1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dennis.

Chair Dennis went around the room and had everyone introduce themselves, including the public, and welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. Review and Approval of Program & Planning Committee Meeting Notes from August 26, 2013:

THE ITEM WAS RECEIVED AND FILED

3. Best Start Implementation Update

Ms. Ellis gives an update on the implementation of Best Start, indicating that the presentation today would be a continuation of the discussion that staff had with the Commission on September 12. She informs the Committee that she and her team welcome the opportunity to discuss and provide further clarity on any of the information that was provided to the Commission that the Commission did not have an opportunity to delve into.

Ms. Ellis states that the objective of the discussion today, will be to help the Board better understand the results-based approach that is currently under development and to discuss the Board-level issues that the Best Start team needs in order for key considerations to be made.
Ms. Ellis gives a recap of what was discussed at the last Commission meeting. She highlights the following important decisions that were made at the last June 26 Board Retreat:

1. The endorsement of the Building Stronger Families Framework
2. Approval of the 6 core results (3 family level and 3 community level) of the framework
3. Approval of criteria for selecting activities to be supported
4. Approval of a framework for measuring progress

In addition, Ms. Ellis gives a recap on the following that was also covered at the September 12 Commission meeting:

1. Current work
2. Partnership Capacities to advance the Building Stronger Families (BSF) results
3. “Learning by Doing” Approach
4. Funding approach
5. Draft Implementation timeline

Ms. Ellis informs the Committee that they will focus on three areas today. The three areas are Partnership capacity review, “Learning by Doing” Approach, and the funding approach options. Her goal, as she states, will be to reinforce the elements of the framework that are anchored to First 5 LA’s overarching goals and focus on achieving outcomes in the 6 result areas. She reminds the Committee that these 6 result areas are as follows:

**Family-level**
1. When parents are better able to manage stressors and understand what to expect during their children's various developmental phases, they can provide a more nurturing environment for them;
2. Likewise, positive social connections influence parental feelings, beliefs and behaviors towards their children; and
3. Learning to ask for, access and sometimes provide help is essential to strong and healthy families.

**Community-level**
1. High quality, accessible and culturally sensitive services for families are an essential component of a healthy community;
2. Community members need to have a shares vision and avenues to act collectively to improve the policies, services and environments what impact children and families; and
3. Families need safe places and spaces that promote healthy living and encourage social interaction

Ms. Ellis goes on to provide background to the BSF Results-Focused model. She reiterates that the strength of the BSF framework is grounded in achieving the 6 core results. She states that staff is using a structured and consistent method for accessing and tracking results-focused partnership capacities. In addition, staff is developing ways for partnerships and the Commission to learn more about First 5 LA’s implementation of Best Start.
Ms. Ellis now provides the Committee with an update of all the activities that have taken place, since the Board endorsed the BSF framework back on June 26. She highlights some of the work that is being undertaken agency-wide, including work of an interdepartmental team that was assembled for the purpose of developing a comprehensive implementation plan. In regards to aligning the framework to First 5 LA’s countywide activities, staff has already developed a decision-making process of how countywide programs would be assessed in order to determine whether or not they align with the BSF core results. Staff is also conducting an analysis of programmatic investments alignment with the BSF framework organization-wide.

She informs the Committee that over the past couple of months, all 14 partnerships have received orientations regarding the BSF Framework and are now engaged in working sessions where they are learning more about the framework, its 6 core results, and the partnership capacity self-assessment, which is anticipated to be completed by the end of October, 2013.

Ms. Ellis now hands the presentation over to Ms. Negron, who will give a recap of the Partnerships Capacities to implement the framework.

As mentioned at the September Commission meeting, Ms. Negron states that Partnerships are an important part of community capacity building strategies.

