive the point home about what -- at what level we're seeking policy guidance from the board today.

I want to move quickly into prioritization criteria for outcomes. The criteria you see in this funnel which has the -- the effect of also appearing as a martini glass, but it is indeed a funnel through which we are filtering outcomes --

MS. BELSHÉ: We do refer to it as the martini glass.

MR. LAFRANCE: We do. We do. Yes, Truth be told; so you have seen it. You will -- this should look familiar because you have seen the martini glass in the last commission meeting. Maybe after the meeting too. But it was during the meeting that we used it to refer to and capture the six criteria that are here.

The -- there are a couple important points, though, in looking at them today. The first is that the last two criteria really are the only ones that we'll be deliberating in terms of applying new information to
today. The -- the top four, high level of need, advancing progress towards goals, consistent -- I'm sorry, it's the top two and then other significant investments and opportunity for leverage.

Those four prioritization criteria were presented in the very first Programming and Planning Committee Meeting that we were engaged in with you in this process; so those are not new criteria.

The policy and funding landscape analysis that we've done help us understand how to apply the few other significant investments in the opportunity for leverage criteria. The community and staff input survey that you'll be seeing today is also a new set of information to help us understand how to apply that guidance to the outcomes that have been generated by the board in the meeting that we had on May 19th.

And so, thank you for listening to me patiently and setting this context as we get to this next slide, which has an overview of the method that we use to assess outcomes against these criteria, with really the punchline here being that we do want the board to engage in the conversation about the criteria and discuss whether you are in agreement with the four criteria that we first looked at -- I can't remember the date. It may have been March 23rd. May have been April 10th. It was in March.
And the additional two that we now have at our access, which are the lever home positions and the survey input. But to know that in having these six coming into the meeting today, we were able to engage in an exercise of scoring, so to speak, each of the outcomes against the six criteria. And, essentially, using a low, medium, and high threshold and a fairly straightforward one, two, three — straightforward but careful application of the criteria against the outcomes to come up with the initial proposal that you'll see today.

But that said, this is where I want to take a pause and invite discussion among commissioners regarding the criteria, to see if we are in agreement that these are appropriate criteria and whether there are any criteria that you feel are missing, if you look at this set of six.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Susannne?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: I just had a quick question on the survey input.

Is that where you would take in consideration any type of quality improvement or changes that might have to be made because of hearing from either the public or from another commissioner or from a program officer that something has to be changed or modified in some way?

MR. LAFRANCE: And could you say a little more about the context in which you're thinking about systems
improvement when you used that --

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Let's say something comes about and --

MR. LAFRANCE: Or quality improvement? I'm sorry. You said quality improvement.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Quality improvement.

And if something has to be changed, If we find that, you know, a year later something really does need to be tweaked, and it's as a result of input that we've received either from -- it could be from anybody, for that matter, is this where this would fit in?

I'm just trying to see, if changes have to be made, modifications would have to be made, is this where we would put that?

Does that make sense?

MS. BELSHÉ: So are you contemplating -- so say the board endorses a set number of outcomes and we begin implementation. Are you asking, Susanne, whether or not these criteria could be employed down the road to inform modifications or make course corrections?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Yes.

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, our view on the planning process is that the -- I think there's two levels to your point. One is that the intention would be to set policy guidance on the priority outcomes in this process that
would endure over the five-year cycle. At the same time, there do need to be performance management processes put in place over the course of the work to ensure that the implementation to make progress on the outcomes is on track and is effective.

So I do think there is a dimension of what you're speaking to that is at play, which for me, regards how well the -- the particular pathways that you define, are actually implemented and that is -- it's an R&E function of the organization to ensure that quality over time.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Marv.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: I was wondering about operationalizing Number 4, particularly in the context of Number 5, because it seems like that, insofar as there is greater leverage opportunities, there are other investments that we would be leveraging.

So is there a conflict between 4 and 5? And I'm not sure exactly how we would do the analysis for Number 4.

MR. LAFRANCE: It's an excellent question, and I can unpack that a little bit. The shorthand here does make them appear as though they might be opposite ends of the spectrum in a way that you could either fill gaps or you could go where others are putting their money. But
the leverage opportunity in particular really speaks to
the home position conversation that the commission had,
where leveraging was really about partnership
opportunities from the start, to scale, and sustain
models.

So on the one hand, few other investments exist
is to say there's -- there's a gap and we can go -- we
could go test things. There's a gap in the knowledge
base, the evidence base, and we could go -- we could go
test there, versus there is an evidence base and an
investment base and we can leverage that to take it to
scale.

So hopefully that's clear, but there are nuances
about the two that we had to take into account when we
operationalized them.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHDARD: Because what I'm talking
about in looking at that is the leveraging opportunities
that may come to pass with regard to the various kinds of
place-based things that are going on. And it seems like
that's a wonderful opportunity. On the other hand, all of
them -- each of those efforts are bringing resources. So
it could be that the very effort to bring people together
disqualifies, or that was my concern.

MR. LAFRANCE: And this is where we are beginning
to frame some very targeted questions for the retreat
conversation, along the lines of -- of what you're getting at that -- you know, we see as the work is emerging, that the investments in the Best Start communities can very much help advance where the strategy is moving as we're discussing it.

But there are some -- there are some policy decisions for the board to make about whether that work in the Best Start communities is tightly focused on the other outcomes that you prioritize here and which would -- which would put some parameters around that work and distinguish it from the other place-based work that is happening.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Or it becomes complementary.

MR. LAFRANCE: Becomes complementary, that's a better way to put it. Exactly.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Neal.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Maybe what Marv is trying to say, I'll just guess, is effective approaches exist or are known, but there's few resources available for them.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: No.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Because in some ways, not enough investment doesn't quite answer it. It's not enough investment when we know that there's something that might work.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: I'm just thinking, for
example, one of the ways that we're trying to focus place-based work within the County is the health neighborhood -- the health neighborhood to leverage the ACA. The ACA is a lot of investment.

So I wouldn't want -- I mean, my concern was, that the health neighborhoods get ruled out of a collaborative like this, because there's already so much resources invested through the ACA.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Significantly insufficient resource of funds to meet the need.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Of course, it's not a lot, but it's enough.

MS. BELSHE: Marv, just if I may, I think how I would be looking at the thought experiment you put forth, is yes, there's a lot of resources for services, but there's not necessarily a lot of investments in building community capacity, which is different.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Right. And that's --

MR. LAFRANCE: That's the complementary.

MS. BELSHÉ: It's the investment in the connective tissue, whether it be a backbone organization or community partnerships. In my mind, that's where there's a leverage opportunity, but not a lot of resources supporting that community and capacity building function.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Perfect. I just wanted
to make sure that the overall resources did not distract
from the places where resources are missing in exactly the
place you pointed out.

MS. BELSHÉ: So I'm sorry, Neal, you were --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Neal.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: The other part that I
think is embedded within it, when we use the word
"leveraging," we're leveraging both financial and other
resources for sustainability, I presume. It's not to
leverage the pilot.

So if leveraging implies leveraging opportunity
for sustaining results, then I think it makes sense. If
it's just leveraging opportunities exist because there's
money out there, then I think it doesn't make sense.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Steven, what may be
helpful, I mean, as a refresher -- because when you look
at the six outcome criteria, I mean, we've done a lot of
work getting to this point. So if you could say just
maybe a few lines about each to refresh commissioners of
what the evolution of thought around these particular
issues -- because, I mean, if you look at them by
themselves, they're applicable in the universe to many
organizations, but they're specific to us. So if you
could do maybe two or three lines on each, it would help
commissioners in refreshing our memories.
MR. LAFRANCE: Absolutely. So the first high level of need in the county, this is building on the work that the organization has done in scanning the environment -- the environmental scan work on a lot of the L-3 research.

And so we've extracted the knowledge from that research to understand whether, in the emerging outcomes, there's a -- you know, meets a low, medium, or high threshold, effectively advances progress towards the goals, is looking at the kind of literature and the evidence about what -- what are the family protective factors and what advances them. And a lot of that work had been done in Building Stronger Families framework that First 5 LA had done. But also, we bring a lot of that expertise from our experience and we've referenced the literature.

Consistent with lever home positions, that's where we reference the conversations that the board has had earlier in this planning process. As I mentioned, a few other significant investments is where we looked at the policy and funding landscape and said, okay, where there are new funding streams coming down the pike, what are they -- what will they cover? And is there -- what's in that mix and what's not in that mix?

And so in this criterion we were looking for
where there is relatively lesser investment, where there
 can be a strategic gap to fill, to test, you know,
innovate, test, and then disseminate the knowledge.
Whereas, opportunity for leverage, as we just discussed,
is more about leveraging opportunities for sustainability
and scale. And then community and staff input is the
survey effort where we literally asked staff in the
community to rank one, two, three their top priority
outcomes, based on the list from -- that the commissioners
generated in the May 19 meeting. But we also provided the
opportunity for staff and community members to write in
other outcomes.

So hopefully that's helpful.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think that's helpful as a
summary in just bringing us to where we are today, and,
more importantly, what we expect to do next week.

So basically, I wanted commissioners to have an
understanding, how do we come to where we are as far as
that outcome criteria. And it's based on the six to eight
weeks of work we've been doing for the last couple of
months in getting to here. So I thank you for that. I
think that's helpful.

MR. LAFRANCE: I also wanted to say quickly that
I really appreciate this conversation about where filling
the gap strategically and leveraging opportunities for
sustainability, and just that what strategic funders do is to define the right balance in their portfolio.

So again, it goes back to your original comment, Commissioner Southard, that they're not, in fact, in conflict with each other, but they're helping to define a balance within your override portfolio of work.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Deanne.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Actually, I like his priorities. But would you define community for me? Who are community?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. Yes. Excellent question. So there are two levels at which we are getting community input. So the first is grantee contractors and other stakeholders with whom First 5 LA has partnered. And the second is Best Start community representatives.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: So everyone is a recipient of funding or services from First 5?

MR. LAFRANCE: That's right.

MS. BELSHÉ: Actually, that's not entirely true.

MR. LAFRANCE: Or have partnered with you in some way to get the work done.

MS. BELSHÉ: Because we opened up the survey broadly. I don't know how many -- off the top of my head, I'm not recalling the profile and the percentage of those who responded who are not currently or previously funded
by First 5 LA.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. That is true. There are other stakeholders that have not been, to date, funded by First 5.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Community. They're not necessarily stakeholders, but they're community?

MS. GARCIA: They range from concerned grandmothers to -- there were a variety of community members, there were just a range of responses.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions, folks, before we go on? Because I think this is a rather important pause place, and so if there's not clarity and agreement of how we got to here, and -- you know, we need to stop. But if we are all okay, then I think we can move on.

MR. LAFRANCE: Commissioner Au, did you have a question?

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. And I'm trying to frame what is going through my head in a way that I make myself understandable here. And I'm always -- the way I try to understand sort of this distillation of all the conversation into these -- really, many of them are just four words. It's pretty remarkable.

So in trying to tie everything together, I guess I go back to what it would look like in the actual
community and neighborhoods that the families have to live in. And I -- it starts with many of the essential struggles that we grappled with as a commission when we looked around and said we have this huge pot of money and resources, but it's still not enough, given the array of needs that are here in LA County. So we already understood that we can't do this work alone.

The other is that we also wanted to ensure that we would be able to establish, unequivocally, when we vested X number of resources, we will have these kinds of outcomes. And it was clear that when you're doing community work, that's very difficult to do. Because communities do not exist in a -- in a hygienic, you know, sterilized vacuum, you know, laboratory environment. And so, there are going to be other folks operating in that arena with similar kinds of concerns.

So the thinking was that we had to enter into this world in partnership and with a broader perspective. And so I guess -- but it was clear that still even with that utilization, we still had to come in with a framing of our work in such a way that we could still establish some direction or -- or mechanism to establish when we do this work, this is the kinds of outcomes we're going to have.

And -- and so, I guess the -- the thinking was
tons of resources, when you look at history of the investments that have come down through the federal and state and even local dollars, we have invested billions of dollars in many of our neighborhoods that continue to be challenging neighborhoods.

So one of the assessment or analyses was that many of these works were fragmented and -- back to what Kim was talking about, in some ways you touched on it -- is in the context of talking about leveraging opportunities or, going with Marv's thinking, about a few other investments exist, and that would be the way for us to want to pay attention to it.

There was another piece to it. It was the -- the need for like-minded folks and investors in these works to come together and somehow or another coordinate their work. So we were not replicating or duplicating, but actually complementing. And that First 5 LA could play a role in sort of beginning to establish this kind of focus to say these are the outcomes we all share.

These are our areas of expertise or priority ways that we want to invest in, but let's somehow or another do it in a coordinated fashion.

So I'm not sure if these six criteria will allow us to look at it this way.

MR. LAFRANCE: I see your -- I see your comment
as really harkening us back to, in many ways, the home positions on the levers, where we talked about what it would mean to focus relatively more of your energy and effort on improving, integrating, strengthening the systems which -- you know, that serve children and families in our communities, which to my mind also does include building community capacity; so that the coordination of the work, the thinking about it in an coherent way is part of what First 5 LA is saying you would be taking responsibility for moving forward.

MS. BELSHE: Nancy, I'm building off of Steven's comments, really speaking to the imperative for us as an organization going forward to work in collaboration and partnership. That it's not just about us.

COMMISSIONER AU: Exactly.

MS. BELSHE: My first blush, I'd say four of these six criteria incorporate exactly what you said. For example, it's not goal attribution, it's goal contribution; so we changed our vision.

Remember, you know, we said it's no longer going to be First 5 LA contributes -- creates, excuse me. But we said we need to bring humility, as I keep saying, to the complexity of these issues and the reality that no one organization, even one with our resources, can really effect meaningful change on our own.
So goal contribution is an acknowledgment of partnership and collaboration of the lever home positions, which really establishes, as we said, that is our identity statement.

And so working collaboratively at the front end is one of those six home positions. Leverage opportunity, again, it's not just about our resources and investments. It's working in concert with others. And then survey input is reflective of our value of hearing from community to help refine and focus our work.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

MS. BELSHE: Is that helpful?

COMMISSIONER AU: That is very helpful.

MS. BELSHE: Because I think you're putting your finger on it. It's a very -- as we think about our identity going forward, it's absolutely got to be exactly what you're saying, and I think it imbues these criteria in almost all of them.

COMMISSIONER AU: Great. Thank you.

MR. LAFRANCE: So as Commissioner Dennis pointed out, this is a moment where we don't have a formal vote, but to --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Well, maybe a way to handle it is, is there anything missing? Just basically, do we capture the essence around outcome criteria from the work
we've done thus far? So the ending question, is there anything we're missing? And I think that is the pause that we want to have, you know, before we move forward. Otherwise, we cannot, you know, go on with the conversation. And so, my question, you know, to commissioners is, is there something we're missing? You know, based on the work that we've done in the last few months, is there something we just blew it, we forgot it? Our consultants blew it? Staff blew it? We all blew it?

MS. BELSHE: I blew it.

MR. LAFRANCE: Definitely blame the consultants.

That's what we're here for.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: If there's something that we're missing, you know, we need to take a pause, because this is a critical juncture. Obviously, it is the foundation of the framework we will use in moving forward next Monday. So if we are indeed missing something, we need to really get it in, because it really would set us back if someone comes up at the meeting next week and say, "Oh, we forgot an outcome criteria." It really sets us back, so that would be an imperative for right now.

COMMISSIONER AU: You took care of me; so --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right. Now, Steve, I think we can move on. And I think the silence is more or less consensus, you know, and so I think we can move on.
MR. LAFRANCE: Thank you. Wonderful. And I appreciate the conversation and questions the commissioners posed.

So then moving forward to looking at the new inputs that we have to share with you to apply some of the criteria. Of course, the policy and planning landscape, as I mentioned, helps us answer the few other investments and the leverage opportunity criteria.

So we looked at the public sector and philanthropic sector and scanned everything we could get our hands on to understand where there are emerging policy and funding opportunities that are relevant to the emerging goals and outcomes for First 5 LA.

We interviewed First 5 LA’s policy advocates, we looked at the policy-related documents that First 5 LA has created to date, and then we researched additional financial implications of federal and state policies and proposals. And we -- the -- that point being specific to the public sector, and then with respect to the philanthropic sector, the private philanthropic sector, we analyzed foundation center data. You have much more detailed reports in your packets.

But there are four kind of high-level takeaways that I want to underscore -- and I apologize for the text-heavy slide here. But the key takeaways for the
policy and funding landscape are that the policy and philanthropic trends project the most new investments in physical health goal area, followed by cognitive development and socioemotional health.

So there's sort of a cascade or hierarchy of the three. There are investments in all three, of course, but the most significant being in physical health.

Within physical health, proposed and allocated funding measures have the biggest implications for obesity, nutrition, oral health, and preventative services. And prominent foundations in the LA area focus on community health approaches, as we discussed, ASA implementation and systems improvement. So this begins to speak to where there are both gaps and leverage opportunities.

Within socioemotional health, proposed policies emphasize home visiting programs as well as systems to detect and respond to developmental concerns. The -- based on our view, the permanent foundations in LA don't appear highly active in the socioemotional health; so there's an opportunity here for First 5 LA to have complementary work in that area and within cognitive development, proposed and allocated policy funding measures emphasize expanding access and quality of early childhood education.
The foundation investments in LA have a moderate emphasis on early care and education. But there's -- there's, you know, clearly opportunity for First 5 LA to articulate what your specific focus is within the ECE system.

And emerging outcome is about the ECE system. There are funding measures coming down the pike that emphasize access and quality, as I said, but it's often the case that when this is happening in the landscape, there's the need for a champion to really look over the implementation, and if when there's a big focus on access, somebody has to hold the quality mantle. When there's a big focus on quality, somebody has to hold the access mantle.

What we see here is that the investments that are coming down have dimensions of both, and so there really is a choice for First 5 LA to make about where your piece of the puzzle lies with respect to the early childhood education system. Okay?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any questions? Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: When you did this analysis, did you focus primarily in Southern California? Or did you do national? How --

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. The way we had to do this was also kind of a different martini glass, which was the
-- you know, of course looking at federal legislation and to see what is happening at that level, but then narrowing it to how it is looking to shape up in California. And then within California, what Southern California is kind of picking up on in terms of the how the state is defining it. So you know, we've had to cascade down from federal to local.

MS. KACZMAREK: Steven, if I can just add; so staff has been looking at this issue for quite some time. We presented to the board back in October last year, the P to 5 environmental scan, which looked at policy and funding trends at both the state -- or the national, state, and local levels. And so First 5 LA did build off of that work as well.

COMMISSIONER AU: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Couple questions, Steven. In your bullet points, you speak to foundation investment, and did the analysis and the scan also include government investment as well? And was that a part of the analysis? That's the first question.

And then the second part of it is, this is my deal, ECE, when we looked at quality, did we also look at workforce? Was that a part of the discussion around quality?

MR. LAFRANCE: So yes and yes. But I'll flesh
those quick answers out a bit.