Partnerships are charged with leading community change processes and implementing and mobilizing people and resources to achieve the results that we seek. The effectiveness of Partnership is dependent on its strengths of their capacities in 6 key areas:

1. Keepers of the Vision
2. Building Community Capacities
3. Resources and Sustainability
4. Effective Collaboration
5. Inclusive Governance
6. Data-driven Decisions, Learning and Accountability

It is important to have a common understanding of Partnerships current level of capacity in order to determine what action is needed and what kinds of support is required to get the Partnerships to an effective level.

Ms. Negron reminds the Committee that today’s discussion will highlight the initial findings of where staff is in identifying Partnerships’ current level of capacities.

If the Committee recalls, Ms. Negron says that the initial review involved three of the 6 capacities. It showed that Partnerships possess foundational capacities to develop into results-focused partnerships, where they continue to be committed to First 5 LA’s vision, value parent and resident leadership, and to continue to build the infrastructure that is needed to pursue results-focused work.

As noted in the September Board memo, Ms. Negron states that the process of developing Partnerships’ capacities is intended to support learning and development. It is not meant to be punitive. This process includes three steps that are to be completed by October 31, 2013.

**Step 1**: Staff’s initial review of the Partnerships’ capacities
Step 2: Partnerships will complete a self-assessment in the 6 capacities. These self-assessments will be done in a consistent manner and process by an external facilitator.

To date, 11 Partnerships have already started the self-assessment process. For each Partnership, 8-24 members, with diverse perspectives and experiences in the community, have been asked to participate in this process. The process takes about 8 hours over a span of two-4 meetings. The self-assessment is intended to deepen the Partnerships understanding in their role of leading results-focused community change processes and the capacities needed to be an effective strong Partnership.

Ms. Negron goes on to inform the Committee that what Partnerships have learned from this self-assessment is that they are gaining the clarity that they wanted of their own capacities and the expectation of their role and function, in achieving the results that we seek. In addition, based on Partnerships’ current level of capacities, they are able to determine what can be done immediately to lead a community change process.

Ms. Negron also highlights the fact that what has come out of these self-assessments is that First 5 LA still needs to rebuild the Partnerships’ trust in its processes. There is still a level of apprehension from Partnerships in engaging in yet another process/program led by First 5 LA.

Step 3: The third and final step will be for staff and Partnership members to complete a collective assessment together, known as a “collaborative conversation”. Staff and Partnership members will enter into a conversation in order to gain a better understanding and more clarity about the roles of Partnerships and capacity in achieving results. These results are intended to provide a baseline data, identify supports needed to strengthen capacities effectiveness in results-focused Partnerships, and inform their “learning by doing” actions.

As next steps, the results gathered from this collective assessment will be shared with the Board at the November, 2013, Commission meeting.

Ms. Negron now hands the presentation over to Mr. Fierro, who provides a brief review on the “Learning by Doing” approach and its relationship to Partnerships capacities.

Mr. Fierro begins by giving a brief recap of how staff is being intentional with assessing the capacities of Partnerships. He goes on to share how findings from this assessment will be used to assist Partnerships in focusing on a family core results within the framework that is grounded in evidence.

Mr. Fierro reminds the Committee that at the September 12th board meeting, he had walked the Commission through a presentation on the “Learning by Doing” approach, and had included an example to illustrate how the approach would be conducted in the community, so that partnerships could begin focusing on a family core result within the framework.

He happily announces that all communities have received an introduction to the “Learning by Doing” approach during Working Sessions that have been held, and that from these sessions, the community was able to get a better understanding of the BSF framework.

Mr. Fierro notes it is imperative for communities to select a core result in the early stages of implementation because it builds upon the work that has been done to date, and is more
likely to resonate with them in achieving greater results. And because the three family core results and three community results are interrelated, movement has the potential to impact others, which Mr. Fierro assures the Committee, will be tracked from the very beginning.

Mr. Fierro provides the Committee with an example:

He gives a scenario where it is assumed that a community partnership has decided to focus on Concrete Supports in its time of need. Parents know how and where to obtain services needed for their family. This would include informal supports, like friends, neighbors and friendship that have been formed within the partnerships, where they could serve as a source of support during difficult times. Mr. Fierro goes on to state that learning to ask for, assess and find – and sometimes provide – help, is essential to achieving strong and healthy family results.

At this early stage, Mr. Fierro says that in order for communities to be strategic in implementing the framework, it is important for Partnerships to select a target population. He reminds the Committee that this process will be informed by data that has been gathered and analyzed. As mentioned previously, this would include empirical evidence as well as the community’s wisdom – gatekeepers, organizations – that would indicate what is currently working well and what not so well.

So far, based on the data that the community partnerships have analyzed, staff has determined that they would like for there to be a focus on parents of young children whom experience maternal depression.

This population is seen as vulnerable because:

1. Parents that are depressed are more likely to abuse/neglect their child
2. Depressed parents are less likely to develop a close bond/attachment with their child, which could result in behavior problems later in life. If this happens, it will impede a child’s social emotional development and impact how they view themselves (self-esteem) and interact with others – withdrawal, social weariness, anxiety
3. Brain research indicates that normal brain development is hindered

This data will also assist in developing objectives and activities (evidence-based/promising practices) – that are also based upon Board approved criteria.

Mr. Fierro now gives a hypothetical scenario: A community has identified Welcome Baby as a means of connecting depressed mothers with services in the community. However, the community has determined that there are not enough services available locally. More importantly, various stigmas are present within the community that inhibit depressed mothers from admitting they are depressed, so there is a less likelihood of them even obtaining the much needed services. Some of these stigmas are:

1. The feeling of depression is a normal everyday part of life
2. Fear of losing their child if it were revealed that they suffer from depression
3. Concern that medications are necessary
4. Do not want to be perceived as being crazy
In response, Communities have identified that they would like to engage in a community awareness campaign in order to mitigate some of the stigmas that are associated with maternal depression. The goal would be to advocate for more services to be available locally. In addition, they would like to focus on places where parents of young children usually attend – doctor’s office, WIC, etc where mothers could ask about maternal depression and be offered a list of services that are available to them.

Mr. Fierro states that Community Partnerships Performance measures will be established before launching any activities so that progress can be tracked from the beginning. Some of the things that will be tracked are:

1. How do they measure progress
2. What is the timeline for them to complete their activities
3. How do they know that the what they are doing is making an impact

It will be during this point in the process that partnerships will be able to identify the capacities they possess, and through their self-assessment that Leanne spoke about, they will be able to be more intentional on building their capacities to be more result-focused and aligned with the BSF framework. This process will also allow them to determine what community resources are needed to successfully execute the activities they want to engage in.

After this step, Mr. Fierro says that the community will prioritize activities that are low cost, no cost and ones in which there is potential to leverage or build upon existing efforts, in an effort to impact the family core results that they seek. And given that they will be tracking their progress, community partnerships will be able to identify if they are making progress towards achieving the core result, and/or if there needs to be a shift to re-focus in order to achieve better results. By doing this, it allows communities to report progress to the Commission on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Fierro reiterates to the Committee that this process that he just covered, is a recap to the “Learning by Doing” approach that was presented at the September 12 Commission meeting. He notes, though, that he had used a different example at that Commission meeting.

He now goes on to the next slide in the presentation. Mr. Fierro says that this slide outlines how First 5 LA, as a learning organization, has started implementing Learning Communities to model the “Learning By Doing” Approach internally. He also highlights how First 5 LA intends to do this with every community partnership in order for it to leverage and mobilize resources to achieve the results that are sought within the Building Stronger Families framework, across all 14 communities.

Mr. Fierro reminds the Committee that the overall purpose of the Learning Communities is to develop and advance a common vision, facilitate the exchange of information and have a systematic way to improve efforts to achieve the core results within the framework. In doing this, it will allow community partnerships and First 5 LA to have shared accountability and the ability to take collective action on advancing the BSF framework.