We -- we were able to look at -- so yes, we did look at public funding sources and looked at actual dollar amounts that are allocated for specific aspects of the work that are emerging in First 5 LA's plan. Now, I -- there's not an exact way to translate what the -- how the dollars are allocated on a national level down to the region in LA, although what -- we did rough calculations based on population size estimates, but I just wanted to underscore that we did go to that level of analysis of looking at okay, if ACA says there's -- I actually have an example here.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: A half million dollars for early Head Start child care.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right. Right. Exactly. How does that -- what does that mean for --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Right. What does that mean?

MR. LAFRANCE: What was really useful about doing that is it's in a way quite sobering, because you look at, oh, there's this whole new funding stream opening up for a particular aspect of the work, but then you see what that means for LA County in particular. And it is -- it's another one of those -- I mean, it's more than a drop in the bucket in many cases, but it doesn't let you off the hook of thinking that the work is going to be done. So we
did look at that level and very much analyzed the public dollars.

In terms of workforce, I think you're -- you know, we did look at that. But this is a great example of what we want the board to discuss in the retreat on Monday. Because -- you know. We've articulated at this high level that you want as a priority outcome to improve the health and mental health systems, to improve the ECE systems. And I think that is appropriate policy-level guidance for a five-year plan for the outcome. But we need board input to understand more what piece of the puzzle First 5 LA is going to bite off. And, you know, focus on at a greater level of detail. To me, that's a pathways conversation.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: No. But my question is, when you had the quality discussion for the quality analysis, was it inclusive of --

MR. LAFRANCE: Investments in workforce? Yes.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That's where I was. A yes is good enough for now.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. Sorry to overcomplicate.

MS. BELSHE: Another example, though, I would raise, Duane, in response to your question about the analysis -- and you're seeing just a snapshot of it here. But, you know, this is an exciting time. There's a lot of
significant new funding streams associated with things we
care a lot about, as well as the prospect of some
additional support. The more concrete financial
opportunities are in the context of, for example, the
Affordable Care Act.

So take as one example the requirement that early
screenings are incorporated at no cost to the family for
all children as a part of the well-child visit. So
there's money that's associated with things we care a lot
about. But it also raises questions for us in terms of --
so is the system structured and supported to actually
connect kids to the services they are eligible to receive?

So it's not just about us funding a service, it's
about us thinking through what's our contribution to
improving how systems work for families and children. And
there's some rich opportunities. It's not just about
money.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions? Neal.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Are we supposed to take
any prioritization from the way that you described you
have found in the funding, the policy and funding
landscape? You're implying that physical health has more
resources going to it, that socioemotional health has
less. Is that trying to tell us something or it's just --

MR. LAFRANCE: So with the example of physical
health in particular, yes, we are trying to tell you something. And that is, that plays out in the matrices that we developed to assess the outcomes that had been emerging.

So, for example, obesity and oral health were in the initial larger list of outcomes generated by the commission in the May 19th meeting. What you will see today as what is emerging as the course of priority outcomes, is they are no longer on the list, because we're saying, based on the policy and funding landscape, those are areas where there are significant other investments occurring.

Now, what is still on the table is the system question. You know, First 5 LA's role with the health system, and whether changes you make to improve the health system have ripple effects for issues of obesity and oral health. Great. But we are saying those specific examples are not going to be your driving -- what you're leading with.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right. Thank you.

MR. LAFRANCE: Thank you. So that moves us to the next, a review of the next set of inputs which is really exciting to share with you. The results of the community input survey.
Now, we are using community to mean the broad definition we used earlier, and it does include staff in the definition. So we were looking for those who responded to the survey to prioritize commissioner-identified outcomes and identify any possible additional outcomes, and to kind of do -- help us do a check on what commissioners had generated. And then also provide input on potential ways that First 5 LA can focus this work. That was more of the pathways question. So we kind of got ahead of the process of the survey effort because we're -- we took advantage of that to ask both about outcomes and pathways.

We were very pleased to have received 203 surveys back in a relatively short period of time that we administered it. A hundred and sixteen current contractor grantees and others, actually, as we discussed earlier, are in that number.

MS. GARCIA: 116 is only for current grantee contractors and 7 are for grantee contractors and 15 others.

MR. LAFRANCE: Thank you, Jessica. And 65 First 5 LA staff for the total response of 203. It's a diverse sample. We do this research all the time. I always get the question, did we get a good response? And most people rest on the number. And for me, the answer is always,
it's not just the number, it's the composition of the sample. And the composition of the sample here is diverse. There are folks representing all of the goal areas, all regions of the county, and engaging in everything from, you know, drug service work to policy change. So that -- that was a reassuring result in the survey administration.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: How about folks that are receiving services, not just the contractors or grantees? Participants?

MR. LAFRANCE: So there are participants included in the -- in that other category. But I want to expand that the response -- my response, to say that we are continuing to get input from Best Start community members, as we speak.

So what did we find? Hopefully, you have a printout of this, because I will not expect you to be able to read the slide. There's a lot of detail. But the slides follow the goal areas.

The first is in physical health. Essentially, you see that we asked, again, the prioritization, first, second, third of each of the outcomes. And you have the results here.

the three highest rated by the community in physical health was healthy births, healthy weight, and
improved capacity of the healthcare system.

We analyzed the data, looking to see if there was consistency in response across types of respondents, and healthy births was a first priority outcome for a greater percentage of First 5 LA's staff as compared to current grantees and contractors, former grantees and contractors, et cetera. So staff rated that their first priority 28 percent, compared to others that were slightly less than that.

So we thought these were important details to call out when we saw those differences, but where you don't see a difference pointed out, it's because there were no significant differences. There was agreement.

And I should say, overall, what we were most surprised by with the survey results was the degree of consistency in the findings from staff and members of the community with the commissioner guidance. Obviously, there are nuances, and I think much of what the survey response helped us to do was to understand how folks define and think about what is packed into some of these outcomes. So it gives us a much better, nuanced understanding of how the work can look and what success of the work will look like, that we can bring into later parts of this process.

Looking at the socioemotional health outcomes
results, there was a runaway leader here, with family protective factors ranked as the first priority and really small percentage of the sample, 20 percent, that didn't rank it all as a priority.

One point I didn't make in setting up the results that I actually want to pause and comment on now is, that, again, as we've done this in many other counties, you send out this kind of a survey to assess the outcomes against each other, and we end up often in the very frustrating position of not having the results differentiate anything as being relatively more important than the other. You often get back enough people saying everything is important, so that there's not a meaningful differentiation in the size of these bars. And that wasn't the case in this survey administration, so that -- Jessica can attest, as would Alex if he were here, that that was my greatest concern, that we would get the results back and it would not point us in any direction, and that was not the case.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I have a question.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Steve, were the people filling out the survey -- responding to the survey given the protective factors listed so they knew what they were voting for?
MS. GARCIA: Yes, they were. That was part of the survey question, in shorthand.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: In general, protective factors sound great, of course, but unless you know what they are --

MR. LAFRANCE: They were defined on the survey so it was clear.

Okay. In terms of cognitive development, there is also a quite a — quite a forerunner at the top of the list, where parents are active and equal partners in their children's learning. But, again, the system outcome of access to high-quality ECE was ranked -- was ranked quite highly as well. And there were some differences in the ranking of parents are active and equal partners in their child's learning by respondent type, but it's really still a significant percentage of respondents in each category.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Equal partners with whom? I don't understand what it means to be an "equal partner."

MR. LAFRANCE: Sure. The meaning behind the outcome was that -- the notion of parents as their children's first teachers; so as contrasting with the notion that --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Children don't learn until they hit school.

MR. LAFRANCE: Exactly.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So it's equal partners with the formal education system?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yeah. Care providers.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Do we know that's how people interpreted it? These exact words that they were given?

MR. LAFRANCE: These are the exact words that they were given.

MS. GARCIA: Yeah. That was the [inaudible]--

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I don't have a problem with that. I don't understand what it means. It's a nebulous concept to me in terms of the language of it.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Also, I'm sorry. Are we talking about biological parents, caregivers, people acting as parents, grandparents?

MR. LAFRANCE: The -- so parents is consistently shorthand for parents and caregivers; so it would be broader. And what we understand to be the guidance that is coming from this outcome having been rated highly, and this is looking at all of the open-ended responses that people wrote in, you know, please explain or elaborate, is that essentially, the notion that efforts focus on parent-child interactions and that reading, singing, playing with your child from day one --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Parents are critical
participants in their child's learning?

   MS. BELSHE: Exactly.

   COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Just asking. Just kidding.

   COMMISSIONER AU: Grandparents too.

   MR. LAFRANCE: We were honoring the language that came out of the commission meeting.

   COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Sometimes you give us too much honor. I wasn't there that day.

   MR. LAFRANCE: But really, the reassurance that I want to offer is that the volume of open-ended data we received in the survey was remarkable. I mean, people wrote extensive -- at times, what we considered mini theses -- on -- on what they were sharing by virtue of their tick marks on the prioritization. And so I -- I really have a lot of confidence in standing behind our elaboration of what people said on the survey, because they were not shy about providing -- providing a lot of detail. It made for a fun --

   MS. GARCIA: Definitely.

   MR. LAFRANCE: -- open-ended exercise.

   COMMISSIONER DENNIS: In addition to what Neal said, there would be those who would suggest, by definition, high-quality early childhood education means that parents are equal partners. So -- and I just want to
say one and two are separate, but may to some degree be connected.

MR. LAFRANCE: That's exactly right. And it reminds me too, about the conversation about the home position on investments, that, you know, engage -- yeah, so I -- moving right along.

And putting more behind my statement about the open-ended comments that we received, we -- we did develop themes about other outcomes that respondents shared that they felt they were missing from the list.

And those are -- those themes are provided here. We grouped them by the goal areas. In physical health, it was about the mental health of parents and caregivers themselves, safe spaces, healthcare delivery system, et cetera. And, you know, they vary in sort of degree of specificity and generality, but this gives you a sense of what the other outcomes were.

For socioemotional health, there was a lot about disparities in pediatric mental health. And really having better partnership with mental health providers at ECE providers and systems to address and work with behavioral issues for children.

COMMISSIONER DAVENPORT: So I'm struggling with understanding. I thought socioemotional health was more related to mental health than physical health. Correct?
So under physical health, why do we have the increased mental health of parents, caregivers, et cetera, depression, you know, in physical health versus socioemotional health?

MR. LAFRANCE: I think it could arguably be moved down. But the reason we put it there was because the socioemotional health and mental health was referring to the child directly. But I -- but I see your point, that mental health of parents and caregivers.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: So with physical health, we were referring to everybody, the parents and the children, and socioemotional health, we were only referring to the children?

MR. LAFRANCE: No. For each of the goal areas, it's the child's focused areas.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Right.

MR. LAFRANCE: Physical, socioemotional, cognitive development. And because this --

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Maybe I can help with it. The hypotheses is that if you intervene with the parents' mental health, then there won't be abuse that would affect the kids' physical health. But as they're saying, it could be in either place.

MS. GARCIA: Yes. Exactly, Commissioner. That's what the theme was, that parents wanting to show that if
the parents and caregivers are healthy, they can ensure the physical, socioemotional health, and cognitive health of their children.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Does it really matter for today?

COMMISSIONER CURRY: No.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: You're right.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. And we have to take it for what it's worth, how folks interpreted some of the questions and then Commissioner Kaufman was pointing that out. So your point is well taken and there are -- this is where survey respondents chose to put this point, because we asked the questions grouped by each goal area.

In the cognitive development arena, professional development did come out as a theme. This engagement interaction between children and their parents and caregivers, which we just discussed, is really unpacking one of the other outcomes.

But, again, this is us honoring the literal responses that came from the survey respondents. And then this notion of helping children to name their feelings, needs, and to respect that their feelings and needs of others as an important cognitive development outcome for potential focus.

There was a couple of things that we heard in
terms of other outcomes proposed that are more overarching and that was with respect to housing and exposure to toxins and pollutants.

So I -- before we move into the next part of the discussion, I just wanted to pause and see if there were any other clarifying questions that commissioners had. I feel they've come up over the course of the discussion. But this is another moment where we want to say, you've just received a presentation on two major new inputs into your deliberations about prioritizing outcomes. We want to make sure you understand them. So if there are any clarifying questions, it would be helpful to hear them now.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think this is really helpful information. Thank you.

I think I want to echo Commissioner Figueroa, in terms of getting input from participants of the program, especially if we're thinking about systems change and the people that are going through the system. Because right now a lot of the input is coming from people that are already working on the issues that First 5 finds important right now. And if we take a total of the numbers that aren't grantees or advocates, it's about 22 people that might be going through the system. So getting information from Welcome Baby or Best Start would be really helpful to
us to really figure out what people going through the system are undergoing.

Is there any talk about bringing that information back to the commission?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. We will be bringing the results of the Best Start community data collection for the July 21st program and planning committee meeting, special commission meeting.

And I also want to remind us, we haven't brought out the overall planning process map in a long time. But there -- we will be doing interactive community sessions as another step of community engagement. Those are -- we had originally targeted them for early August. They may be early September. We'll see what makes the most sense. But we've gotten -- when we defined that original timeline, we hadn't known how much we would be getting from the survey effort, and we're getting a ton of input from the Best Start communities. That's still happening. And so it may make more sense process-wise to bring those inputs in at the end of July and then connect back with communities the beginning of September; so there's a better flow of community dialogue.

MS. NUNO: Best Start is very linked to Welcome Baby.

MR. LAFRANCE: That's true.

MR. LAFRANCE: We had scheduled a break at this point.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. We can take a break.
MR. LAFRANCE: Let's take a ten-minute break. So 1:35.

(Brief break.)

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right. Let's get started. Okay. We will resume our strategic planning discussion.

MR. LAFRANCE: So we shall resume. The microphone is not on, for the record. But I have a loud voice.

So we are now going to implement the conversation that we had before the break, looking at the criteria and assessing the outcomes against the criteria. So this version of the outcomes is what you all saw last on June 10th. Nothing has changed. This is exactly what was last presented to and discussed by the commission in the full meeting on June 10. So I'm just grounding us in what you last saw.

So when I say that we went through a prioritization exercise to apply the criteria to the outcomes, this is what we used. We used all of the
outcomes on this page, both the -- what you see under "family community systems" and "child population level."

The next set of slides is -- provides great detail on how the assessment exercise resulted in overall averages for each of the potential outcomes. The -- the key takeaway is that on this first slide, we present the eight outcomes that scored above a 2.0 on the -- as an average. And if you -- if you recall, we're using a three-point scale here for each -- for each of the outcomes and each of the criteria.

So we needn't go over the -- the detail of every number and every column for every outcome. The point is to share that what rose to the top in this exercise are the eight outcomes that you see on this slide before you, with increased family protected factors and high-quality ECE healthcare system. This outcome about parents being active and equal partners in their child's learning, early parents are the child's first teachers, early screening and referrals, healthy births, breastfeeding, and improved listening and language skills, which is really about child literacy.

So those -- those are the eight that -- that score at the top using the criteria and the rating system that I described earlier, Commissioner Dennis, when you asked me to unpack our methodology.
So I'm just going to move through these other slides quickly. They are really detailed with the methodology. But if you will recall, we -- we critiqued some of the outcomes and earlier on, saying that, you know, there was some refinement that was needed and some reframing to get them to a place where they're closer to being parallel with each other and -- and tightened up a bit.

So based on analysis of the outcomes relative to the criteria, we needed to make some of these refinements. What you see in this next slide is where we are proposing some new wording to outcomes, where the original wording is on the left-hand side, some proposed wording is on the right.

So you'll recall our discussions about the increased access to high-quality early care in education. Original wording also included this clause about through nationally accredited and certified providers. And what we're proposing for the policy guidance and the strategic plan is wording for this outcome that stops after the word "education," that the outcome does not begin to also articulate more details about how you would get there.

And this is really this exercise of kind of sorting through the, you know, okay, let's put all the apples in the apples bucket and let's put the oranges in
the oranges bucket, and let's get clearer and refine the language as we get into the conversation about prioritizing outcomes themselves.

And I -- so in the -- this depiction of the graphic, it is structurally similar to what you've seen before. But what we have done in this version is to include this -- the proposed language for some of the outcomes that you saw in the previous slide. We pulled out all of the outcomes that in the -- in fact, were actually indicators of -- the goals themselves, those population level indicators that would indicate progress towards the goals, we pulled those out. We maybe would call those oranges and all we wanted on this page were apples. And so what you have on the left-hand side with the dotted box around it, are the priority outcomes that emerge from applying the criteria and with refined language and -- and that's it.

This -- this is what we are seeing as the expression of priority outcomes that would bring greater clarity to First 5 LA's work consistent with the strategic imperative for this process, and begins to define where First 5 LA's identity would be expressed, where you would be holding up as high-level statements of success for your work, that the priority outcomes.

What this doesn't do -- and as I was trying to
share earlier -- is get us to that more detailed level about the indicators. It also doesn't express the pathways, but it does show that the areas of focus would be to advance progress on the priority goal -- I'm sorry, the commission-approved goals.

And in this next version of the slide, what we've brought in are -- what changed from the previous slide to this one is what's under the goals column, where you'll see that we provide illustrative examples of population level indicators like breastfeeding and healthy births and so on, on substantiated cases of child abuse, et cetera.

But what we're really demonstrating here is that where we're asking for board discussion and policy guidance is on the set of outcomes that's on the left. That the further work of defining what the indicators would be and the pathways to advance progress towards the outcomes, will be later phases of this process.

MS. BELSHE: Steven, it might be helpful to say a few more words about how the -- we've got the assessment of outcomes against prioritization criteria on slide 28. That lists eight outcomes. And how those bottom three you all basically believe are more indicators rather than outcomes. So the top five really represent the five principle outcomes on the left --

MR. LAFRANCE: That's right.
MS. BELSHE: -- of number 34?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes.

MS. BELSHE: And the next three, in terms of healthy births, breastfeeding, and listening to language skills, you use as illustrative of population level indicators?

MR. LAFRANCE: That's correct. Is there more you'd like me to bring out?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: You said it.

MS. BELSHE: Well, all I did was draw an -- make explicit how it would have been eight -- smarty pants. I will be mocked.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: She's blushing.

MS. BELSHE: Never. It's hot in here.

So the eight prioritization criteria, eight emerged, yet five are identified, one, two, three, four, five are identified on your priority outcomes list. Three had been outcomes, but are now indicators. Just make explicit how they pivoted in your mind from outcome to indicator.

MR. LAFRANCE: Thank you very much, Kim.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you.

MR. LAFRANCE: That was an extremely helpful point to call out. Because the commission has articulated primarily the focus of its work being at the systems level
and it goes back to an earlier conversation we were having today, that by making improvements at the systems level, there are potentially many population level outcomes that can be affected by those improvements.

And so we wanted to get very clear on what was the policy level guidance that the organization needs from the board at the outcomes level, separate from what that would look like in terms of manifest progress at the population level.

There are -- there are lots of indicators that you may choose to monitor over time to keep your finger on the pulse of how things are progressing for children and families.

But you are not going to hold yourselves accountable for the way those population level trends are moving, because you're not the only actors. And because where you've chosen to target your work is at a level that could, you know, that is intended to and could have a broader effect than breastfeeding only, healthy births only.