As organizational learning for First LA, the successful implementation of Best Start is in part contingent upon First 5 LA’s ability to encourage, support and systemize shared learning among staff and Commissioners.
To date, Mr. Fierro says that First 5 LA has held 8 learning institutes for Best Start staff to further their knowledge on place-based work and components of the BSF framework. In addition, Mr. Fierro states that staff and participants have also learned more about the Community Partnership’s self-assessment process that Ms. Negron discussed previously, as well as the leadership role that would assist the community’s transition in achieving the core results.

Mr. Fierro goes on to give a quick overview of what Ms. Ellis discussed at the September 16th Commission meeting. He reminds the Committee that First 5 LA currently has six interdepartmental teams working collaboratively on the implementation of Best Start. The intent is that this will help garner an agency wide support and understanding on how the implementation process can be accomplished – to avoid silos and duplication of efforts.

In addition, Mr. Fierro states that there have already been three all staff meetings held to inform staff about place-based theory and practice, the BSF framework, and the protective factors.

Mr. Fierro concludes with saying that Best Start Community Learning Exchanges provide the platform for cross-community dialogue and learning in real time to help inform changes needed in a timely manner. This process ensures for quality improvements to implementation of activities on the ground.

Given that communities are executing different strategies/activities, Mr. Fierro says that they will be able to take advantage of the lessons learned from other communities so that they can have the opportunity to implement those strategies that have the potential to achieve the results that they seek for their community.

In summation, Mr. Fierro says that First 5 LA is one of several organizations that is working to improve conditions within communities to improve results for families. He states that it has always been the intention for community partnerships to leverage and mobilize resources.

In addition, he states that staff has already identified and connected with other funders, programs, county systems, and stakeholders to understand and leverage other efforts. Mr. Fierro says that the learning community focuses on building relationships, cultivating collective will, integrating efforts, when possible, and mobilizing resources to advance the vision and achieve results.

Mr. Fierro states confidently that place-based approaches connected with local and regional context, results in long term sustainable change at the community level.

He now hands the presentation back to Ms. Negron, who will discuss the funding approach that is needed to support the implementation of the BSF framework.

Ms. Negron begins this presentation by reminding the Committee that staff plans on bringing to the full Board, in November, a comprehensive Implementation plan that includes a Funding Approach recommendation, spanning from January 2014 through the end of the Strategic Plan in 2016.

She goes on to reiterate to the Board that in order for Partnerships to lead a Community change, they will first need a stable infrastructure of resources and the capacity to leverage, influence and redirect resources toward the results they seek. It is with this
understanding that Ms. Negron says staff will develop a funding structure that promotes a focus on achieving results.

As a reminder, Ms. Negron says that the funding options include the following:

1. Tiered funding based on each Partnerships capacity
2. A single Best Start funding level to support all Partnership
3. Equal funding to support each Partnership with phased access to funding based on its performance

Ms. Negron states that First 5 LA is finding that the last two options are influenced by how the structure is implemented. For example, she says that option 3 may actually promote a focus on funding levels. Based on First 5 LA’s experience, it has found that when staff enter into discussions with Partnerships that includes a determined funding level, then the focus becomes more about the funding, rather than the actions that should be pursued that can be low-to no-cost or that can be leveraged or supported by other resources.

Ms. Negron says that staff recognizes that all three options are dependent on appropriate budget projections. She concludes her presentation by asking the Committee for its input.

Chair Dennis now asks the Committee if they have any questions, beginning with Commissioner Kaufman.

Commissioner Kaufman says that he likes the presentation and would like to comment on the three topics one at a time, beginning with the funding approach. He does not understand the funding approach and would like for staff to explain what the difference is between the three options.

Ms. Negron says that the first option is based on the Partnerships capacities. One option would be to do a tiered level of funding. Before Ms. Negron proceeds, Ms. Chough interjects and says that it is helpful to provide a little more context to the Committee and informs the Committee that it is important to think of the money, in general first, in three different areas before proceeding:

1. The total allocation that has been allocated for the 14 Community Partnerships
2. The determination of how much money is to be given to each of the 14 community
3. And on what basis should be used to determine how much each partnership would receive funds

In response, Commissioner Kaufman asks what happens to funding as capacity goes up, since it appears that a partnerships capacity is one of the criteria used to determine how much money it would receive.

Ms. Negron says that in option 1, First 5 LA has not yet determined whether or not a partnership would receive more funding if its capacity is at a higher level or less, if its capacity is at a lower level.

Ms. Belshé adds to Ms. Negron’s answer by indicating that under option 1, there will be differentiated funding based upon the outcome of the capacity review that has been completed.
Commissioner Kaufman states that there should be some type of scale that determines, based on the capacity review, if a community’s capacity is at a specific level, then it would possibly receive more funding or less funding. Commissioner Kaufman needs the scale to be more specific in order for him to determine which level of funding would be the appropriate one.

Ms. Negron says that this is the exact conversation that staff is currently having and that they have not yet determined the criteria for communities to receive funding.

Commissioner Au would like Partnerships defined and who constitutes partnerships before going into the funding options. However, Commissioner Kaufman would like to do the funding first, since this is the item that matters the most at the end of the day and that would require a vote.

Ms. Belshé suggests that Partnerships is defined by staff first before proceeding with the funding approach, since the capacity of partnerships is key in advancing results oriented community partnerships.

Ms. Negron explains that partnership members made up of diverse stakeholders of the community and are inclusive. ie. residents, parents, representatives of local services, county representatives, funders, and businesses.

Commissioner Au would like to know if one of the criteria for determining partnership capacity is to be diverse.

Ms. Negron answers yes.

In referencing one of the handouts, Commissioner Au would like to know, of the 6 items, why membership is not on the handout as one of the criteria for determining partnership capacity.

Ms. Belshé responds by saying that under inclusive governance on the handout, there is stakeholder representation and demographic diversity that is capacity related. To further her response, Ms. Belshé adds that a community can have a lot of stakeholder representation and demographic diversity, but if there is non-meaningful engagement leadership by residents and parents, or collaboration, then there would be an incomplete capacity present. She also adds that within the 6 core capacities, there are 22 measures used to determine the different levels of capacity.

Commissioner Kaufman would like to know why the focus is only on Partnership capacity. He feels that First 5 LA is leaving out two other capacities that are just as equally important: Community Capacity and Individual Capacity. If a community has great capacity, then Partnerships are not needed because they are working fine without them. Doesn’t understand why these two capacities are not being used to determine how much funding a community should receive.

Commissioner Kaufman feels that there needs to be a more defined way of determining whether a community is a low/moderate/high need community with a low/moderate/high capacity/resource in order to determine how much funding is allocated to these communities. The criteria needs to be clearer on whether or not more funds are given to those communities that have a greater need or given to those that have a greater capacity.
Commissioner Kaufman is not clear on what direction First 5 LA is trying to take with its funding approach.

Commissioner Au piggybacks on Commissioner Kaufman’s comments and informs staff that if she were someone who is a parent, raising children and faced with many economic challenges, and one of them being trying to get food on the table and optimizing opportunities for her children, she doesn’t think that all of this would resonate with her.

Commissioner Au then goes back to the framework and says that there needs to be more of a focus on building stronger families. She feels that if staff does not focus on this, then the focus of the framework is lost and First 5 LA will not be able to achieve the results that it seeks.

Ms. Belshé responds by saying that the focus on partnerships is just one key part of the BSF framework. She reminds the Committee that First 5 LA does have the Family Strengthening Welcome Baby/Home Visitation program that is fundamental in their work with Best Start.

Ms. Belshé also reminds the Committee that Community Partnerships is just one investment that First 5 LA is supporting and the reason why there is a focus on it today is because it had been the part that was on hold, pending further direction from the Board.