So hopefully that's helpful. That's what we were trying to pull apart.

And then that is not to say that there isn't further guidance that's needed from the commission for the planning process.
MS. BELSHE: Yeah. Those indicators were just for purposes of illustrations, but for those who might be saying, well, wait a minute, where did that priority indicator to -- where did that priority outcome go, based upon our further analysis and consideration, seemed like they were more properly at an indicators level.

MR. LAFRANCE: That's right. And this -- this really is -- I mean, we showed you the two different versions of the graphic, which illustrate, kind of, how we parsed not only the results of the prioritization, but also the putting the apples in the apples bucket and the oranges in the oranges bucket.

But this is the fundamental discussion that we want to engage in with the commission in the meeting today, which is for you now to kind of take that step back and seeing what we're -- how we've gotten to the five priority outcomes, to open it up for discussion with commissioners about whether there are high-level outcomes missing, further refinement, et cetera. And -- well, I shouldn't -- I will read the third question because it is an important question, and that is, can you see First 5 LA adding unique value by focusing on these outcomes? I mean, part of what we're really trying to do here is ensure that there is both focus for the organization and unique value delivered to the overall set of actors and
stakeholders involved in advancing outcomes for children and families in LA County.

So I -- I'd really open it up to discussion from commissioners. I'm not sure if you want me to leave the outcome slide up or the discussion questions up, but this is -- this is the stuff of the decision making for today.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER CURRY: I brought it up at the commission meeting, I guess, on the 27th. Where -- yeah. And I still don't understand -- I have trouble tracking the middle one, which is reduction in substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect, to having a good emotional health. I can get from the improved oral health, improved asthma, increased healthy way, all of those. I can get all of that. I can track that to maximum physical health. I can't track in my head substantiated cases of childhood abuse and neglect to the goal of achieving the maximum socioemotional health and potential.

MR. LAFRANCE: So the -- I hear your question and the point that you're making. In fact, at the break, I had some conversation with members of the community about this as well. We do still need to flesh out what the indicators will be for child socioemotional health that you will track over time.

It's not the decision that we're asking the
commission to make today, though. What we're asking the
commission to make a decision on today is whether
increased provision of early screening, referral, and/or
intervention and improved capacity of health and mental
health systems, together with increased family protective
factors, parental engagement in their child's learning,
and access to high-quality early care and education, if
those priority outcomes taken together provide the
commission with a sense of coherence and clarity about the
focus of where the organization will make its investments
moving forward.

We absolutely need to better define that the
pathways and what is the definition of improved
socioemotional health. But today we're asking, do the set
of outcomes on the left-hand side of the page resonate
with the commission, based on the criteria, the
conversations to date, and the strategic imperative for
the planning process itself?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Neal.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Well -- so when I brought it
up at the commission meeting, you said, "That's not what
we're talking about today," and that's fine, and that we
would be talking about it today. So now when I bring it
up today, we're not going to talk about it today. But it
still doesn't track. And especially when you say
"substantiated," and especially when you say "abuse and neglect" -- neglect is about a third of the cases that the department gets in. And neglect is often translated into poverty. It's not of mental health. And so I -- and substantiated versus unsubstantiated. I don't know. It does not fit in there, that whole box doesn't fit.

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, perhaps --

COMMISSIONER CURRY: So we don't have to talk about it today, but at some point in time we do have to talk about it.

MR. LAFRANCE: And I agree. What I don't want you to have a sense of is that I am trying to kick the can down the road to the point you forgot there was a can in the first place.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: That won't happen.

MR. LAFRANCE: But I would invite your input into what is missing. What would round this out for you so that there is a picture that tracks?

MS. BELSHE: Although, Steven, are you inviting feedback on indicators?

MR. LAFRANCE: I am. For this reason, because if I want us to still surface what is meaningful to the commissioners at that time, so that we can be sure to incorporate it in the next version, because we haven't been able to do that. And if we're getting stuck here, I
think it's worth taking the moment to get back to the outcomes.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: And I don't know if I have an exact answer for you. But what I can say is that in terms of socioemotional health or mental health, whichever term you want to put in there, I think it relates to -- where it says families in the protective factors, I think the stress, the depression -- you know, those are things -- the stress and depression and the trauma that the child faces are the important issues.

The child often is -- is in foster care system, not because they have mental health problems, although they probably have them once they're in there. But a lot of the times it's because of substance abuse, the parents' stress, the parents' emotional and mental health problems and -- and the violence, you know, issues. The kids develop those mental and emotional traumas often because of the parents' reaction; so --

MR. LAFRANCE: So reduced parental stress and depression? Reduced signs of childhood trauma?

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes. I guess what I'm trying to create is that there's a whole picture with the family. In order for the kids to have -- to be able to bond and to -- be free of the trauma, then the parents have to have the mental health too. The whole family
needs to be seen as a whole and not just the children or the adult. It's the whole family, and helping the whole family through all the stresses of trauma and the mental health.

And then this doesn't even address some of the other issues like autism and some of those issues that need to be treated in the child, and which also cause stress and anxiety with the parents.

MR. LAFRANCE: That's very helpful elaboration on kind of what's been missing on tracking the kind of thread about what could be indicators of the socioemotional health goals, and I appreciate the input.

And, you know, one thing that I want to add, because your comments about parental stress and depression, child trauma, parent-child bonding all resonate and have come up over the course of the process and will have a place in this indicators' part of the framework that we haven't gotten to yet.

So I'll be sure that any next version of this that you see incorporates that language.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Deanne and then Neal.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I want to agree with her on her points, because when you're so close to the issue, it's really hard not to be very particular about how it's
stated.

We have struggled since the very beginning of this commission to figure out how to measure reduction in child abuse, and we came up with reduction of substantiating cases over hours and hours and hours of looking at alternatives. And if we can think of something better, great.

I have a question. Two questions. One is when we talk -- again, I said this before. Parental engagement, are we talking about parental/caregiver engagement? We're eliminating a huge population of people acting as parents, taking care of grandchildren or whatever, we don't want to just focus on parents because we know they're not all able to remain in that capacity.

The other thing is, do we know -- do we have a number of children who are removed from child care due to behavioral issues? Is there a measurement of that, that we can use? I said last time I think it is kind of a nonsequiter in here, but if it isn't, then I think we need to know what we're reducing from. How we would measure success. I don't know.

MR. LAFRANCE: I do believe there is.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah.

MR. LAFRANCE: It is tracked. So those data are available. But, again, you're making a point that --
about the indicators that we will take into our work on them.

And I also want to say that I've -- I consider your point about parents and caregivers an amendment to this, that the language in the second bullet in the families circle on this graphic, should -- we'll change from here forward as parent/caregiver.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Neal.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So I know all we're doing is wordsmithing, but sometimes words do matter.

So going out to the left side, family and system priority outcomes. I'll give you a suggestion that has to do with the violence. If we had decreased levels of stress, depression and exposure to violence as one of the increased protective factors, I don't know if it's in the official -- remind me who the group is.

MS. NUNO: CSSP.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So whether we put it there or somewhere else, I think the issue is of exposure of violence of all kinds. So that's one suggestion.

The second one, which is actually even more substantive is, nowhere does the word community, neighborhood, place you live, come into this language. Even increasing positive social connections which can happen within communities, but can also happen within
families. So, again, with respect to the -- or the
originators of the protective factors, I don't know what
to say, but something like, families live in neighborhoods
ready and able to support them. I'm not sure where to put
that or how that gets put. But it seems like that gets
closer to the generic term.

Without that, Best Start doesn't exist on this
page, if you want to be very concrete and specific,
because all of the things that are listed here could be
done without a community-based approach.

And unless we're going to be changing that
approach, it needs its representation as a fairly minor
representation of the project.

And then my final one is, I guess, even more
language. Increased provision of early screening. Do we
want to say "universal early screening referral and
interventions"?

So can you have outcomes that are in some way
aspirational?

So increase provision is fine. All children
should have universal screening. All kids need to be
screened. We know that it's an effective method of
identifying lots of different problems. And if they have
a problem, they should be able to receive it.

Universal access to high-quality early care and
education, rather than increased access. I mean, maybe because these are more measurable.

MS. BELSHE: Actually, that's a good comment to pause on for a moment, Steven, in terms of, you know, best practices. Because there's something -- having a goal that is aspirational is important in terms of making concrete a sense urgency and focus. But we also don't want it to be so aspirational that it's --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Right. I understand.

MS. BELSHE: So what are best practices --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Let's do them in the reverse order.

MR. LAFRANCE: Sure. I think bringing into the conversation the word "goal" is exactly where I would target this. I -- I -- I -- a best practice in articulating a goal would be to have that aspirational dimension that where you could potentially achieve it, but may never. And so it is -- the best practice with articulating outcomes is that the direction of change is what you start -- you know. The articulation of the outcome, just so that you're clear, it's action, it's change, and the direction is conveyed.

And so, it would not be consistent with best practice in my experience to articulate universal provision. So that's my answer about best practices in
framing these things.

    Now, if in your plan there was -- I mean, there's going to be narrative around all of this. And there's an elaboration on this outcome that, in fact, what you're holding out as your -- what you'll consider ultimate success is that you've achieved universal access, I think that's -- I think that's helpful to know as part of your strategic plan.

    But if your outcome is articulated as universal access, you will never be able to claim that you've been successful until you've achieved that.

    COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So I'll take that one away.

    MR. LAFRANCE: So then another excellent point about communities. This is a conversation that I think we should begin today, see how far we get, and get with it and pick it up on Monday as well. But as we were thinking hard about the community outcomes and First 5 LA's work, you know, current and future, we were coming to the recognition that the community outcomes that First 5 LA is working towards are in the service of the family and child outcomes, ultimately.

    And so the case that we're making here in this proposal is that the -- the community capacity building and the community outcomes be part of the pathways
conversation that we have on Monday. So I mean, and to
give a quick preview --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Why, then, is increased
capacity to health and mental health systems been a
pathway to improving health? It's somewhat inconsistent
to say improving health and mental health systems --

improving community systems is not --

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, here's another way to

approach this, because I'm sincerely coming to you with
curiosity about your stance on this. I mean, we had, in
earlier versions of this, kind of different dimensions of
the community work, but it was never completely fleshed
out.

And as I'm thinking about this in the

conversation we're having, you know, maybe what belongs
here in the dotted line is -- is a -- is a high-level
articulation of a community outcome that as you're
pointing out, sits next to the systems outcomes and just
as the graphic sort of suggests, you know, are supportive
of the central piece. So I -- I could see that being

something that we work into this.

And we also will still have the conversation that

I think it important, which is that the community outcomes
are in service of the child and family outcomes. They're
not outcomes in and of themselves. If they are, then you
are back to being all things to all people.

But if there's a community outcome such as you proposed, families live in neighborhoods that are ready and able to support them, something along those lines, that seems quite consistent to me and I think rounds out something that does come from this picture.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Let's have other people comment.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER AU: Right. Well, I totally agree with the community piece, and I think that your suggestion that we consider it as part of -- of that dotted-line box.

MS. BELSHE: In service, I really like Steven's "in service of the family level outcomes."

COMMISSIONER AU: Exactly. And I think that's most fitting because it's truly reflective of the work we're doing with Best Start and the community place-based approaches. So -- and -- it is about -- and the way we're measuring or we're moving with that work is looking at families and their protective factors in Building Stronger Families and essentially the theme or the bases for our work there. So it's all -- would be a lot more in keeping, I believe, in terms of our -- our -- our work.

The other piece that I also have -- would like to -- to talk on is -- well, two things that's happening. I
oftentimes have struggled with -- with -- with a lot of these approaches and framing. Because --

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER AU: Because it's never truly accurate. Because it's almost like building a scientific model. You -- you lose things oftentimes in trying to come up with something that is discrete and measurable and so on and so forth.

So in some ways I resonate with tradition when they talked about how does the substantiated cases of child abuse -- how does that fit into the socioemotional health category? And I guess you could even move that under physical health if you talk about children being physically abused, or putting it under cognitive development because child's cognitive development becomes impeded and even delayed when they're subjected to any kind of abuse.

So I think it's a matter of where it's best to place that. So I think you could justify it in any category. But when you talk about neglect and the fact that many of the reasons based on the analysis of the children's commission as well as DCFS in their work with abusive situations, many of the neglect cases are due to the poverty issues that families are struggling with.

And but we've -- we're -- we're, in a sense, not
addressing it with our major outcomes areas when we talk about poverty, unless I'm missing something in the translation here. And maybe we -- we purposely have not dealt in that arena when we talk about poverty in terms of economic factors that can add to a family's instability, so I -- I'm not sure where it fits. So perhaps, this is where we need to have the conversation.

The other piece -- I have a third, when they talk about decreasing levels of stress and depression. I guess for me it's not -- I'm -- I'm very cautious about the decreasing levels of stress and depression because I think life happens.

And, in fact, I -- maybe this is more of a philosophical perspective that I have, is that when -- when a person loves and cares a lot about another individual that they can't put in a -- in a protective bubble, just the fact that that individual that they care and love so much are out there and subjected to just life, that in itself is almost equivalent to the stress that one can endure.

But the indicator for me of a person's healthiness, if you can call it that, is how they manage stress, how they're able to recognize stress, and then find a resource for -- for help to -- to minimize or make the stress manageable.
So I'm not sure if decreasing levels of stress and depression is really an outcome that I would like to track. Do you see --

MR. LAFRANCE: I do. So I have a couple of thoughts on your comments. One, is that the last sub-bullet under protective factors about access to concrete supports in times of need, that is speaking to the poverty-related, you know, services that families would need access to. It's also health and mental health, et cetera.

So -- so I think that that -- that last sub-bullet really does capture -- capture that piece that you're speaking to.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

MR. LAFRANCE: In terms of your comment regarding stress, depression, et cetera, what I actually think this connects to Commissioner Kaufman's suggested amendment to this point. And I think that Commissioner Curry was pointing out to us that, you know, parental stress is a big part of the equation that we do need to account for.

And so what I would propose as maybe a revision to the second sub-bullet and I think we can take license with the framework.

MS. BELSHE: I mean, if I may, the protective factors don't use the language of decreased levels of
stress and depression. They talk about increased resiliency.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes. Absolutely.

MR. LAFRANCE: So perhaps what we ought to do is really just to adopt, bring that language in again. We're in this transitional moment of where we're massaging original language from the commissioner conversation, but maybe we just bring in those protective factor language, the resilience.

MS. BELSHE: It's more positive.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AU: I believe so. I believe so.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Trish --

COMMISSIONER AU: And it sends the right message that, you know, life happens, and you will be subjected to stress if you care so much. So it's really a matter of how you're able to deal with that stress in a positive way; so I -- I think --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: We use the word "toxic stress" rather than "stress;" that implies that their stress is not toxic.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Trish and then Carla.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: I agree with both Nancy and Neal. I wonder if instead of we decide to go with resilience, which I think is good, that is there a place
in this for the concept of prevention and early intervention, in terms of versus increased or decreased, you know, whether the intervention is delayed until someone is at a high level of being unable to cope with things, or whether through the community we can identify leaves and intervention and/or prevention prior to -- to prevent the high levels of stress.

[Inaudible] sometimes that are left and I think that kind of goes to the whole concept also of neglect and being issued -- being an issue with poverty is it's the whole idea of putting through the community things in place, whether it be food, whether it be a job, whether it be physical health or emotional health to -- to prevent families from ending up in the situations that they find themselves in.

MR. LAFRANCE: I -- I have the language here for the protective factors, which I -- I'd like to read if I may. Because if we're -- if we're comfortable with replacing the current sub-bullets with what is in the framework, then I think that will get us closer to something that commissioners may be ready to recommend.

So the first is that parents provide enriching structured and nurturing environments. Second, parents are resilient, parenthesis, competent in their parenting abilities to effect problem-solving and coping skills.
Third, parents are knowledgeable about parenting and child development, parents are connected to supportive networks, and parents are connected to concrete supports in times of need.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Can you just asterisk with those parents and have --

MR. LAFRANCE: Oh, caregivers. Yes, I can.

COMMISSIONER AU: That would be --

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes, thank you.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I have a comedic point here. Anybody who watches Saturday Night Live when they have the news, and they say, "Research has shown that women in their middle years who suffer stress are more likely to develop Alzheimer's." And then it said, "In other words, all women will develop Alzheimer." She seems to be --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: You had something to say?

SPEAKER: I don't know if it's appropriate for the audience to speak up, but that's an edited version of language. So I just want to make sure before you voted on that particular language that you might want to refer to -- back around to what the original was and see whether -- so people can determine whether the edits really do make sense for your pieces.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Carla?

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: I have some questions about the first priority outcome, and depending on some of the answers, I might have additional comments or questions.

Can we get a little clarification as to why these two were separated in terms of the capacity of health and systems? And within that system, can we have some of the meeting referral? Can we just get some clarification on that.

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, I -- I think we are in it right now. We're refining these together. I think you're making a good observation that the first point really is contained within the second. It's a refined -- calls out a specific aspect of the health and mental health systems. So if there's a -- yeah, maybe there is some refinement that we do here to either combine them or somehow capture what you're describing, because you're making the right point.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: Okay. Well, I'm not sure where the commission leans, but if it does fit within the second one, I'd probably make the argument that within ECE systems, that we keep two bullet points on the top one, that we bring a second bullet point to ECE systems, also talking about capacity building and systems
in terms of the coordination of that decision itself.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. Thank you. I wanted to circle back also to the conversation about the community outcomes that Commissioner Kaufman raised. I -- I was playing with some language to propose a potential community outcome, and I'm also looking at the Building Stronger Families framework, which has a community outcome.

But -- so the initial language that I was toying with was along the lines of increased community capacity to support families in safe environments for children to learn and grow. The language in the building healthy -- Building Stronger Families framework is communities have safe places for families and children to play, learn, access healthy foods, exercise, and come together as a community.

So I'm -- when we put this all together, it will need to be clear that the community outcomes are in the service of -- so I played with the language about that as well. You know, there's increased community capacity to build family protective factors. I mean, maybe it says straightforward as that and we really make the linkage. Even in the language of the outcome itself. So I'm acknowledging --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Explain to me whether we
just take the words from the protective factors group, why
do we need to change them? Are we changing them
consciously to have them our own? Or are we changing them
because we don't agree with them?

MR. LAFRANCE: I was --

MS. KACZMAREK: Since building the stronger
family framework, there were some revisions to the
protective factors language.

MS. BELSHE: Well, I don't know if I would
characterize it that way. I'd say what we did was we
distinguished between -- the framework distinguishes
between family-level outcomes and community-level
outcomes.

So the five family strengthening protected
factors that CSPS has developed are embodied in the
building stronger family framework family level outcomes.
And then we talked about so what would be the community
conditions that would need to exist to support and
reinforce the ability of parents to develop and strengthen
those factors; so I think we kind of added.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: But the five we see here
are different than the five from the --

MS. BELSHE: No, they're generally consistent
with the family-level results.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: The wording is changed.
MS. KACZMAREK: The wording is slightly different than the wording that CPS uses in their protective factors, and I don't really recall why there was a shift. But it was because of, you know, trying to really instill what the Building Stronger Families framework for First 5 LA was.