Commission Browning says that the funding options that sticks out to him the most is option #3, since it appears to be the only option that is performance-based. He says that in order to make these programs viable, there is a need to base funding levels on performance. He would like to know if it were possible to make the other two options tied to performance as well.

Ms. Negron responds affirmatively.

Commissioner Curry says that she hasn’t been involved with place-based efforts as much as Commissioner Kaufman or Commissioner Au so is not as well versed on this topic as they are. She does note as an example, though, that there are a lot of children who end up with DCFS and would like to know what types of support services do Partnerships help to provide to prevent these children from ending up there in the first place.

Ms. Belshé responds by reminding the Committee that the core results, also known as the protective factors, is a fundamental approach in achieving the results of the Building Stronger Families framework. The protective factors have the following strengths:

1. Universal- regarding all families
2. Strength based- not deficit based
3. Asset based- fundamentally prevention in nature because the evidence is clear that if families have these capacities, then there is a higher likelihood of reducing abuse and neglect, and increasing child readiness for school

Ms. Belshé also notes what is exciting about the new framework is that First 5 LA is no longer focusing on services that remediate problems, and instead is investing on approaches that support strengthening individual families and communities to support parents.
Commissioner Curry refers back to the maternal depression example and would like to know what it is that First 5 LA does, through partnerships, to help women who are suffering from maternal depression seek the services that they need.

Ms. Fierro responds by informing the Committee that First 5 LA would assist in connecting service providers with those individuals who need it. So part of First 5 LA’s job will be identifying the service providers within these individual’s communities and then assist in connecting those in need with them.

Ms. Belshé reminds the Committee that First 5 LA is not funding services, and instead supporting capacity building.

Commissioner Curry says that if the focus is on supporting capacity building then there needs to be other funding sources secured in order for this to be successful. Commissioner Curry is concerned about the sustainability of this program without other funding sources secured and that there needs to be some type of long term financial plan in place.

Ms. Belshé asks Commissioner Curry for clarification on what she is referring to in regards to her concern over sustainability. She would like to know if it is the sustainability of the partnerships or services that Commissioner Curry is referring to?

Commissioner Curry responds and says that she is concerned about the sustainability of the partnerships, especially if the partnerships viability depends on the resources that First 5 LA provides. She furthers her statement by saying that it is important for First 5 LA to stands by what it says it will do. Trust is important to establish with the communities, given the history that First 5 LA has had.

Ms. Belshé acknowledges that there is a trust issue present that does pose as a potential barrier in achieving the results that the framework seeks.

Commissioner Delgado feels that the focus on Partnerships is the way to go. However, he comments that partnerships are the hardest way to go. Take meetings for example, it is extremely difficult to gather a group of people together on a regular basis that would be required to get the impact that is needed in order to achieve the results that the framework seeks.

He goes on to comment that option 3, if there is a baseline, would be the best way to determine the amount of funding that is required to assist these communities in achieving their results. In addition, Commissioner Delgado wants First 5 LA to keep the program simple, in order to get the community to understand the process of achieving results. If it gets too complicated, then the rate of success of achieving results will decrease. He also feels that First 5 LA should not focus on micromanaging how communities spend the funds that are given to them. He feels instead, that there needs to be more of a focus on the results that are yielded.

Ms. Belshé acknowledges that the work with Best Start is difficult to do and that First 5 LA is trying to lead a change process within communities.

Chair Dennis now asks Commissioner Bostwick for her comments.

Commissioner Bostwick comments that she appreciates the examples that have been given today. She likes that fact that a lot of what First 5 LA is supporting is not costly. She
agrees that all communities should be given a base amount of funding and then based on performance, possibly be provided with additional funding. She would like to see a breakdown how much the projects would cost that First 5 LA would be supporting.

Commissioner Au comments that she does not want what happened to the Spa Council/Children Council to happen to Best Start. The idea/concept of the Spa Councils was a great idea, but was difficult to maintain, so residents left. And as soon as others found out that there was no longer money on the table, they also soon left the council as well.