MR. LAFRANCE: I'm not checking my e-mail. It's Jessica just searched the language for the protective factors. And, I mean, they are a couple sentences long for each, and so I'm imagining part of it was kind of --

COMMISSIONER AU: Shortened.

MR. LAFRANCE: -- shortening them, honing in on the key concepts.

MS. NUNO: Also, in the context of our own process to create our theory of change that was significant to our communities.

MS. BELSHE: But the principal difference for this organization is we endeavored through the community level results to identify what are the community conditions that will support and reinforce the ability of families to achieve the family-level results, which are really the five protective factors.

So my takeaway here is we need to do some additional work to call out for explicitly a community-level outcome, or whether it's one or more, but
that really speaks to one will be our aspiration, that really speaks to the need for the communities -- community outcome that supports the ability of families to achieve those protective factors.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. LAFRANCE: I --

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Would you read them back to us?

MR. LAFRANCE: The parents and caregivers provide enriching, structured, and nurturing environments; parents and caregivers are resilient, confident in their parenting abilities, effective problem solving, and coping skills; and parents, caregivers are knowledgeable about parenting and child development; parents and caregivers are connected to supportive networks; parents and caregivers are connected to concrete supports in times of need.

And Jessica just helpfully pointed out that there, is the community outcome that I read in the Building Stronger Families framework is actually in service of another, which may provide us the language that we're looking for, community support and promote the healthy development and well-being of families with young children.

MS. BELSHE: Right. Right.

MR. LAFRANCE: So I hear the commission making
several very helpful suggestions.

One is to bring in the community outcome. I think the one I just read seemed -- was most resonant.

The other is to -- perhaps, you know, we'll flip the order of the health and mental health systems at a minimum to show that one is sort of at a higher level, or maybe make the second a sub-bullet under it.

Additionally to have as a sub-bullet under the ECE outcome to strengthen the capacity or increase the capacity of systems to coordinate -- I haven't gotten the language exactly. But increase coordination, increase capacity and coordination of the ECE system.

And we will change the language to parent/caregiver throughout.

And what else am I tracking?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Did we add "decreased exposure to violence"?

MR. LAFRANCE: That's a great question. Let's track back to that -- that's right. It came up in the increased resiliency conversation. So we were going down a path about talking about decreased levels of stress, depression, and exposure to violence, and then we reframed it to parents are resilient.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I don't know if that covers it.
MR. LAFRANCE: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: The way I look at it, you think about toxic stress and exposure to violence, those are environmental exposures. Depression is a condition that an individual has. They're not parallel.

And whether you mention depression specifically because it is too prevalent, it might have some bearing, but it's kind of like one of the other results that we have, the specifics of putting it stress and violence is because those are things that communities, families and others can make better or worse for an individual family.

So I think they are different, which is different than resilience. You're resilient in a lot of different ways: Financially resilient, emotionally, physical resilience.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right. And there is some elaboration of that language which is in the current framework, but also maybe there's some additional concepts to flesh out there.

But I'm also appreciating that there may be that the exposure to violence may need to be one of the dimensions of how we define an indicator for the socioemotional health goal. You know, and it's apropos of Commissioner Curry's earlier points.

So I think maybe that's where we should bring in
that piece. And I think that's consistent with what you're saying, Commissioner Kaufman.

MS. NUNO: I think you were going more towards the community context.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: The community context does lower the exposure to violence and lowers the exposure to toxic stress. It's also an indicator of how to measure the separate question for socioemotional health.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: But I don't know -- if you look at when you say "safe neighborhoods," that implies exposure to violence. Doesn't talk about toxic stress necessarily, but --

MS. NUNO: Language is well-being. Well-being for the child.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right. Community support and promote the healthy development and well-being of families with young children. And I'm wondering if -- if -- if "safe" should make its way in here.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: One of the ones you read had "safe" in it.

MR. LAFRANCE: It did. And I think we might amend to "Community support and promote the safe and healthy development."

COMMISSIONER AU: May I make a suggestion? Is
there a way that we can look at the -- the priority outcomes in terms of family and systems priority outcomes? Because I do want to move forward.

But noting that under -- I think you don't have anyone taking exception to wanting to focus in on increased family protective factors as one of the outcome areas. But I think we're struggling with some of the bullet points underneath that, regarding what should then illustrate those protective factors. And it seems like we need access to the -- the actual document or whatever.

MR. LAFRANCE: Center for the study of social policy.

COMMISSIONER AU: Exactly. For us to sort of move forward on those particular refinements.

So, Steven, is there something we can do this afternoon that would give you that direction and we can move forward?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yeah. Well, I think -- let me just say that this conversation is exactly what we need. This is giving us great guidance on the -- on the details that we will elaborate here and, in fact, I'm appreciating that the second major bullet under the family -- in the family's bubble -- "increase family engagement in their child's learning" -- is repetitive of one of the protective factors that a parent and caregivers provide
enriching, structured, and nurturing environments for their children.

So I actually think that's a deletion here. And the conversation that we're having about what is important to the commission to be captured by the articulation of the outcomes, gives us a lot more to work with to refine what's here.

I think my sort of process question is, you know, well, I could -- I could see kind of we take this guidance work with it and at the start of the meeting on Monday, we do a final review and --

COMMISSIONER AU: That would be great. That would be my recommendation of the commission, that you give us the opportunity to kind of contemplate and think deep thoughts about the feedback we're getting, work with LFA, and come back at the start of Monday.

MR. LAFRANCE: And just show you a clean version of what you've laid out. I do -- what I want to reflect back to the commission is that I hear a lot of coherence in your guidance. And -- and as I mentioned earlier, our initial take even on what we put before you today felt coherent and provided a greater focus.

But what you're -- the guidance you've given us makes this all the stronger without having lost any of the coherence for providing less focus and provides more. So
that is really helpful.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Susanne, did you have something?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Just a quick process question.

At the end, when we're looking at these illustrative indicators, I know that each one of them is limited to two bullets.

Will it always be that way? Or are these just examples? For instance, something like, say, oral health during the survey, that particular issue was prioritized much lower; so it's not in here. But it doesn't say it couldn't be in there because it could definitely be part of early screening and referral.

So I'm just trying to see how it all fits together eventually; so it's very finite when it talks about breastfeeding or healthy births.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right. My thinking was that, in what we bring you on Monday, would include a more elaborated set of the possible population level indicators. Because it's -- while it's not the decision making focus, it's clear that we need to kind of see how the big picture holds together.

And so I would view bringing in Commissioner Curry's suggested additional points as well as
Commissioners Kaufman and Tilton have brought up some others. We would add those in to what you see on Monday.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Trish.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: One more comment. I like what you're doing and I like the changes and I like showing the resiliency of the families and I like bringing in the community.

I think with the community, I think that that's a terrific opportunity to bring in the word "safety," as you said, which covers the violence issues. And what I like about, you know, creating communities that have safety and resources and support, implies some type of prevention. And so I think that comes together for me. Thank you.

MR. LAFRANCE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Anybody else?

MS. BELSHE: So, Steven, is there -- and, Jessica, are there some additional issues you want to make sure we get on the table as commissioners to help inform the staff and our collective work with you over the next couple of days to get ready for the Monday retreat?

MR. LAFRANCE: There are not, in fact. We had only wanted to additionally just remind commissioners of next steps. It feels that we've talked about that quite a bit over the course of the conversation.

So just clarifying that the Best Start survey
results will be coming in and we'll be bringing those back to the commission. And that on Monday, we'll start by reviewing the refinements that we've perceived as part of this discussion, take a final look at it, and vote to adopt the outcomes.

And from there we'll have discussions about the -- the pathways. And we'll talk about values and mission as well.

So I -- I haven't talked about those two pieces much. But just to remind the commissioners that we'll have here an update from staff on the work they've been doing to articulate organizational values, and the question for the commission will really be, are you comfortable with these? Do they feel right for the organization?

And with the mission statement, we have been kind of working with the input we've gotten from the commission over the course of the process, and reflecting on the current mission statement. And what we found is, essentially, that there is a lot of really helpful language around the current mission. And by "around," in doing this gesture, I mean literally on the page there is helpful content that is resonant with what you've been talking about to date.

So we were going to bring to you a recommended
statement based on conversations we've had to date and the
language that's been in place, but it hasn't been called
your mission. It's been how you're talking around your
mission. So that's how we were proposing to handle that
aspect of the discussion on Monday.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. All righty. Thank
you very much.

MR. LAFRANCE: Thank you. Great discussion.

Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Where is the meeting on
Monday?

MS. BELSHE: Actually, that's a good question.
I'm not entirely sure, but I know we have a place.

Speaker: It's at the Huffington Center at Saint
Sophia Cathedral, 1324 South Normandie, which is Normandie
and Pico. Free parking right there next to where we're
meeting; so it's a brand-new facility.

MS. BELSHE: So we will send out, today, to all
commissioners, that just basic information, Linda? And in
the next couple of days, by the end of the week, we'll be
sending some, probably, limited background information and
a reminder of what we're trying to accomplish. So don't
expect a ton of reading.

SECRETARY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: 8:30 to 12:30?
MS. BELSHE: Meaning it's going to start at 8:30.

MR. LAFRANCE: So, commissioners, I just want to clarify that we're actually going to step away from the table. We're going to work with your input right now. So we're --

MS. BELSHE: And they're really happy about the extra 20 minutes.

MR. LAFRANCE: We have 20 extra minutes to do it.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We have a little break. And then if James can start early, we can start early. He's not supposed to be on until 3:00.

MS. BELSHE: We will rustle him up.

Linda, would you get James, please?

(Brief break.)

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Let's get started. If we can come to our seats.

And we're at the point in time when we get to hear from the illustrious James Lau. And so, there you are.

MR. LAU: Mine is actually a written presentation.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: You're not speaking?

MS. BELSHE: Actually, we have -- I apologize. Yeah. That's what we mean by written. So we have a number of written updates for commissioners, items 5, 6,
7, and 8 are -- excuse me, and 9, actually, are brought forward to commissioners as brief update and informational items.

And as we've done in the past, if commissioners have specific comments or questions and want to pull them off of written consideration for verbal, we stand ready to do so.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Commissioners? 5 through 9? 5 through 9 are FYIs only.

MS. NUNO: Unless you have questions.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I had one clarification on 9, the two-in-one? This is not the two-in-one developmental question, developmental screening. This is the two-in-one major --

MS. BELSHE: Correct. That is our baseline --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: It's got nothing to do with the developmental? You're not bringing that back?

MS. BELSHE: It's a little bit of ministerial issue.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I understand. That still has several more months.

MS. BELSHE: It will be coming back to the board in July with an initial update.

COMMISSIONER AU: Now, is this a new venture we're entering into? Or is it a continuation of one
that's always been in place?

MS. BELSHE: It's a continuation, Nancy. And it's, in some respects, kind of a catch-up. Actually, John, why don't you speak to that?

MR. WAGNER: Sure. The item on the agenda is really in order to continue a strategic partnership that First 5 LA has had to do information referral with 211. And the process, given the procurement policy that the board approved, requires you to approve a strategic partnership. When the board approved this funding, we did not have that strategic partnership. And so, we are catching up the strategic partnership approval to the funding that the board already approved.

So it's not new, it's extending a previous strategic partnership.

Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes, it does. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: James, in terms of the governor signing the budget for preschool slots --

MR. LAU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Explain what that means, and how does LA qualify.

MR. LAU: So there's two parts to it. There's the expansion, the goal of expanding traditional kindergarten for all low-income four-year-olds. And then
the second part is the state preschool program. And then -- so those are the fours.

And then there's also the general child care slots that -- the alternative payment slots. So those are the -- you know, they kind of cover the --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: But for the four-year-olds, does that mean that there's additional money coming to LA to cover additional slots that currently don't exist?

MR. LAU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: And we know how -- is there a formula based on --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Low income.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: But how do we know what LA County's share is compared to other counties?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Maria?

MS. BELSHE: Is Maria in the building?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Come back to your table.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I mean, when you look at LA County, you're going to get 30 to 32 percent of state funds. So we can look at, you know --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: How does that relate to LAUP and their capacity to maintain their 10,700 seats?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It won't come close.

MS. BELSHE: Very, very little. Very little
implication on the access side. There's potentially some implication on the quality investment side.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Is it only school districts?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It's going to be transitional kindergarten.

MS. BELSHE: On the slot side.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: So school districts take care of transitional kindergarten. So the system then changed with regards to making it available for private providers, but still located in public schools. But hopefully a better expanded developmentally appropriate transitional kindergarten program.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Quality side.

COMMISSIONER AU: You also had the listing of action on local control funding formula. And there's two, four, six, seven specific provisions under there. What does that mean? Does it mean that, that it's good to go or it's still in discussion, consideration?

MR. LAU: Yeah, we'll have Roberto come up here and talk more.

SPEAKER: Absolutely. In terms of LCFF --

MS. BELSHE: Come sit on down, Roberto.

SPEAKER: Wonderful. In terms of LCFF and in the
work we have been doing with LA Unified, we had been
working closely with the office of one school board
member. And then at Kaiser in terms of being able to
produce a resolution that would allocate 10 million for --
for ECE programs within LA Unified.

In terms of the support, I think we were close to
having the majority of members on the school board in
support of the board measure.

As conversations unfolded with the resolution,
there were some changes. Family literacy, for exam ple, a
line-in amendment was included to support family literacy
as well. And I think school board member Kaiser included
a figure of $750,000 for family literacy within the ECE
resolution itself.

The vote was scheduled last Tuesday with the
school board. At that moment, school board member Kaiser
pulled, made a motion to pull the resolution and save it
for August, allowing his office, and as well as supporters
of the resolution, more time to shore up some support
among school board members to make sure that it passes
through.

If it would have gone up for a vote last Tuesday
and gotten voted down by way of a vote, the school board
wouldn't be able to bring up that resolution again for two
months -- six months. I'm sorry. Six months.
So with that in mind, trying to give us a little more time within the confines and the structure of LCFF, we can get additional votes on the school board for the measure.

COMMISSIONER AU: How are we in our efforts working with LACOE, because LACOE also has an involvement in some of that planning as well; right?

SPEAKER: For the most part, we --

COMMISSIONER AU: The local control funding issue.

SPEAKER: For the most part, we've been working with a lot of partners that we're familiar with, the Advancer Project, Early Edge, the LA Chamber, LAUP, in trying to bring support forward. Not so much with LACOE, at least as it pertains to the resolution with LA Unified.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: How many of the family literacy programs in this month are in that $750,000 pot?

SPEAKER: There's no way to exactly tell at this moment how many programs are in that pot. I think they're within conversations with school board members. They're trying to figure out a way to reconfigure where the placement of the programs will land if the resolution is adopted.

In some locations it may not continue, but it may
get picked up in other parts of the school district. So that hasn't been fully determined just yet.

SPEAKER: I was just going to clarify for the commissioner how LACOE is going to review the plans from the school district, so that's their role within the formula. They kick them back if the budgets don't align with their three-year plans. That's their role.

COMMISSIONER AU: Now, are they eligible to access some of that funding to support, because LACOE does have some family literacy projects; right?

SPEAKER: The county offices receive some funding through the state budget for different purposes for the populations that they serve which are outside of the traditional K-12 school population; so I don't think it's for family literacy programs. I think it's for their nontraditional students that they serve.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Rumor has it that the superintendent wasn't in favor of the ECE pitch; is that correct? I mean, you all don't have to lie, but is that right?

SPEAKER: He has been very supportive of ECE generally. I think he has hesitation about using his resources at this time.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay.

MS. BELSHE: I think -- I've been in public
meetings and mentioned the endowment committee meeting two weeks ago on their sons and brothers campaign. And Superintendent Deasy was there, and he spoke very directly to his priorities, which is not early learning and it's not elementary. It's high school.

So he was saying that's where the additional dollars need to go as a high priority. And he wasn't necessarily reflecting bad judgment on ECE, he's just saying there's a higher level of priority relative to restoring significant cuts in high school.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Anybody else on any of the items through 9? Not hearing none, we will go on to Best Start and then we will come back to the ECE landscape, taking into consideration we told the advancement group to be here right at 3:00, and they haven't gotten here yet.

MR. GONZALEZ: We're in the same predicament with our core presenter. She is also on her way.

COMMISSIONER AU: I do have more questions.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: You can ask your questions, then.

COMMISSIONER AU: It has to do with the Tot Parks and Trails of --

MS. BELSHE: Jennifer. Just as you stand up, we cannot not take advantage of you being here, Jennifer.
COMMISSIONER AU: The Tot Parks, it sounds like this one particular project is part and parcel of the Grand Park project.

MS. PIPPARD: So there's two projects, actually.

MS. BELSHE: Microphone, please.

MS. PIPPARD: There's two projects. They're both just passed in our budget that went forward and both called out in the memo.

So the first part is a children's play area in Grand Park, and this is our county partners are behind us. It's a $500,000 match with the county to construct and design the children's park, and there will be programming in addition.

So it would be a contract with the county, a partnership with a county entity. The second part --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Where's that one located?

MS. PIPPARD: In Grand Park. So part of my very elementary way to describe Grand Park, is it functions as LA's Central Park. I've never been to Central Park, but this is the only thing I can kind of explain it.

It's between City Hall and the county departments. It's a beautiful, huge space. They have many, many free programs. They're providing a new opportunity for children and families to come down.

Actually, our staff has done a site visit of it.
And it is actually amazing how many children and families are utilizing the park.

So the second part is actually an enhancement to our current parks, Tots Parks and Trails, and this really came about from community conversations with contractors on how we could enhance the projects that were currently under design, with the extra focus on safety.

So again, both of these are both for $500,000. Both matched by our partners. And then, because they're built environments with our partners, they'll be sustained.

COMMISSIONER AU: Will we have naming opportunities?

MS. PIJPARD: Yes. Yes. Signage, yes. And, actually, I should say, just for Tot Parks and Grand Park. Tot Parks and 50 parks originally came out at the same time, but we're modeling our good experience with 50 Parks' initiative has sort of helped us with these as well.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Nancy.

MS. BELSHE: We're -- we don't want to cut off, of course, any commissioner questions, but we are fully present now for the Best Start presentation unless there are any other questions.
COMMISSIONER AU: Regarding the health survey, are there any surprises or exciting bits of information? And Melinda?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think she left.

MS. BELSHE: So this is an extension of an existing strategic partnership of LA County Department of Public Health, which is really one of those core foundational investments and data infrastructure.

And one of the things we have been looking at is -- and I'm sorry Arnie isn't here, but --

SPEAKER: I'm here. I wasn't here for the question.

MS. BELSHE: But can you speak to the LA County Department of Public Health strategic partnership?

SPEAKER: Just in general?

MS. BELSHE: Just in terms of, are there any particular points of pride in that relationship? This is one of those core investments in county infrastructure that helps undergird not only our work, but the work of our community partners.

SPEAKER: So whose question was it? I'm helping do this.

SPEAKER: So we've had the partnership for a number of years and we rely on the data from the survey for a lot of our, you know, surveillance data for the
population that we serve; so there's really no other
source quite like it in the county. And a lot of other
organizations in the county use it as well.

COMMISSIONER AU: I guess I wanted to know if
there was anything in the recent reports, any surprises or
-- or bits of information that sort of popped up based on
the history.

SPEAKER: Yeah. I wish I -- I can't think of
anything off the top of my head.

COMMISSIONER AU: That's fine.

SPEAKER: If Armando was here, he would probably
be able to snap something off the top of his head. Yeah.
I'm sorry.

MR. WAGNER: We can get that back to you, I just
want to point out, though, that the item on the agenda is
really just to continue the strategic partnership because
of the ongoing issues with the department of public
health. So we would be happy to get some high-level
findings to date.

COMMISSIONER AU: That's fine.

SPEAKER: Yeah, a lot of the environmental scan
that we use, that we prepared recently, relied a lot on
the survey over time; so it allows us to look at those
scans over time. And we can definitely pull out those
ones that, you know.
COMMISSIONER AU: I think that there's no question about that -- the value that the survey does provide, and I think it's in keeping with our commitment to truly be able to track as much as possible outcomes and impact, and I think this is the way for us to do it.

but it's oftentimes very helpful sometimes to have interim reports as to what is happening as a way of gauging, you know, the -- the way the community is either evolving, developing, or progressing and oftentimes, it's -- the results can be counter-intuitive and those are oftentimes very helpful actually.

SPEAKER: And there are reports and briefs that the staff have developed, as I said, that can easily do a better job.

COMMISSIONER AU: That would be wonderful.

SPEAKER: To share regularly.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: They've done a lot of briefs lately on tobacco use on -- into conception, health, and some others, but there's linkages that we can give to you. There's -- they do some really nice briefs on the data that they collect.

COMMISSIONER AU: Wonderful. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions? Okay. Now we have all our presenters; so we're still going to go out of order. We're going to start with Best Start and
then we'll end up with ECE landscape with the advancement project.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis.

Happy Monday, everyone. Over the last -- over the last few months, we've shared with you quite a bit in terms of our implementation plans with Best Start communities in our Building Stronger Families framework.

And I do want to share that along the way, along our journey, we've been met with many valuable insights and progress and lessons learned. Being able to address what we know as challenges in the opportunities that face our community that actually play a real -- a critical realtime role in terms of strengthening what we have here as part of our moment, both internally and externally. Especially, as we move forward.

And these are going to be important elements to our conversation here today. So our objective is to discuss the insights, progress, and lessons learned from January to May, presented by Harder and Company and SSG, and also to discuss how Best Start's staff is moving forward with the Building Stronger Families framework implementation over the six months, based on what we've learned so far.

And so, before we actually introduce our copresenters today, I'm just going to hand it over to my
colleague, Antoinette, who will give a little context in
terms of the important role of what we're going to discuss
today plays in the development of Best Start communities.

MS. ANDREWS: Thank you. So, Commissioners, as a
reminder, in May of this year, we presented information on
the progress made on the six-month outcomes, and we
provided some concrete information in terms of the number
of people who are involved, and our progress in each of
the six areas of implementation that was approved during
November 2013.

So today what we're going to actually talk about
is how we're going to use evaluation to understand how
Best Start is evolving as we implement the Building
Stronger Families framework. So even though we're making
some significant progress, there's still lots of critical
decisions that we have to make. And the information
that's emerging from early implementation is really
helping us to make those decisions as we move forward with
Best Start.

So today, we're going to give -- we're going to
provide an update of what we're learning through our
developmental evaluation process. And just to give you a
little bit of background, we're embarking on a -- an
emerging evaluation approach. This is not traditional
evaluation in the sense that, you know, Best Start, we're
not implementing or planning, acting and then evaluating, but we're actually planning, acting, and evaluating at the same time.

And we're getting some very good information about what things we need to tweak, where we need to improve, things we may need to move around.

And so the developmental evaluators who are here today will provide some information on what we're learning so far and how we've been using that information to adapt, and to continue to move forward in the implementation of Best Start.

The other thing about developmental evaluation is that the evaluator is a critical part of the process. That they're actually partners in facilitating learning versus being an objective outside observer of the process. So what you're going to hear today is more of an insider's view of how Best Start is evolving across the 14 communities.

And so I want to present to you Sonia Taddy Sandino from Harder and Company to present this information.

MS. SANDINO: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm glad I'm the same height as Antoinette. I'd also like to introduce my colleague, Giannina Fehler-Cabral, who's with Harder and Company community research. She's also a key
core member of our team. Eric Watt with SSG will be coming at any moment.

What we wanted to be able to do today is -- get to the right slides.

So I'll just continue while they get those up. So over the course of the last few months, you've been hearing quite a bit, many updates on what's going on with Best Start in the communities and what's new, what's different.

Part of what we want to be able to do today is really focus on what we're learning, and more importantly, how that learning is being used to inform the work, how it's being used to help shape the work and advance the vision and goals of Best Start moving forward.

As Antoinette was saying, one of the things that's really fundamental to the develop evaluation approach is around continuous learning and this critical reflection that goes on throughout the process so that information can continuously be used to continue to enhance the work and the strategies that are being used as part of Best Start.

So as developmental evaluators, one of the most important roles that we play is feeding back information in real time in a very rapid and useful way so that learning teams, partnerships, First 5 LA staff, and all of
you can take that information and use it to improve the work.

So we helped to bring that information back and helped to make sense -- make meaning of what that information might tell us. So the key things that we wanted to focus on today is really how -- what's been happening in the last few months, how are things evolving, what's been challenging, what's working. We really want to make sure that we're highlighting some of those best practices and emerging strategies that seem to be effective and could potentially be replicated. And then, also, how is that feedback, how is it actually being used by staff and communities to improve their work.

And so we have a few themes that we wanted to really focus on today. One is around navigating the complexity of this work, which you have heard lots about. And we have some information to share back on that.

Also, engaging the community, which is a task in and of itself, especially when it comes to making sure they're involved in decision making and have the capacity to participate in meaningful ways.

And then also managing change, and also the funder of community relationships.

So navigating complexity, what do we mean by that? Okay. Fourteen communities, the scope and scale of
Best Start is in many ways daunting. There's a lot of work going on in very diverse communities.

Another key aspect that brings complexity to the Best Start work is that if you look at many of the other funders around the country that are doing place-based work, many of them are private foundations. They're not necessarily public entities. In fact, few of them are. So being a public entity, there's a whole array of different challenges and constraints and opportunities that exist in the context and in of doing this Best Start work.

Other things that have been very relevant at the community level as well as at the staff level have been an array of new concepts, processes, terms, models that have been introduced just in the last few months.

So what are those? The developing, introducing the Building Stronger Families framework, learning by doing process. The concept of this learning team, which are contractors and staff who support the work at the community level, the developmental evaluation, the resident outreach coordinators, new leadership in Best Start.

So, obviously, a lot has been introduced. There are a lot of changes. So part of what we wanted to do in our role as developmental evaluators is really understand
how the different stakeholders are learning, adapting, and assimilating all these changes and all of this work.

So in the midst of all of that, there have been some practices and some strategies that are promising and really worth raising up and sharing with the hope that they could be adapted in other communities.

And I'm going to have Giannina just talk briefly about what some of those strategies that are happening at the community level are.

MS. FEHLER-CABRAL: So as Sonia just mentioned, there are an array of new concepts that have been presented to the community.

You know, this new framework, this learning by doing process, things that I think even took us a long time to really grasp and understand the meaning of at the community level, that also took a little time. And I think what makes sense in terms of understanding these key concepts is interacting with the concepts and making them connect to your real-life experience; right?

So what has been happening in a lot of the partnership meetings are what's called "world cafe activities," which are basically small group discussions where the facilitators present the key concepts.

For example, the three family core results. Right? That those are three intersecting concepts that
took a while for the community to really understand. What made it easier for them to really connect with is just talking about their daily life experiences in connection to those core results, why those core results are important, and why it is important to focus on those core results in the work that they'll be doing in the future.

Another thing that we’ve been engaging as a learning team, the community to be a part of is using data to make informed decisions.

When we all think of data, a lot of us can say, oh, my gosh, that can be so boring, overly technical. Can we really present technical data to the community? Can they really use it?

And clearly, what we’re seeing is yes, they definitely have the capacity to use data. Not in the way that statisticians would use data, but, for example, we created different info graphics or visuals with the relevant data that pertains to their community, and we've helped make those connections, whether it be demographic information or information related to the core results.

People were able to form small group discussions to say okay, well, this is what the technical data is telling me. What does that mean in my community? Does it make sense? How can I use this information? And, more importantly, how can I connect it to what our community
wisdom, which is something that we value just as much as
the technical data?

So through this we've seen that the capacity of
the community is building. We're making informed
decisions based on both of those factors; so --

MS. SANDINO: So another key theme that we wanted
to focus on was the issue around engaging community.

As you know, there's been lots of work, not just
in the last few months, but over the course of the last
few years, around engaging the community and building
rapport and building trust. And it's quite obvious to
state that those efforts to cultivate those relationships
is something that takes a lot of time and care.

But it's important to remember, because one of
the things that we observe during these first few months
is that there's this constant tension between, you know,
giving the time and attention to that rapport building and
that relationship building, and then also, deadlines and
the expectations around making progress and demonstrating
progress along the way.

So those are real tensions that are felt in
communities and things that need to be navigated.

And we wanted to be able to share, you know, some
specific examples of how communities are dealing with
those issues and how learning teams and staff are dealing
with those issues.

The other kind of key contextual aspect of this is that different communities are really in very different places when it comes to their readiness to engage, to act, to take on leadership roles.

Some of the communities have mobilized around a variety of issues in the past. For others, they're just beginning to coalesce. So there's a lot more that needs to be done around building capacity for them to more actively participate in decision making and taking on leadership roles.

So Giannina, again, is going to mention a few specific examples that we see as particularly promising as regards to really engaging the community, not just sitting in meetings, but participating in active and meaningful ways.

MS. FEHLER-CABRAL: So, again, this varies in each community. We're talking about 14 communities that are engaging in a similar process but in very different ways because they each have their own unique needs. Right?

So then the way the parents in each of those communities engage is also going to look slightly different. But what we've seen that has been kind of similar across is parents are becoming more -- they're
kind of standing up more as leaders and engaging in
coo-facilitation of certain processes. So, for example, in
these world cafe activities that I mentioned earlier,
you're actually being the facilitators of that activity
and helping the rest of the partnership members, you know,
understand and learn the new concepts.

We -- each partnership -- or each -- yeah, each
Best Start community is divided into either a leadership
group, which is a smaller focus work group. There is some
LBD work groups, and then there is a larger partnership.

And inside those leadership groups are key
parents who are now serving more as leaders and they're
also now informing to -- in the planning stage so, aside
from just the learning team, really focus on planning. We
are asking for -- for the parents to help inform how the
agenda is actually going to play out just to really make
sure that everything is community relevant, that we're
paying attention to the cultural needs of that community.

I think it's going to be very exciting as we move
forward as we're building those capacities and
understanding how to use data. They're teaching each
other how to use that information. It's going to be
exciting to see how they take more of that ownership and
making it their own to see how their capacities are
working throughout this endeavor; so --
MS. SANDINO: And then the final theme, which is around managing change. One of the other key things that we've seen has been this -- this constant trying to balance the funder-driven goals with the community-driven needs and really kind of trying to find that balance and that space.

This is played out a number of different ways that we've been sharing back with the Best Start leadership and the Best Start staff with the learning teams. What you're hearing today is the same kind of information that we share back on a regular basis, and that's around the importance and the need to be defining very clearly roles and expectations.

Things have happened very fast and so there isn't always the opportunity to kind of sit down and understand, even with the learning teams, who's doing what and kind of how you work together effectively as a support team in service to the community.

So those kinds of conversations are still ongoing. They didn't -- there's not like a silver bullet or it happens overnight, but really trying to be clear about what the roles of different stakeholders are and what the expectations are. So there continues to be ongoing conversation and work around that.

The other kind of key way that the managing
change has manifested itself has been around transitions. So there's lots of transitions that are happening all the time and these transitions will continue to happen. So being able to effectively manage those transitions will be important. Currently, those transitions have to do with the role of program staff and them taking less of a prominent role in leading and more of a support role in this process.

So really what does that look like? Lots of people have questions about what does that mean for people -- for roles of other people who are involved in Best Start; what does that mean for members of the community stepping up and are they ready. So it gives rise to a lot of other really important questions. And, again, this is something that continues to be discussed throughout this process. And it's going to be evolving over time, so it's not like, once you figure it out, you're good to do. They'll have to keep revisiting those conversations about -- about changing roles and expectations.

One of the things that has been helpful, we feel and we've been hearing that it's been helpful, which is encouraging, but also something we're still kind of figuring out what's the best way to do this, is around this continuous feedback and continuous learning.

When we started out with the development
evaluation, we didn't know how receptive people would be to receiving feedback, particularly if it's around kind of more critical reflection. Clearly, this is very difficult work and people are working very hard to do a good job and to do it right, but it isn't easy and there aren't always easy answers for this.

So we've come up with a variety of different mechanisms to make sure that people are really getting information in real time. We've been trying to figure out what that really means. But, for example, after a partnership meeting, there might be an immediate debrief with other members of the learning team to talk about what happened in the room, what the dynamics were like, maybe there was some folks in the room who really weren't engaged or participating, but being able to share that information so there can be some discussion about, well, how do we make sure we're engaging some people who are coming to the meetings but they're just really not engaging in the way that we would hope that they would. So that's one example.

A lot of times too, our development evaluators might follow up with an e-mail to the learning team, some observations or some notes about things that they observed as follow-up to a meeting or some suggestions about, here's some ways that maybe the data could be presented in
a more dynamic way so that people could interact with it differently.

We've also been providing feedback in the form of learning memos to Best Start staff. And that usually is more around kind of strategic operational things and kind of the logistics of operationalizing a lot of these concepts and this work.

So, so far, that appears to have been -- appears to be helpful, and we're kind of continuing to refine our thinking about what really -- what kind of information is useful to the organization, to the partnerships, to community members to really kind of take that learning and use it in ways that are helpful to their work.

So just quickly and final reflections, some of the feedback that we've provide to -- to Best Start staff is really around, you know, Best Start is fundamentally around -- about capacity building, building the capacity of communities. And it's been -- a lot has happened in the last few months, a lot of tremendous effort and work has gone into the learning-by-doing process, and there's times where maybe you just need to take a step back and slow down a little bit because you're quick to make the decision but don't really know if the community really is fully understanding or has the capacity to actively participate. So really, you know, taking the time and
attention and being reflective about the importance of that.

And then the other kind of final reflection is around, again, this funder-community relations. It's an inherent challenge. No matter what you do, it's going to be something that you have to continue to work on. But specifically, kind of in the more immediate future, around clarifying and revisiting those roles and those expectations in the transition plan.

So with that, we'll take any questions. And Eric Watt, our colleague from SSG, will answer them all.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any questions, commissioners? Susanne.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: I really appreciate a lot of the information about how you've been very sensitive in providing critical feedback because I know, being on any type of committee or meeting, that's very sensitive. And if you're dealing with community, you're really trying to begin this partnership with, that's very hard.

Have you found that with that balancing the funder-driven roles and the community-driven needs, have you run into a particular community where the ideas have really been divergent and they haven't been able to come up with some type of a goal or a plan or a project just because they're so different?
SPEAKER: If I could I apologize. I was late.

Hi, Suzanne.

MS. BELSHE: We were early.

SPEAKER: So I don't think -- I think we have a lot of ideas right now. I don't think we're at the stages of fleshing them out to become strategies, and I think there's a lot of collaboration between hearing those ideas and then coming in with some funding guidelines that will meet those -- meet the aspirations of the communities. And I think that's part of the challenge of balancing. I think First 5 is very clear about not being so funded driven that, you know, that we're going to end up with a strategy that does sense to communities.

I think one of the things that we want to be mindful of in the last memo was making sure the strategy is not just the typical direct service strategy and what does that mean to the communities and how do we help the community build out strategies with the inquiries that we've been instituting through the learning-by-doing process to make sure that they have the conversation. That's not about just fixing -- fixing broken people, as one contractor put it.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Anybody else? Karla.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: A general question.

In terms of -- (inaudible).
MS. BELSHE: Karla, can you use the microphone?

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: Do you have a sense of what the community feels they're meeting for or their ultimate goal because all of the communities are really different? So what brings them to these meetings and what are they looking to accomplish from the folk that you're hearing back from?

SPEAKER: You know, I think they all understand they're engaged in this learning-by-doing process and the end goal is to develop some sort of strategy or activity that will build community capacity to address one of their core results that they've chosen. So was your question specifically, is there community -- do they not understand what that goal is? Is that what you're --

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: I think that terminology, I think, for us might mean different things. So in terms of the 14 communities, when they get together, is there a certain community that says, we are working towards bring more early care and education, we are working, and are those sort of different throughout, and is there really clear guidance as to why folks keep coming to the table.

SPEAKER: Yeah. I mean, honestly, I think at this stage, since it's still somewhat in the early stages of the LBD process, I think what we're seeing is useful is
that they're building relationships with each other, they're learning how to work with each other to work towards those specific goals. Those goals haven't been operationalized yet because they haven't -- most communities haven't gone into the formal strategy development. But I think what's happening -- what we're observing is that they're forming those social relationships, they're meeting other parents, they're meeting other CEOs. These are -- you know, some of these parents have never interacted with a community-based organization.

So in terms of process, that's what we're observing.

MS. ANDREWS: So the communities right now -- and all of them are at different places and some communities are moving into what we call stage four, which is really identifying those strategies. And so some of them have been thinking through for a while now the kinds of things that they want to do to address the issues within their community. And some of that was -- was outlined or discussed in that community prospectives booklet that the board received.

But there's still now -- they're now at a point where they have to say, okay, we understand, looking at the data, that the issues are large; how do we focus to
really address those systemic issues that prevent families from developing optimally and thriving.

And so they're going through a process using the information that they have accumulated up to this point, looking at their core result, looking at their -- the indicators and the data and the stories that they've collected behind that data, really trying to understand who in their community they really want to target, and then determining what are the strategies.

And, again, we've outlined the four funding categories around civic engagement, organizational capacity building, community resource mobilization and social capital. And so within those community capacity building type of approaches, what are going to be the best strategies to actually achieve those results.

So they're right now entering into, you do have communities, such as Long Beach, that already know they want to do work around civic engagement and some organizational capacity building work, but others are now approaching that area. So soon we will know more about what it is they specifically want to do in each community.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Neal.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So my question is both related to how to measure outcomes as well as perhaps a way to move the process forward. If you imagine that, in
any community, we know that they're quite different and we knew that when we selected the 14, and maybe let's just pretend that there's ten or 15 dimensions that we care about that may have to do with capacity to self organize, the ability to have relationships between individuals. There's probably 10 or 15 of those core capacities on a one-to-five scale, each of one of them so to speak. And the hope is that, if you measure that without hurting anybody, you, measure that every six months, you could maybe show that things are getting better along those dimensions. But also people have used that same approach to self assess and to show you're perspective as you think we're doing really well on quality Number 1 -- or attribute Number 1. I think we're doing terribly. Why is it different?