Commissioner Au wants to ensure that money is not a motivator for participants to be involved with the Partnerships. There has to be something that resonates with the community that would keep them engaged.

Commissioner Dennis summarizes the discussion by saying that the issue at hand is whether First 5 LA should provide more funding to those that are at a higher capacity or provide less funding because they have a lesser need?

In addition, Commissioner Dennis would like to know who decides on who gains membership access into these Partnerships. Who governs this? He notes that there will be people who would like to know what is it that they need to do in order to gain access into these partnerships. And most importantly, Commissioner Dennis says staff readiness is extremely important to the overall success of Best Start. Staff needs to be properly prepared and trained in order for them to train the partnerships, themselves.

Commissioner Dennis would like staff to come back, at the next meeting, prepared with answers to all the questions and concerns that have been raised today.

He further concludes that staff should come back in October with an expanded illustration of the funding approach and options that were presented at today’s meeting. He says this is necessary in order for the Commission to be properly informed and be able to take a vote at the Commission meeting in November.

4. Early Childhood Education (ECE) Landscape and Budget

Ms. Muñoz informs the Committee that she is here today to provide an update on the ECE Environmental Scan scope of work, to bring the Committee information about the budget. She begins by giving a bit of background information regarding the ECE landscape. She reminds the Committee that back on July 11, 2013, the Commission directed staff to develop an environmental scan of the early care and education (ECE) landscape in LA County. The purpose of the landscape was to provide the Commission with a comprehensive picture of the ECE-related issues and activities in Los Angeles. In addition, to inform First 5 LA’s consideration of its role and contribution to increasing kindergarten readiness within the LA County, and guide future decision making regarding First 5 LA’s strategies, investments and partnerships related to ECE.

Ms. Muñoz says that the landscape will focus on the current capacity and gaps in relation to services, workforce, and quality improvement, including their implications for kindergarten readiness. This was all done while keeping in mind the whole continuum of out-of-home early learning, which includes Licensed – such as Center Based centers and Family Child Care homes and license-exempt care which includes the Family Friends and
Neighbors Population. The scan will review service types and service levels, populations, funding, and resources.

Ms. Muñoz goes on to inform the Committee that there are three overarching questions that will guide the work:

1. What is the landscape for ECE in LA County, which includes looking at impending and significant federal and state issues or changes that are looming which could have an impact on the ECE Landscape in LA Co?
2. What have been the past roles, strategies, and where possible, their effects around ECE for First 5 LA, other County Commissions and other ECE funders?
3. What are the potential future roles and strategies for First 5 LA and others?

Ms. Muñoz would like to note that these questions are the same questions that were proposed by the internal team in collaboration with the contractor. However, she reminds the Committee as stated in previous presentations, one of the tasks the contractor will undertake, to complete this work, is to convene advisory/stakeholders group to discuss project orientation, research questions and design. Essentially, the proposed activities outlined in the contract are flexible.

She reminds the Committee that First 5 LA has identified the Advancement Project to conduct this work based on its unique qualifications.

Its qualifications are as follows:

1. Professional Expertise
2. Existing relationships with local and state government agencies, foundations, nonprofits, and state and local officials
3. Extensive data use agreements with partners that will enable them to access and analyze data quickly.
4. Technology platform – HealthyCity.org which has interactive module to help audiences understand findings
5. Previous work – with us in the Save My Seat LA project which covered extensive research around ECE services and gaps. This will give the project a beneficial head start.
6. Because they are a current contractor, First 5 LA will have a timely project launch since it will be able to use an existing contract to initiate the work. Then, given their unique qualifications, we will secure an AB 109 Exemption for the rest of the project.

Ms. Muñoz informs the Committee that before she moves on to the budget, she would like to mention that First 5 LA will be presenting this work plan both at the Program and Planning Committee meeting and the September Commission Meeting. The recommendation given at the September Commission meeting was that staff considers looking at successful, evidenced-based strategies that are being implemented in places other than Los Angeles County, relative to the three segments of the ECE scan, in order to provide a benchmark for its work.

The Board also suggested Commissioning university faculty to publish white papers to add knowledge to the field. In response to this recommendation, Ms. Muñoz informs the
Committee that staff will work with the Advancement project and stakeholder group to assess where there may be gaps in the ECE landscape plan that could be addressed by commissioning white papers.

Ms. Muñoz informs the Committee that the total allocation being requested for this project is $581,600. She also goes on to indicate that this amount isn’t unprecedented since First 5 LA has made significant investments in the past, informing its planning efforts. She reminds the Committee of the Universal Preschool Master Plan that was a two-year effort, requiring a $3.7 million investment.

Ms. Muñoz says the first task will be to identify the current landscape, which will include over 1600 hours of professional expertise, where a total of 6 staff members and consultants would be used to engage in obtaining stakeholder input; overseeing research teams; designing research questions, producing a literature review, and overseeing the research methodology.

The second task will be to identify past roles and investments, which would include 864 hours, 7 staff members plus consultants, whom would collect data from key stakeholder interviews with identified First 5 LA County Commissions and other ECE Funders, for the purpose of summarizing, analyzing and synthesizing research findings on current and past roles.

The third task will be to utilize 614 hours, which includes 7 staff members plus consultants, whom would facilitate discussions to gather input on future roles and strategies from the advisory group and First 5 LA Leadership, based on findings to date from the research in order to prepare advisory meeting materials and summarize convenings.

For each of the first three tasks, the contactor will also review, revise, and publish findings and a report. In addition, they will create an online site to display research findings for public access and dissemination.

First 5 LA has also allocated enough hours for disseminations of findings so that the research could be utilized by the broader ECE Community, along with regular project management for check-in’s and presentations to the board.

In summary, Ms. Muñoz informs the Committee that the $581,600 budget will allow for over 3300 hours, which is approximately 8 months of project time, research design, data collection and analysis, highly qualified staff and consultants, a web based platform to disseminate findings, in addition to three reports that could be utilized by the larger ECE community. The contract is also flexible so that in the event First 5 LA is able to identify areas where commissioning white papers would enhance the project, it would be able to do so in a timely manner.

She also informs the Committee that next steps would include bringing this item to the full Commission in October as an action item. The projected start date is October 11, 2013, one day after the October Commission meeting, with an anticipated completion date to be June 30, 2014.

Ms. Muñoz now asks the Committee for any questions they may have.

Commissioner first begins by stating that this project with Advancement Project will help inform others, not just First 5 LA, to help move an agenda around ECE.
Mr. Jimenez says that this landscape will definitely help to identify the gaps with ECE so that they can be filled. Staff will have the data that is needed in order for them to do this as the Advancement Project carries out this program.

Commissioner Dennis feels that the Advancement Project leading this project is great, given their role with Save our Seats. He asks that Staff come back with a timeline of deliverables so that all Commissioners can understand what time frame they are looking at for each phase of the project. It needs to be more specific and not just a sketch of the costs that are associated with each deliverable.

Commissioner Curry would like to know how this will be connected to Policy.

Ms. Belshé responds by saying that there is a Policy aspect to it that James Lau, our Policy Director, will be covering and incorporating into this project.

Commissioner Au would like to have endorsement from the Commission on this item. Commissioner Dennis says that since this item is on the consent calendar, there does not need to be a separate presentation at the October Commission meeting for there to be an endorsement on this item.

There is no further discussion on this item.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.

**NEXT MEETING:**

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be taking place as follows.

Monday, October 28, 2013  
1:30 pm – 4:30 pm

First 5 LA  
Multi-Purpose Room  
750 N. Alameda Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Meeting minutes were recorded by Linda Vo, Secretary to the Board of Commissioners.