Have we been using something like that? Some people call it spider web maps that have 15 different elements? It just seems like I have a lot of trouble -- and it's very impressive materials you gave us last meeting, I think it was, but I don't know how to tell on those dimensions any one particular community's capacity because I don't know what the dimensions are and I don't know what the scale is and I don't know what their scores are on it. I don't know if I need to.

And I don't want to just know it so I know it.
But is that not a way that people use those kinds of approaches to help build communities?

MS. ANDREWS: Yes. And in fact, one of the -- I don't recall which presentation it was at this point, but we did talk about the different areas of community capacity that we're trying to build in the learning aspect of learning by doing. And we also discussed the fact that they do a self-assessment. What we're going to do is, every year they're going to assess so that the -- what they've done is, the partnerships did their own assessment and their own conversation and reflection. Staff also did that.

And then there was a collective conversation about that. So there is actually scores and all of that that help the community see where they are in relation to where they want to be and need to be. And then we're going to assess them -- or they're going to assess themselves again in February, March of next year.

MS. BELSHE: So there was a very specific framework that reflected -- so these are the capacities for a partnership to be results --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

MS. BELSHE: -- six different domains, subdomains. I think it was a terrific tool just for our staff and as well as the partnerships, so we absolutely --
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Was there a great variation amongst community members in terms of the subdomains that I thought we were doing well on and you thought we were doing others well on and then was there big disparity between what staff thought communities would have thought they were doing well versus the things that they were doing well.

MS. ANDREWS: What's interesting is that, what I understand from the staff, because this assessment initially was done, I believe --

MS. BELSHE: Last summer.

MS. ANDREWS: -- October. Staff actually thought that there was going to be huge discrepancy, but there wasn't. There was actually great consistency between the community assessing themselves and what the staff saw. So those was collective conversations, you know, were really reflective conversations, not only for the partners but for staff as well because we're constantly assessing our role in helping them to build capacity.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Is there a summary way, even if you took the names of communities off, that we could see -- going back to that spider web approach of the one and one to five -- that you could see, look, there's some communities that clearly are doing very well. There are four or five on this particular element, and
others aren't. In case it was a sensitive thing, you don't want to necessarily show -- just trying to figure out if that would be an effective way to let us see what's happening.

MS. ANDREWS: Absolutely. We have that information and we can provide that.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Just because you have it doesn't mean you need to provide it. Think about it and make them anonymous I think that might be helpful.

MS. ANDREWS: Absolutely, because what we don't want to do -- and we've heard this from the board -- is to make it seem as if there's any competition between communities; so we're very sensitive to that.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Anybody else? I got one piece. I said this in our meeting the other day. To what degree does the learning-by-doing process inform what we need to do as a staff and more importantly what we will need to do as a commission in support of and contributing to the success?

How -- how are we documenting that, if we are, because I think the learning-by-doing is honestly important for the communities, but it's to me as equally as important for us informing what we should do, how we should do it, and more importantly when we should do it.
MR. GONZALEZ: I mean, it's definitely having a major impact on the work that we do in terms of how we're approaching our community in terms of you know, how we're -- I think today was kind of showing us with developmental evaluation, you know, how we're able to basically adjust as we go along. I mean, there's a lot, you know, that our teams are learning as they're out in the communities and lots that are being shared with us in terms of where we're going to go.

One of the things that we are recognizing is this emerging role of the community, playing a much more active role in terms of their own determination. And it's actually had an impact on us in terms of our short term. We talked about the transition. We talk about how roles are evolving, right, in terms of the program officer. I mean, we're realizing, right, and as we sort of step up to see other opportunities to support the partnerships. I mean that right now is -- what we're going through right now is actually telling us a lot in terms of how we could be leveraging other opportunities outside the community partnership that not only have a positive impact of the partnership itself, but the overall communities that are represented.

I think it allows us really to spend some more time to make some of these linkages, to look at some of
the -- when we talk strategic partnerships and some of the
points that Commissioner Southard brings up in terms of
how neighborhoods, there's a really great opportunity to
take advantage of some of those linkages, the work that's
going on with LAUSD and the early linkages programs
through wellness centers, what's happening in the
northeast alley in Pacoima with the Youth Policy
Institute.

It allows our staff, right, to look at
opportunities like that. And we're learning this as we're
moving forward right now because, as the communities are
moving forward in the various stages, as a learning team,
plays a more prominent role, it gives us that space to do
that. And at the end of the day, it's going to have a
major impact in terms of the connection that our Best
Start community partnerships have to the overall body
electric, not just within what's going on in that
partnership, but the overall community. And that is out
aim here.

So that's part of it. I'd love to hear from you
all because I think you all are on the ground seeing
things.

MS. SANDINO: And I think one of the other things
that I would stress in response to your question is that,
the developmental evaluation, we're not looking just at
the partnership or just -- you know, but really trying to understand because what happens here has implications for what happens in the community and vice versa. So we're really making sure that we're gathering information that we can share back. That kind of goes back to the operational and what is the organization learning and how is the organization using that information to make course corrections or to inform your thinking moving forward.

So that's something that we're very committed to and, you know, work closely with the Best Start leadership to really understand what kind of information is helpful and valuable and when.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah, I could see where this could be helpful in developing how we recruit staff, how do we train staff, and how do we develop staff as the communities progress. And so long as we are attentive and intentional I think that's helpful.

Thank you. Anybody else? Neal.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Quick question, I hope. Business model research complete supposedly by the end of June on the time line. You have it shown it on the board. Does that mean in July we'll begin to start seeing that business model?

MR. GONZALEZ: One of the things that we also wanted to share today it's, you know, while we're working
with our consultants, we're limited on our long term business model. I mean, I think, as we all know right now, we're already in the process of our short-term transition, right, you can see from today's presentation.

But you know, there's also an opportunity right now to really look at parallel tracks that are taking -- the parallel tracks that are taking place with our strategic planning process. And so we wanted to be very -- we wanted to make sure that we weren't moving too fast and that we're actually able to align ourselves, right, with the entire strategic planning process.

So as I speak right now, we continue to contribute information to our friends over at LFA to make sure that we can be at a point where our long-term business model actually meshes well with where we are with the strategic plan. So I know that, originally, we had taught. We see this as an opportunity really to merge both tracks together and come up with something stronger.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So it means a couple of months more for the --

MS. BELSHE: Yeah, we want to align --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I was just surprised that it was June on the graph here.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah, our earlier thinking is --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Which is just later, fine.
MR. GONZALEZ: We'll just revisit the (inaudible) that you're looking at there right now.

MS. BELSHE: We want to get it on the same track with our broader --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I agree with you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER AU: Just a comment. In fact, Suzanne sort of whispered to me as well. We're kind of (inaudible) is that the -- the incorporation of the developmental evaluation process has really enriched, not only in terms of what we're hearing, but informing the commission as well because a lot of what was happening in community was sort of lost and we were always at a quandary as to whether or not we had made the right decision because there was very little coming to us in terms of making any kinds of potential impact. We knew it was going to be a long haul, but we still needed to -- to have a sense that we were going on the right path.

And so this presentation, as well as the previous Best Start presentations, have really been helpful and enlightening us and encouraging us and feeling quite hopeful in that we truly are making a good investment in terms of this approach.

So thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Anybody else? Okay.
You've got two seconds. Okay. That's it. Let's go.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you very much, commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Folks, we have one final presentation, and that is with our ECE landscape and the Advancement Prospect, and we have John and Kim WHO we've seen before, and they're looking gooder than ever.

So welcome, once again.

MS. IIDA: If I may just take a moment to --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Oh, I'm sorry, Elizabeth. was I supposed to introduce you?

MS. IIDA: Oh, no. That's fine.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. I'm sorry.

MS. IIDA: I'm making kind of -- give an overview, but. Yes, walking back, John and Kim of the Advancement Project today present on the final two questions of this project, which are past roles that First 5 LA and other ECE funders, including other county commissions have played in the ECE investment strategy that they've employed. Also looking ahead to potential rules and strategies that First 5 and other funders consider.

So as a quick review, this project is really a point in time analysis of the ECE field here in LA county relative to three areas. So one is access: The availability and accessibility of services for young
children across different kinds of settings. The second is the quality: The extent to which quality is measured, recorded, and then support provided for the ECE providers to be able to enhance their services. And then the third area is workforce: The background of the professionals who are serving our young children, the different types of professional development opportunities in the county and to what extent they're participating in these professional development opportunities or activities, rather, throughout the county.

So you might recall that the team presented on access in April and then last month they presented in areas of quality and workforce. So to's presentation will also be provided through these three lens, but with a little different information. They'll begin by discussing current and past investments, ECE related to these three areas. Then they'll move on to talking about our past roles and strategies and also include discussions about what other county commissions have done and other lenders. And then, lastly, they'll conclude with an overview in terms of gaps in needs and various potential strategies for filling those gaps to inform what they may do in the future.

So now I'm going to turn it over to John.

MR. KIM: Thank you so much. Good afternoon,
everyone, and thanks again for having us for our third and final installment of the ECE landscape.

I don't know if you guys want to start with the World Cup scores. I could give an update. People DVRing it? I won't mess with anyone that may be recording.

So let's jump right into it then. So Liz has been able to walk us through the three research questions. A couple of things before we jump into it. The initial impetus for this work was indeed to support you all's ongoing strategic planning process. But the hope was also to create a space to engage other stakeholders, other funders and to potentially spark collaborative conversations so that we as a county overall could take a more collaborative, comprehensive approach to this question of ECE.

And so we're doing things beyond just writing a report and presenting it to you all for action. We're going to be producing an online presentation of our findings that will be launched later this summer. We're also going to be getting many other presentations and engaging other funders and other sorts of cohorts or groupings of stakeholders. And once you see the reports, they've been written specifically to sort of engage and invite other folks to see themselves in this picture as well.
The other thing I want to mention before getting into it is that, throughout this rather behemoth project, we're imaging a few limitations in terms of data access and in terms of time. And so what we're setting out here we hope is the baseline for the conversation, not the end of the conversation. We think this should set a great platform for which the commission and the staff could have further conversations around these questions. And the last thing that I want to mention is that what we're presenting today are not recommendations. We're simply sort of laying out the review of our findings and sort of an inventory of what we've seen elsewhere here in the county and what might be possible strategies as well for looking forward.

So with that being said, I'm going to go ahead and hand it over to my colleague, Kim Brownson, to talk through our question, too, which was, what had been the past roles and strategies around ECE for First 5 LA, other county commissions, and other ECE funders.

MS. BROWNSON: Thank you. So, essentially, question 2 breaks down into two parts: One is a look back at what First 5 LA has done historically in terms of its past roles and strategies. And then the other is a part, which is benchmarking best practices from other First 5 county commission around the state, as well as other ECE
funders.

So as we've looked back at the history of the strategic plans that First 5 LA has invested in since its inception, what you see, essentially, is a funnel. So in the early years, the strategies and the investments were much more broad and diffuse. There was definitely an interest in early learning and a focus on third grade reading scores from the early outset. And as time went by, by the second time -- second strategic plan, evaluation and policy came into sharper focus but there was still a fair amount of diffusion in the number of strategies and the number of roles pursued.

The last strategic plan, 2009 to 2015, is definitely a further narrowing of the funnel so that there's now a very clear focus on place-based initiatives, the idea of strengthening families, looking at the ecology in which children and families live, and policy and capacity building as key parts of the strategic plan.

So the next three slides, essentially, are an overview of what First 5 LA has invested in the past broken down by the idea of access, quality, and workforce. I'll say it from the outset, there are several initiatives and investments that, essentially, span all three of those or two or three of those categories, and that's -- LAUP is a very easy example of doing both access expansion, it's
doing QRS, and it's also doing workforce investments.

I'll just say that, for your reference, the entire report will have a debrief on each of these investments and access to quality and workforce, the dollar amounts, what they do, and what the time frame was. More broadly, I'll just describe what unites all of these access investments here, and that's to say that they're all about increasing access to early learning opportunities, preserving access to early learning opportunities that were either threatened by state budget cuts or issues with how state contractors were paid or addressing some of the preconditions to access such as facilities development.

The second slide is definitely a good graphical illustration of how varied and wide some of the investments were, particularly in terms of workforce, which you see on the left-hand column is a pretty broad mixture of workforce investments that span things like public education in the KCET listening (inaudible) program, database projects, projects that outreach to licensed exempt that outreach in terms of incentivizing high school participation in ECE. And then on the right-hand column are the later scale investments that's a total of $52,000,000 investment which LAUP was chairing, along with 16 other partners. And those investments also
are more focused but still include and house quite a
number of strategies. So there's advisement and
mentoring, coaching cadres, BA cohorts in there, as well
as direct financial assistance and alignment of community
college standards.

The last slide of past investments from First 5
LA, essentially, address both quality improvement in the
very direct services sense, as well as QRIS efforts. So
the two QRIS efforts here, of course, are LA universal
preschool QRIS and the Steps to Excellence program, which
is run out of County of Office Childcare in which we
describe and did a much deeper dive on at the last
presentation in May. The others are direct quality
improvement and enhancement programs that are geared
towards providers either family child care, licensed
exempt, or center-based care.

So across all of these investments -- and there's
about three dozen over the last couple of pages -- there
are many recurring and often overlapping roles that recur
through each of those investments and that also cross
workforce quality and access. The topology that's
described here, essentially, is borrowed from previous
strategic plans. I think they're mostly all pretty
self-explanatory as to what they are. I'll just pause to
say that the catalyst role in particular is a little
different -- differently defined in our report than I think some of the past strategic plans have defined it, and that is -- and I'll describe this in greater detail as we go through some of the benchmarking work. The idea that the First 5 commission would serve as, essentially, a spark that would incentivize others, not necessarily state government, but others, sometimes other funders, sometimes other county agencies to actually join in and see the value of the work that it's done and begin to underwrite it directly.

So as we compare -- and you can do a little side-by-side for the paper versions. It's harder to do split screen here electronically -- there's a lot of overlap between the roles that were played by First 5 LA and the roles that were played by other county commission and other ECE funders that we benchmarked. What you see in the bolding essentially is a preview of what we're going to go through in greater detail of, essentially, strategies and roles that other county commissions and other ECE funders leaned into more heavily.

It's not to say, for example, that, because it's bolded here on the screen, that First 5 LA hasn't previously worked as an advocate, a school trip partner, a catalyst partner, or a capacity builder. But in other cases when we benchmarked other county commissions, it has
been the case that several of those county commissions have said that has been their central if not singular early childhood investment or early care and education investment for that commission, which is not just a difference in sort of role, but also in degree and kind.

I should also mention, in the list of all the interviews that were done in the benchmarking process are included in the report, there were, basically, 15 different benchmarks that were conducted via interview and document review.

So partner seems a rather obvious one, but I will say that pretty consistently in the interviews with other county commissions and other private funders, partner was frequently described as the key and central role that they envision themselves to play. Part of that is about scale. Some of it is about risk allocation, joint funding, and a codesign process, but it is -- it was definitely striking that virtually every single interview began with the executive director saying they view their primary job is to build partnerships and to partner with other either agencies or other public funders or private funders.

So First 5 California, in particular, has done a number of partnerships in looking to other state agencies. In fact, their upcoming annual conference in February of next year is going to be all about partnering across state
agencies and they're going to have, I believe, seven state agencies present as co-conveners in their upcoming conference. In particular the two that they highlighted here were the work with the Race to the Top, which is the regional consortia across the state and a new partnership that they're very excited about with WIC, which is outreach to prenatal to two. In Ventura, they were working looking at a private economic coalition, doing facility --

MS. BELSHE: Can you say more about the WIC partnership?

MS. BROWNSON: Well, it's still under development, but this is one of the things that George Halbertson (phonetic spelling) in particular has been very excited about doing direct outreach to WIC, pregnant and parenting teens.

MS. BELSHE: -- very excited about First 5 LA's Little by Little program --

MS. BROWNSON: Yes.

MS. BELSHE: -- using WIC as a platform for engaging families with very young kids.

MS. BROWNSON: Yes. And I should say that the degree to which these are highlighted as partnerships that are different aren't necessarily to say, again, that First 5 LA is not doing work in these spaces. It's just
frequently that they either -- the degree to which they're doing it or the primary reliance on this particular role or strategy is the reason that we're highlighting them here.

First 5 Santa Clara as well has described its key partnership with private foundations and other city and county agencies and mental health and as well with family resource centers, with the Packard Foundation. And First 5 San Francisco, which is, obviously, a unique case because they have dedicated municipal funding, has done really interesting work with the human services agency as well as their department of children and families to fund registry workforce development, wage compensation directly, and a host of other services.

So, again, school district partnerships: This is not something that we are a stranger to here in Los Angeles. School Readiness Initiative, which was described earlier in the PowerPoint is something that First 5 LA has historically invested in and in fact had direct grantees with the school district. That's also true of the Family Literacy Initiative, which has been the subject of some new found money at LAUSD, which is exciting.

That said, as we talk to other county commissions, Orange County started the interview, not \by
saying that partnerships were their primary ECE investments, but school district partnerships in particular were its primary mode of investment. So what they do, essentially, is they fund an early learning specialist in every single one of the school districts in Orange County. There are fewer school districts in Orange County than there are in LA. There are fewer school districts in every county than there are in LA. But that said, they basically have a dedicated person on staff. There's an RFB process where they design the RFP but are fully funded by First 5 Orange County. They're employees of the school district, but they have a scope of work which is essentially about helping Orange County school districts to draw down additional state funding, to expose their teachers and their principals and administrators to best practices in terms of STEM, and to, essentially, be the go-between when there's a new class in sort of training that comes up, for example, as one of the things they described; that it was their early learning specialists who are on the ground who were both their employees as well as school district employees, but then went back to the First 5 Orange County commission and said, we could use a conference on this. And then they were able to follow suit and have that immediate communications feedback loop.
Another idea that is common to both Alameda, Marin, and Santa Clara is a shorter term access investment, and that is around summer prep camps for entering kindergarten. These range from six to eight weeks. In Marin and Santa Clara, these are funded by the county commissions, but --

MS. BELSHE: What's OUSD?

MS. BROWNSON: Oakland Unified School District.

So Alameda has historically funded their summer -- and they're called Preppie K or Prep Kinder camps. And so Alameda has historically funded it. They did some evaluation on the outcomes of the children who had participated and after seeing several rounds of that evaluation, eventually Oakland Unified School District is basically footing the bill and has said, thanks for showing us the way, we've got it from here, which is a very exciting model. And we'll talk about that a little bit more under catalyst.

San Francisco also does a number of investments in terms of is KROA, kindergarten readiness observational assessment, as well as direct PD coaching and sub pay for when teachers need to be out of the classroom.

Fresno, which I think really is just a shining light of school district partnerships, has a really interesting model where they've gone from, essentially,
just barely having a seat at the table to do joint
planning around early childhood to then having joint
funding and then to having the school district do solo
funding, not at all solicited or prompted by the First 5
Fresno commission but, basically, them having done such a
good job of indoctrinating their school district partners
in the value of early learning that, when Prop 30 passed,
the superintendent of Fresno then made his first priority
for new money to expand their preschool programs. They
did this again by doing the Fresno Unified District-wide
kindergarten readiness assessments showing very alarming
data. About -- about a quarter of their students were
entering kindergarten actually ready to take on
kindergarten content, and that activated the school
leadership to then become involved.

Their next step was then to do these P-to-three
grants which were jointly funded with Packard, the Fresno
County Office of Ed, Early Ed California, and, of course,
First 5 Fresno. Those started as planning grants and they
have a sort of phrased introduction. So in year one --
and these are just launching. It's a three-to-one match.
So for every $3 the county commission puts in, there was
$1 from the school district. In year two, it goes to a
two-to-one match. And then in year three, it's a
one-to-one match. That said, obviously, the prospects are
quite good given that Fresno Unified has already
independently put in about 30 million of its new Prop 30
funding into preschool.

The Packard Foundation is another example in the
workforce space and their professional development,
learning communities, and cohorts around transitional
kindergarten. The California Community Foundation -- and
I apologize, I think we lopped off California on that last
bullet -- has held and continues to hold briefings and
convenings to urge district leadership to invest in early
education.

MS. BELSHE: Kim, before you move on to school --
is it fair -- one of the -- my observations from what
you've shared with these bullets with maybe the exception
of the summer prep camps for entering kindergartners, is
that non-First 5 LA First 5s have partnered with school
districts at more of a systems level in terms of they're
not funding direct services like we have done with Layco
and Family Literacy, but they're focusing on program
quality, technical assistance, incorporation of best
practices, kindergarten readiness assessments,
professional development, learning communities, quality
improvement.

Those strike me as a different way of partnering
with school districts than partnering by funding school
districts to deliver services. Is that a fair observation?

    MS. BROWNSON: That is mostly accurate. The wrinkle in that is, of course, that First 5 San Francisco also funds preschool for all under its countywide tax. So that means they both do the quality enhancement and workforce development as well as the access, but because they have that unique funding source from the county --

    MS. BELSHE: Fresno also puts some money into the -- I guess I'm just trying -- especially for our commission, as we think about the future and our -- the levers that the board has endorsed in our strategic imperative and declining services. One of the pending priority outcomes is around the ECE system. And so it's just a way of thinking about partnerships very differently than we have in the past.

    MS. BROWNSON: That's totally fair.

    The other -- I think Fresno, actually, is also a really good example of having done very significant systems investments, the matching grant for V to three is also very much in the systems and quality enhancement level. That said, they also do maintain a small amount of direct services funding for language minorities and special ed. And that is sort of in the innovation platform more clearly.
First 5 Orange County I think is a very clear sort of example of all systems, no access. And they're -- they're very straightforward, and I think they went through a very crisp strategic planning process where they thought about what the trade-offs are of access expansion versus quality enhancement and landed on the side of saying that the access expansion work that they want to do is essentially providing TAs, so that their school district partners could draw down more State funding, which is one step away from direct obviously.

Okay. So the catalyst funding that I give a little preview of, again, is this idea, again, from Fresno. And so the incentive grant funding that I had mentioned before, a three-to-one grant, a two-to-one grant, and then finally a one-to-one grant is the idea that, essentially, you build the sizzle, right, but you start with what is most exciting, and that is a three-to-one match, and then you taper off the funding but also then insure that the school district is bought in and will actually continue to provide the services and funding that's required once First 5 begins to step away. And that is absolutely with an idea of declining revenue in mind and the sustainability long term of how these programs will continue to exist.

The other really interesting example that they
gave, and it almost has kind of a salacious generalism, sort of flavor to it.

MS. BELSHE: Salacious? That's a word that hasn't been used in this room probably ever.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: She's an attorney. That's how they talk. It's just how they talk.

COMMISSIONER AU: We'll have to label MA.

MS. BROWNSON: I think it's such an interesting model. They partnered with their local DCFS department and, essentially, said, here is something that we are hearing from parents of infants and toddlers who are foster parents, and that is that their babies and their toddlers are not getting sufficient touch, they're not getting sufficient interaction, call and response, everything that is the early learning side of the trajectory for zero to two. So they developed these baby teams. They basically staffed and funded an in-house staffer for their DCFS equivalent to actually create baby teams comprised of former adoptive parents and former foster parents who were willing to do this and share sort of new techniques to their parents. They funded evaluation. They sold the sizzle. This is the salaciousness element I think, of making it as exciting and real and promising in terms of results as they can, And then basically just showing the child welfare
department what they could do at very low cost.

So before their contract year was up for funding, a couple of people within their child welfare department -- their child welfare department said, this program is paying itself off and we have had far fewer child deaths, child maltreatment reports, and therefore, we're going to actually steal the thunder and take this as our own glory, which I think is a fabulous way to incentivize other public actors to actually get involved. So now the child welfare department is fully paying for the program that started with First 5 Fresno.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: In what way do they save cost?

MS. BROWNSON: Well, they were -- they saved on litigation costs and that was the big one that they were looking at.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Litigation from --

MS. BROWNSON: Child death suits and child maltreatment suits.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: At the hands of foster care?

MS. BROWNSON: At the hands of parents and families of the children.

So the First 5 Alameda was a success story that I described earlier of having initially piloted the program
for summer pre-K at Oakland Unified School District, done
again the evaluation study to show that it pays itself off
in terms of lesser incidence of special ed improper
placement and lesser incidents of grade repeats for
children who have gone through the pre-K program, and then
Oakland Unified elected to take the program in-house
without any cost to First 5 Alameda.

The last catalyst example that I'll highlight is
First 5 Santa Clara. Educare of Silicon Valley just had
their groundbreaking model around the rest of the country
for educare, essentially, to build the program, build the
research and evaluation results at the local level, and
then have policy adoption throughout the state. In
Santa Clara, they have just broken ground, I think maybe
two weeks ago. But based on the national policy
evaluation results out of Frankforter Graham in North
Carolina, a number of school districts that are not going
to be touched by the Silicon Valley educare have already
started adopting certain professional development
protocols for their school districts.

All right. Advocate. I will say just briefly
that Prop 10 -- involvement in the Prop 10 litigation for
county commissions to retain their funds was definitely
described as a turning point where a number of commissions
described a feeling, a sense of their own advocacy
potency, an ability to actually get involved in state politics, and also the state budget. At the local state level -- local and state level, Alameda, Fresno, Marin, and also LA have been involved with Raising California Together campaign with SCIU, were very involved with the state budget negotiations in this last go-round, which I expect we've already talked about here, yielded 264 million in new funding out of the state budget.

The Marin Kids Campaign is also an example of advocacy directly that was started with convening work, started with some poling work, and is set to go on to the November ballot for a kids tax that isn't just zero to five, but has got a strong zero to five component in a larger campaign that's about zero to 18.

The California Community Foundation has also done some advocacy, sort of planning and platforming. By that, I mean that its members essentially went -- used this as a training ground and a recruiting ground for other members to get involved in various policy campaigns around LAUSD or county zoning, and then went on to win policy wins with their colleagues.

And then the last thing that I'll describe is the Atlas Foundation on Advocacy and the Partnership for Early Childhood Investment where they view advocacy as an in-house sort of activity, and that -- by that I mean,
they hold funder convenings to essentially incentivize other K to 12 funders or mental health funders or foster youth funders to think of zero to five as something that should be a part of their strategic plan, and so it's an outreach effort.

And then their other big investment is around the NPR KPCC reporter, Depa (phonetic spelling) Fernandez, who's covering early childhood now.

Capacity building, obviously, connects with squarely to workforce. First 5 Santa Clara, San Diego, and San Francisco are the three sort of biggest leaders in terms of investments and coaching and assessors so that the QRIS system will function so that there are people who can essentially support quality improvement directly on the ground for providers.

So the conclusions of -- I'll just end with here is to say that there is in fact a lot of overlap in terms of roles and strategies that First 5 LA has pursued in the past that you will see in other county commissions and other private funders. But the difference in degree and the difference in kind is the way in which other funders have chosen to lean on some of these other roles and strategic investments in particular around partnerships, school district partnerships being a catalyst sort of idea incubator, and spinner-off of great ideas and advocate and
a capacity builder.

And then I'll turn it back to John for Q-three to crosswalk us.

MR. KIM: Excellent. So we are -- we're fairly ambitious in our presentation today. We didn't want to come -- Question 2 and Question 3. And so for question three, I'm going to now bring it back just focusing on LA county, the needs that we have in particular in LA after the sort of statewide tour of other approaches.

One of the ways that we really look at this question -- there's a few things about this.

We took what were the needs and gaps that we found in Question 1 when we did the landscape analysis, particularly in the areas of inquiry of access of workforce equality. Then took what we found in Question 2, which were approaches that other folks had taken and that we've taken here in LA county and have to address those thing and sort of map those together. So the through line between those two reports, which you will all receive, will be the results of what we see in Question 3.

Now what we're looking at today are potential strategies and inventory strategies that's meant not only for First 5 LA but for, again, other interested funders. This has not been filtered or weighed in any way. These are sort of presented in rank order. We have not weighed
your newly published strategic imperatives onto those
these potentials. But we are looking at gaps that we've
specifically found for LA county. One of these we were
just hearing about in all these approaches from Fresno,
from San Diego, what have you. And try as we might to
have Fresno level needs and issues, we do have LA-sized
problems in terms of the level of need. So we're going to
have to come up with a very unique LA approach, which is
you all's job to try to figure out.

All right. So let me see here. Let me move us
forward now to this. So what we're going to talk about
are the gaps that we've identified and collected in the
areas of access workforce equality, and then list off some
potential strategies. There are multiple roles that First
5 could take in any one of those strategies. There is no
sort of recommendation from this chart that First 5 LA
should play every single check marked box in terms of
roles, but these are sort of the universal potential ways
that First 5 could impact those particular questions.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I'm confused. These are
not what we're doing now, but what we could be doing?

MR. KIM: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: And the fact that, just
for example, catalyst access doesn't have one because they
don't think we can do that? I'm confused as to what has a
check and what doesn't. Implement, it seems like --
there's only one, two, three, four that don't have checks.

MR. KIM: There's nothing here that some
creativity and some folks coming together, thinking about
it, couldn't figure out here. What we're looking at is
what we found in other places, what has some proven
models, what we've seen in LA county before around those
particular areas. That's where I check marks would come
in.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Check mark means that
someone else has done it?

MR. KIM: Someone has done it. We see --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Someone else has done it?

MR. KIM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: And the four -- one, two,
three, four where there's no checkmark means that you
didn't find anybody who's done those roles and those
particular --

MR. KIM: Hasn't been lifted up in our scan.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you.

MR. KIM: Again, you know, we go through much
more detail about considerations for taking on particular
roles for particular needs in the report which we're
submitting later today or actually probably by now. So,
hopefully, that's been submitted.
Let me now walk us through the gaps. So the next time when you're on vacation, Neal, and you need some reading on the beach, we have a 300-page report that lists out all the gaps in needs, or you can look at this one page.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: That implies I would take a vacation.

MR. KIM: I am assuming that.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Big assumption.

MR. KIM: So what we've done in this particular side is listed off all of the major gaps that we identified through the landscape analysis in the areas of quality and workforce access. For each of these gaps, we'll talk about potential strategies and some considerations about any one of those particular strategies. I'm going to be covering first access, and the four key gaps that we found around access were the need for additional center and family childcare programs all throughout LA county.

The second was the significant gap by age groups. So if you are zero-to-two year old, you have 20 times less access than if you are two-to-four year old. The high need for ECE services that still exist for children living in low-income communities of color. And then again -- and this is something that we really struggled with over the
past eight months, the lack of centralizing in terms of
data system and the kind of data systems that allows us to
really zero in and come up with the most nuanced analysis.
So let's talk through what you all could potential do
about this.

So the first access gap, the need for additional
child centers and family child care centers, on average
we're looking at about, for every 38 children under five
years old -- I'm sorry. For every 100 children under five
years old, there's about 38 seats available for them.
There are fewer than ten percent of zip codes in LA county
that have the infrastructure to serve 80 percent of the
kids in that area. This was not helped by the recession
where we saw statewide the $1 billion loss in the system.
And just in LA county alone, we lost 11,000 seats.

Some of the strategies that we're looking at
here, of the five, let me start with funding ECE programs
directly. So by providing operating funds to insure that
children in LA county have access, this provides sort of
the vital funds for access for many families who otherwise
might not have had access, particularly those of the
highest need. You all have made significant investments
in this. The largest being LAUP. But in reviewing and
talking to other county commissions and other funders
interviewed for this particular question, they reported
not directly funding access for -- for -- given the fact
that they felt it wasn't sustainable nor offered a clear
exit strategy.

Some funders do also try to carry a balance
portfolio between funding some direct services while also
reserving some investments for policy advocacy work. So
the Atlas Foundation is one particular example of that.

Okay. Another potential strategy to take on here
for First 5 or other funders would be to focus on
facilities and expand the facility's development to insure
that there are sufficient facilities and infrastructure
for the needs in LA county. First 5 LA has made a number
of these investments in the past. Most notably, a
partnership with New Schools Better Neighborhoods.

We also heard from examples in San Diego. San
Diego also made some facilities investments, but really
targeting very specific populations: Homeless children,
children of veterans, so on and so forth.

First 5 Ventura put together a community
investment loan fund that would help finance or provide
low cost financing for providers to develop a facility.
That's as an option.

But one of the -- some of the considerations
around capitol investments is sheer cost of the capitol
investments and the need for strong oversight and
accountability for those things. We have seen in the past that there had been some concerns around that.

And then also looking at this particular challenge or this particular option, there is the challenge of timing out facility dollars with operational dollars and ensuring that these beautiful new facilities don't remain empty.

Another option or potential way to approach this particular gap would be around partnering with school districts. And I do agree to partner with these school districts to bring early childhood investments to scale and to increase sustainability beyond declining Prop 10 revenues.

School districts are good and natural attractive partners for this kind of work as they could help to bring a program to scale. Also there are many parts of the state that are seeing declining enrollment, so they have facilities that may otherwise be empty and could be repurposed for early learning.

Some examples that we've mentioned before, there's the pre-K summer bridge program, First 5 Alameda and Marin. One of the key things that we would lift up around this is the need for strong and clear expectations laid out with the school district in advance. So First 5 Fresno is a great example of that where they sort of come
together understanding that this is a codesign approach for them and did -- sort of investment where they ramped it down in terms of what they contribute, three-to-one originally, then two-to-one, then one-to-one, and so on and so forth.

Challenges. I think we all know challenges around partnering with school districts. School districts are inherently complicated. They are -- it's rather difficult sometimes to move large systems. There needs to be a strong sort of leader that has real buy-in on the question of ECE, and oftentimes requires a good investment up front to really move that school district.

Another key consideration is that you -- you want to supplement the funding of existing programs and not in anyway supply that. So that's the other sort of trick of the trade here.

A fourth approach or strategy around dealing with this particular access gap is around advocate for a greater public investments in ECE. And this can be done at the state, the federal, or the local level. This really kind of expands on what you all have been doing in some ways. And so we could be looking at, let's say, advocating for additional funds through the state budget process, advocating for more LCFF dollars at the local level, so on and so forth.
There's also the idea that's been lifted up a few times about doing impactful research that really supports advocacy. So as in First 5 Fresno, they did that kindergarten readiness assessment that really showed the big gaps in terms of readiness, and that sparked that question about and really pushed -- allowed them to set a platform for their advocacy.

The fifth and final potential strategy around addressing this very large gap would be about exploring additional funding streams specifically dedicated to ECE. We can look at San Francisco and hopefully Fresno or Marin. San Francisco successfully passed Proposition H, a countywide initiative focused on public education enrichment with about a third of the revenues being allocated specifically for high-quality individual preschool programming. You know, what this does is, it creates a clear revenue stream.

What -- what could be a challenge though, as with other funding streams and potentially what's happening with First 5 dollars if you all didn't push back was this the idea that the money could be raised in hard times. And that's what we did in San Francisco. The money was borrowed during the recession, but -- and also can be made whole.

MS. BROWNSON: That's rated not by the state
government, but by the county.

MR. KIM: Within the jurisdiction.

So those are the five potential strategies that were identified and we're lifting up to address that particular access gap.

The second gap that I mentioned was around services for different age populations. And in particular, we're talking about zero to two year olds. There were three strategies that were lifted up for this. The first one around assisting licensed-exempt providers to becoming licensed. This plays on the fact that our research found that infants and toddlers were more likely to be served by licensed-exempt providers and a report that you all had commissioned by Harder & Company, actually 78 percent of friends and family -- friends, family, and neighbors expressed an interest in becoming licensed. And once licensed, they are more eligible for a range of supports, including some government subsidies. An approach in terms of doing this work would be to do specific outreach -- cognitive outreach and education to license-exempted providers and then providing them technical assistance on how to get through that licensing process.

A second strategy around addressing this particular gap of the need for access of zero to two year
olds would be around supporting the increase for the
standard reimbursement rates or regional market rates.
This would again be about advocating at the state level
for a rate that better reflects the true cost of care. We
could also look at the advocacy at the statewide level.
There have been some ideas about creating a countywide
reimbursement program that helps to sort of bridge the gap
in terms of what it costs to take care of infants and
toddlers beyond what's the offered reimbursement rate.

And the final strategy that we would offer around
gap two is this creation of a comprehensive investment
strategy, sort of taking the best practice and what's been
learned with the development and maintenance of LAUP and
creating a comprehensive plan around what to do for zero
to two year olds.

Okay. The third access gap that we had mentioned
was around high need for ECE services, particularly for
children living in low-income communities of color. This
has been, unfortunately, a persistent problem in LA county
as long as we've been mapping and doing this particular
research. One way to go about this would be about
place-based investments to particularly target the
neighborhoods that we've identified or others have
identified as areas of highest needs. And those are
clearly mapped out in our Question 1 report that you'll
get access to soon.

This is not about sort of aligning per se with Best Start and the Best Start communities as we understand that there are direct services being provided in those particular sites, but -- and also not all of the ECE highest needs areas are aligned with the Best Start communities, but it's that similar kind of approach, looking at, you know, where there's the greatest needs, potentially also looking at other funders that do place-based initiatives and how to align and sort of create a common goal of improving access in those particular areas.

Another issue that's come up around particularly low-income children is this need to sort of preserve a continuity of access, so that if they actually are using Title 5 or CalWorks funding to access ECE services, that in some ways First 5 or other funders could guarantee -- could create a guaranteed voucher program so that if some life circumstance changes, a parent gets a new job or for some reason is no longer available or eligible for those vouchers, that the children wouldn't automatically lose their seats and the burden of having to replace those seats wouldn't be placed on those providers, so in some ways sort of creating that bridge funding as a sort of fund.
MS. BELSHE: Would that type of bridge funding approach not create an incentive for state policymakers or local policymakers to withdraw funding knowing that First 5 LA would be -- or other funders would be a safety net?

MS. BROWNSON: That is a possibility. It's not clear that -- certainly the scale of that program where they're doing that insulation, that's First 5 San Francisco, that essentially underwrites the risk of primarily parents who work in the food and beverage and hotel industry who get tip money, essentially, over the holidays and get sometimes get bumped out of eligibility, that they'll preserve their children's slot in an early care and education program.

It's not -- that certainly seems possible, but we haven't thus far heard of anything to that extent.

The flip of it though is that they could also build a track record. And I don't think this is actually part of what they've done, but to say so the state, essentially, here is a policy that pretty regularly bumps needy children out just around the holidays. They haven't actually taken that next step to roll it up to state policy level though. But it could potentially certainly create an incentive.

MS. BELSHE: So in that one example, it's a fairly targeted set of circumstances in the population?
MR. KIM: Right. Good. Excellent.

And the last area of access gap is around the lack of centralized and solid data systems. You know, there are a few approaches. One would be to work with the California Department of Social Services and their community care licensing division and to work with them to improve what it is that they measure around licensing and when doing renewals, insuring that actually the database that's created and maintained already by that system actually is more comprehensive and useful for planning purposes.

Another strategy is around using approaches like First 5 has already invested in around the Children's Data Network. That was a network that had produced, you know, prior workforce, shrinking investments reports that laid out really what the gaps are and the needs are. Every time we push on these questions of data, we find better data, we slightly improve what it is that we understand about this. And so pushing both at the consumer level as well as pushing the at the provider level in terms of data could be two strategies around this particular gap.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I have a question. Much earlier in this meeting you talked about a goal of reducing the number of children who must leave child care because of misbehavior or whatever. And I asked if we
know what that number is, how we could measure that, what's the baseline. But I'm not seeing that we really have good data on even the number of kids, much less how many might be ejected --

MR. KIM: Right.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: -- for problems. So help me with that.

MR. KIM: Sure. Well, in the context of our particular landscape, I don't believe that that was a question -- specific research question that we were looking to address. Therefore, we didn't do specific data gap for that. I would tell that you that I think it would be very difficult to find data to answer that question. Again, we're having a hard enough time setting some of the baseline questions about where access is, where the seats are, so on and so forth. Some of these things about what happens actually in some of these sites might be more (inaudible) to have data and to answer that very specific question.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: They're guesstimates and they actually are around Head Start because this question came up with children who were being expelled from Head Start because of bad behavior. So that prompted a discussion around -- I mean, do you expel a three-year old? Do you expel a four-year old? I mean -- but in the
general child care population, I think John is exactly right. It would be hard to find that out.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Well, we should I think have that as a goal if we don't know how many kids are expelled from day care if we're just doing a look at --

MS. BELSHE: I think it was offered as an indicator for -- an illustrative indicator.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: This was from --

COMMISSIONER TILTON: But I don't think it should be illustrative.

MS. BELSHE: You're absolutely right. There's no data. It's a really good, important question.

MR. KIM: I mean, certainly, if the commission gave us something to focus on though. It wasn't a part of our particular research and --

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I know it wasn't, but you brought to mind the fact that we don't have a baseline of even numbers overall. How would we know how many --

MS. BROWNSON: And it is something that other states and geographies actually do track and have data indicators that they report on annually. This is not a part of this report, but CNN had a report on this phenomena and lots of other states actually have it as part of their comprehensive data tracking systems.

MR. KIM: Excellent.
So let's now move on then from the question of access now to the question of workforce. And for that, I'll pass it back to Kim.

MS. BROWNSON: So from the prior one pager that John had referenced at the beginning of the gaps from the Question 1 report, the key gap that was highlighted in terms of workforce was the inadequate system of compensation. The problem there, essentially, is that there are fewer rewards for higher educational attainment and there are even fewer rewards for continued professional development once they made it into entry into the field. So the strategies that we have seen from others around the state are to support an increase in the standard reimbursement rate and the regional market rate, to look into tiered reimbursement, essentially rewarding higher levels of education through wages, and then at the more local level to look at stipend programs. Again, here the shining light in terms of stipends directly at the county level in San Francisco, but there is certainly quite a bit of policy and advocacy workout of Alameda, Marin, and Fresno that have all been focused very much on the standard reimbursement rate and the regional market rate.

The second workforce gap that was highlighted in the report with was the lack of centralized source data on
individuals in the ECE workforce. And the consistent sort of solution that was proposed in lots of interviews was a focus on the registry project, which is already being piloted here in Los Angeles. San Francisco is the other copiloter of the strategy. And in this way it's been explicitly described as sort of the aspiration for this project to work as a catalytic agent to basically pilot it and then have other sources of funding come in to adopt it and bring it to scale.

So that would be funding that would support broader participation in the project and dissemination of the outcomes of the registry project, research and evaluation, as well as information sharing, in order to expand and improve data alignment so that it would not just be a pilot in Los Angeles and San Francisco, but that it would actually grow to be a full statewide system. The other roles there to emphasis our catalyst funder and policy advocate.

The third workforce gap that we described in the first reports was a lack of alignment across qualifications, competencies, and workforce preparation. Here the sort of most recurrent role that people raised up was that of convener. And that is essentially a neutral convener that could help sometimes not so aligned parties come to agreement on common standards, and those would be
common standards that would address basic educational qualifications between Title 22 and Title 5, standardized pathways for education and professionalization between the community colleges and CSU system, a system more at the level of program design for practicum and field work sites for the state budget cuts. A number of the practicum and field work sites that were previously funded by community colleges and CSU have been defunded and so now the moment is again burgeoning where people are starting to wonder where the next generation of high-quality providers will actually get their practicum work done.

And then the idea of scaling. What we know now is promising, but smaller practices and that would be scaling practices around cohorts of nontraditional students, around supports and advisement through the community college and the CSU system, advisement course transfers and, of course, financial aid.

Again, the role here -- the roles here most regularly lifted up with that of convener, advocate, and funder. And the shining examples of where they are beginning to do this work are San Francisco, Santa Clara, and San Diego.

In terms of the quality gaps that were identified, the big one, which is both the fort of issue for children and families providers as well as a data
issue is that we do not yet have a fully developed countywide QRIS. The low saturation or participation rates here tell the story pretty clearly. It's nine percent of all centers who are currently participating in the countywide QRIS and two percent of family childcares. So some of the direct funder work could be around the expansion of the QRIS efforts in LA county. It could also be around funding the expansion of QRIS in a more targeted way just around outreach and recruitment. And then, of course, the policy and advocacy systems play there is to fund advocacy either in-house for First 5 LA through contractors or through grantees to promote a state or federal -- state or federal funding program for QRIS in California.

The other thing to note that there is that this is -- this is a field where there is a lot of work being done. So San Francisco and San Diego are quite active. The First 5 association, which is the statewide coalition group of all the 58 counties and First 5 California have all expressed considerable interest in this.

The second gap that we highlighted in terms of quality rating improvement systems was that the current systems are not funded for sustained and long-term quality improvement. And so, again, it gets to the issue of funding, but it's more around the level of what -- what
levels of quality people are being benchmarked at who are participating and already in the system. So right now it's 43 percent of rated sites have a four or five rating. And the goal obviously would be to push that number higher. The way to do that would be to actually fund direct enhancements of quality improvement and support offered to people who are already participating. And the very expensive part of that is the funding of coaches and QRIS evaluators, which examples of, again, First 5 San Francisco and San Diego and Santa Clara have done evaluation studies to show that they're very effective but quite expensive.

The last quality gap -- and this is one that is not unique to the QRIS program, is that infants and toddlers are not widely served or represented by QRIS programs. So the strategy that could be pursued there many of which are a replay the access expansion strategies that John described earlier in the presentation. It could also be an effort to undertake a specific outreach to incentivize QRIS participation, in particular to family childcare homes.

And then last example of a strategy comes from, again, First 5 San Francisco where they have essentially a pre-QRIS intake effort, which is sometimes for license-exempted providers, sometimes for family childcare
providers who are not yet at a high enough level of
goodness to serve or to participate in the QRIS system, but
essentially need basic literacy skills, basic accounting
skills, basic safety training that will take them
essentially to give them an entry point or an on ramp
onto a QRIS system.

So in terms of conclusions, I should highlight a
couple of strategies that certainly cut across the workforce quality and access meta categories,
and that is to say certain strategies and roles are
definitely present in all three of those, in particular
license exempt and finding an on-ramp to bring
license-exempted providers to becoming licensed and within
the formal systems; secondly, the issue of standard
reimbursement rate and the regional market rate; third,
the coaching and advisement function which implicates both
QRIS as well as workforce data systems that would produce
and support quality for the workforce and QRIS school
district partnerships which have the potential to increase
access, increase the level of workforce training. And,
lastly, policy and advocacy which cut across and QRIS
workforce and access.

These are essentially what we presented as a menu
of potential options. As John mentioned, there isn't yet
an application of weights or filters. And, obviously, the
next steps that make sense are to think about what
strategic levers you all have already adopted and are in
the process of thinking through to determine the
feasibility, the fit, and the appropriateness of
strategies that have proven successful in other
geographies but are question marks for LA.

The other piece of the analysis that has also
been highlighted by John at the outset was that we are --
we are not alone here in LA and we're fortunate to have
many private funders who are also very excited to think
about sort of what the next iteration of ECE policy is.
We've had request already from the California Community
Foundation, the Partnership For Infants and Child
Development Investment, from Packard, and also from First
5 Santa Clara to have the results of this benchmarking
work shared with them so that they can essentially take up
some of the best practices that have been learned
elsewhere.

So I think maybe I'll just close by saying that
we envision this as an opportunity to inform the ongoing
strategic planning effort and are here to answer
questions.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Questions? I can't believe
it.

MS. BROWNSON: We talked you under the table.
MR. KIM: We win.

MS. BELSHE: One thing I want to note, if I may, just to acknowledge the extraordinary amount of work that The Advancement Project has undertaken on its own in concert with our program development colleagues and really the broader LA county community. I think, as evidenced by the last comment you just made, there's a lot of interest in this project. So this is not just about the landscape as it relates to First 5 LA; it's really about the LA county urban landscape and opportunities to inform how we think about our work as well as others looking to have it help inform their work as well.

And I was just saying to -- to Duane, it would be really helpful as a next step working with our strategic planning team is building upon your excellent presentation of gaps and needs in these three critical areas and some illustrative strategies where there's some experience, some of which is First 5 LA, much of which is by others, to then look at our roles associated with each of the strategies and then begin to use that to layer our levers. So I think there's just a rich amount of information here that can be used in a very concrete and effective way to inform some of the important decisions that the commission has.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Neal.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So the first was, we were very wise to hire you. I think we take almost no credit for that other than that it was a great decision and really very, very impressive presentation. I think part of the silence is the number of things that are in our brains.

I guess I can think of two things: One is the area you didn't really talk about, which could be foundational is evaluation of all of the things you're talking about. So for example, you mentioned that Orange County has EDI, Early Developmental Index. We don't. I don't know how well that's done, but I know it's international and the like. So there's a number of things which we have not done but we've always talked about.

MS. BELSHE: Done in a much lesser scale.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: A very modest, not scalable scale.

But looking at how you evaluate the impact on children's readiness to enter school, if you want to use that as the error point or whatever, and I would like to comment on that in a report, not necessarily today because I really do believe that one of the things that we could -- we should consider and we should do -- Armando is shaking his head over there -- looking at both how do we better fund evaluation of actual early care education
settings. But actually the second part -- I think we're actually doing that. The second part though is, how do we create the capacity to understand by individual and by neighborhoods how individuals are doing, and we're always looking for our neighborhoods that are doing well when you expect them not to. So that's one part to.

MR. KIM: You want more spider maps, don't you?

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I want positive data. I want to be able to understand for many reasons, if we recognize that ECE is one of the core methods by which we're trying to improve outcomes by the time the child turns five, if we don't have evaluations that are measuring those outcomes, particularly in a cognitive, emotional, social, perhaps physical health also, but the other two in particular, we're not going to be able to answer the question of whether we've made any difference.

That's the second question I want to ask you. And I know you were not hired to tell us to make a good investment. Not counting 580 million to LAUP, we spent two or 300 million, 400 million? I have no idea. You guys probably know that someplace. There's all these other things. Have we gotten anything for our money? You're going to tell me I can't answer that. I'll say, yes, because we don't have EDI or something else, but I have no way of knowing, over 15 years, other than LAUP
which we're evaluating -- that's part of the whole world
if not the whole world -- did we get a return on our
investment. Are we better off than we would have been --
are the young children of LA county better off because we
were here. You weren't asked to do that. But I'm sure
you have some impressions or ideas or maybe challenges.
Give us some ideas of how we may go about doing that.

And then the final comment is, again, we were
very wise to get this done at this point because we are
now looking at what our next activity is. The fact that
you've got the bulk of it done, if not all of it done
right now, when we're looking at how they can handle that
ECE line on our major part of our strategic plan, I think
it's very, very helpful and your efforts will not be
forgotten because they're going to help us really figure
out at some level what our next steps are.

So thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: John and Kim, in the -- in
the presentation when you talked about license exempt, you
talked about it from a providers' perspective and your
recommendations with regard to those providers and our
work from (inaudible). In the full report, does it talk
about the children in the care and recommendations as to
possibilities and options that we can invest in and work
around in those children who are in license-exempted care
considering that most of the -- a large number of those children are poor kids, you know, of color? And there are decisions being made to have those children stay, you know, by caretakers in those license-exempted situations. So is there a discussion around possibilities for those kids who are in care and who will probably stay in care for some period of time?

MS. BROWNSON: So it's interesting because I -- when we undertook this work, I expected that we would find lots of examples of other county commissions who are doing interesting things with license exempt, and we did not find very much. And it became recurrent enough of a gap that I -- I basically asked all of the interviewees, are you doing anything on license exempt, and they pretty unanimously people said no.

The -- the area in which there is now some new interest, and it's part of their new strategic plan, is the Packard Foundation has just adopted some strategic initiatives to increasing quality and licensing pathways for license-exempt providers. I think they've just adopted that as part of their strategic plan in late March, so have not yet unveiled any grant making around that particular strategy and how it will play out.

The closest analogue is the example of First 5 San Francisco which actually wasn't about license exempt
at all, but was about trying to figure out how to bring along family child care homes, which, as we all know, disproportionately serve more infants and toddlers than other parts of the system, and actually came up, as part of our dream team of sort, advisory group; the idea of applying that model of what San Francisco is doing with family child care homes to do outreach to license exempt, to bring them along into a pathways toward licensing. But sadly we have -- we have not found much.

The place where they're -- I have sort of an and then statement, is, essentially, that -- that is a very highly probable candidate for a white paper to sort of look at other geographies beyond California as to how they're reaching out to license exempt. It's a fairly unique thing. There are other states that don't allow license exempt, as we well know. So it's -- it's a harder one to benchmark, but I think --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And it's an important issue in the county. You know, it's an issue that I'm, you know, advocating around for the last like seven years. And it's really a problematic issue when you look at the new quality trajectory that's coming from the state and the federal government and license-exempt kids are not in that mix. They're not even eligible for those funds. So when we talk about Best Start and early Head Start, those
kids are not there. When we're talking about QRIS, those
kids are not there. And we have thousands of those kids
in this county, many of whom are infants and toddlers.

MR. KIM: But if you recall, we do in the
contract answer any questions 1, 2, and 3 by June was the
primary bulk of the work, and then we had set aside enough
resources for three white papers. So as Kim mentioned, we
could potentially allocate some of those resources to
focusing a little bit more on that particular question.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That would be great.

Anybody else? Any other commissioners? Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: I guess that the one question
that comes to mind -- actually, thank you very much. This
has been good. Really almost going to a banquet and
going all of this.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I was thinking more of a
tsunami.

MR. KIM: We were looking for shock and awe.

COMMISSIONER AU: I can only nibble here and
nibble there.

MS. NUNO: Better than a tsunami.

COMMISSIONER AU: I guess the nagging question I
have is that, even though we had invested quite a
significant amount of dollars for preschool -- quality
preschool for four year olds, it's obvious that it's just
been a drop in the bucket because, in your landscape analysis, you know, we kind of just like a blip in terms of how significant are -- our investment has been in impacting in the whole area and arena of ECE here. So it's sort of sobering at the same time. And, clearly, the notion I got was First 5 LA can't do this alone. Obviously, we can't do this work alone.

So the next question for -- for me becomes, what would then be the most strategic way to look at this and to position ourselves. And this is where -- is there a next step in terms of your work in doing this sort of -- this very quick and almost amazing work, but it's still quick and dirty, right?

MR. KIM: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER AU: Is there a way for us to take it to the next level so we get a bit more refinement? Because I think it's becoming really clear to me, especially when we made ourselves in principle say to ourselves we will be as much as possible driven by data and information, good information before -- we'll be very informed as we make these kinds of decisions. Is there further refinement that can be produced by taking this one step further? Do you -- because we really -- we can't afford to -- to sort of fiddle around with this anymore.

MR. KIM: Sure, sure.
COMMISSIONER AU: And our declining revenues, we really have to be quite wise in terms of where we invest further dollars. So, yeah, is there a next step?

MR. KIM: Sure. Just to quickly respond to your comment, the question about, you know, when we do the landscape scan about the remaining need, it is pretty stark. But the thing that sort of we consider when we look at this is how much more stark would it be if First 5 had not been there making some investments. As you guys think about your next five years, the idea was to set this baseline. And the biggest struggle of that project was actually how to get the information to you all. We're talking about hundreds and hundreds of pages of maps and projects on some of this stuff.

And so our next steps for this particular contract is now to actually publish the reports and to publish the findings in online ways to create other venues for us to engage other stakeholders. And so later this summer actually, after we go back and forth with final edits with the program development staff, our hope is that you guys have access to a more refined, more nuanced intensive sort of reading of what it is that we presented because we have essentially taken about 400 pages of work and presented it to you all in I think about, you know, three short presentations.
So I get the sense that it just kind of zooms by you. But the hope is that the reports will actually give you even more time than the tsunami.

MS. BELSHE: If I could offer a couple of ideas. Number one is, something we need to talk with the Advancement Project about is your capacity, bandwidth, resources to support dissemination beyond online and other kind of technology-based strategies, your ability to get in front of the some of the other folks who share our goals and interests around quality early learning countywide, such as the partners of the LA Compact. That would be a great opportunity to talk about these findings in the context of cradle to career, college and career.

Second, as I noted a moment ago, I think there's a -- there's a matrix in our future that will -- where we can take these gaps and suggested strategies and roles that First 5 LA or others would play relative to those strategies and use that to help inform our thinking about our role going forward to effect the outcomes that will be finalizing on Monday around ECN and other areas.

So I think there's really some rich information that we now, working with our strategic planning team, can use to bring more focus and more concrete ideas back to the commission.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: To me, the next step is to
think about rules and possibilities which may be as far as we go in the plan or a little bit further, and there's still six months after November to be looking at what real strategy does that mean. Because we don't have to decide 150 or whatever you gave us which one it will be. That's not strategic plan. That's an implementation plan. So we have to really define what we need to decide within the strategic plan that guides the implementation plan that's in the next six months.

MS. BELSHE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. All right.

Folks, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(At 5:07 PM, the meeting was adjourned.)
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