AGENDA
COMMISSION MEETING
Chair: Yvonne Burke

Thursday, April 10, 2008
1:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

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

Item 1  Call to Order / Roll Call  ACTION

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 2-3)

Item 2  Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes  ACTION
  • Thursday, March 13, 2008
    o Yvonne Burke

Item 3  Approval of Monthly Financials  ACTION
  • February, 2008
    o Anthony Bellanca

COMMISSION: (Items 4 – 10)

Item 4  Announcements by the Commission Chair  INFORMATION
  • Yvonne Burke

Item 5  Executive Director’s Report  INFORMATION
  • Evelyn V. Martinez

Item 6  Receipt and Acknowledgement of the 2006-2007
Annual Report from First 5 California  INFORMATION
  • Evelyn V. Martinez

Item 7  Discussion on LAUP Counter Proposal
to First 5 LA Commission Action of
November 28, 2007  INFORMATION
  • Yolanda Bosch

Item 8  Approval of the 14 Recommended Applicants
as Outlined in the COF Funding Recommendations Report  ACTION
  • Teresa Nuno

Item 9  Approval of the Staff Recommendation in Response
Proposed Revised Requirements for Future
Funding Approvals  ACTION
  • Teresa Nuno

Item 10  Public Comment  INFORMATION

A public entity.
Item 1

Call to Order / Roll Call
Item 2

Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes

March 13, 2008
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Commissioners:
William Arroyo (Alternate)
Nancy Au (Arrived @ 2:10 pm)
Yvonne Burke (Chair)
Cynthia Harding (Alternate)
Evelin Stockwell
Corina Villaraigosa
Carolyn Wilder

Ex-Officio Commissioners:
Jacquelyn McCroskey
Connie Russell
Deanne Tilton
Harriette Williams

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Commissioners:
Jane Boeckmann (Excused)
Jonathan Fielding (Excused)
Neal Kaufman (Excused)
Marv Southard (Excused)

STAFF PRESENT:
Evelyn V. Martinez, Executive Director
Carol Baker, Director of Public Affairs
Anthony Bellanca, Finance Director
Yolanda Bosch, Director of Grants Management
& Legal Compliance
Armando Jimenez, Director of Research & Evaluation
Teresa Nuno, Director of Planning & Development
Maria Romero, Executive Assistant

LEGAL COUNSEL:
Craig Steele, Attorney-at-Law

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

1. Vice Chair Fielding called the meeting to order at 1:37 pm.

RECEIVED

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 2 – 3)


The minutes of March 13, 2008 were amended to reflect that Commissioner Stockwell had received several letters from parents during the discussion of Item 5: Approval of the Full Cycle 2 School Readiness Initiative Funding (Option 1) For an Amount Not-to-Exceed $42 Million.

M/S (Angie Stockwell / Carolyn Wilder) APPROVED AS AMENDED
3. Approval of Monthly Financials – December, 2007

M/S (William Arroyo / Cynthia Harding) APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

Approval of Monthly Financials – January, 2008

M/S (William Arroyo / Cynthia Harding) APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

COMMISSION: (Items 4 - 9)

4. Announcements by the Commission Chair

RECEIVED

Commissioner Burke welcomed Connie Russell as the newest member of the Commission. Ms. Russell joins us with over 40 years of experience as an educator of elementary and special needs children. Commissioner Russell will be representing the Policy Roundtable for Child Care on the Commission.

Commissioner Burke made the following designations for her term as Chair of the Commission for 2008.

- **Operations Committee:** Commissioner Jonathan Fielding will serve as Committee Chair. Other Commissioners appointed to the Operations Committee are Neal Kaufman, Jane Boeckmann and Carolyn Wilder.

- **Public Affairs Committee:** Commissioner Harriette Williams will serve as Committee Chair. Other Commissioners appointed to the Public Affairs Committee are Deanne Tilton and Corina Villaraigosa.

- **Planning Committee:** Commissioner Jacquelyn McCroskey will continue to serve as Committee Chair.

Commissioner Stockwell asked if the Commission could consider having term limits for Committee appointments so that Commissioners could have the opportunity to serve on the different Committees not just the same Committees each year.

Executive Director Martinez commented that these types of issues could be addressed through bylaws amendments and asked the Commission to consider doing this. The Commissioners were agreeable to this suggestion. Executive Director Martinez will work with legal counsel on the process for amending the bylaws.

Commissioner McCroskey commented that Commission policies and procedures were also being addressed as part of the strategic planning process.

5. Executive Director’s Report

RECEIVED AND FILED
In addition to the written report, Executive Director Martinez reported on the following Commission-related issues:

- **2006-2007 Annual Report for First 5 California:** First 5 LA has received copies of the 2006-2007 First 5 California Annual Report submitted to the Legislature and Governor. The report is available on the First 5 California website (www.ccfc.ca.gov) which is linked from the First 5 LA website (www.first5la.org).

6. **UPDATE: Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP)**

Director Bosch reported that at a Special Commission Meeting on November 28, 2007, the Commission approved a motion that, in part, stated the following:

*To Approve a FY07-08 LAUP budget not to exceed $60 million; that LAUP's FY07-08 scope of work was approved to scale back to conform to $60 million budget approval amount; and, that First 5 LA staff should meet with LAUP to produce these two documents.*

In addition, at that meeting, the Commission asked that First 5 LA staff report back to the Commission at this March 2008 meeting regarding the status and progress of these items.

Director Bosch also commented that at the Commission's direction, First 5 LA staff scheduled a mutually convenient meeting with LAUP staff for January 23, 2008. First 5 LA staff was then directed to cancel that meeting at the request of Supervisor's Burke office. This meeting was later re-scheduled for March 5, 2008 and was attended by First 5 LA and LAUP staff as well as Deputies from both Supervisor Burke and Knabe's offices. The FY 07-08 budget for the period January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008 and the SOW were discussed. It was agreed that LAUP would provide these documents to First 5 LA in a timely manner. Since then, LAUP has submitted the documents and First 5 LA has worked very hard to review these documents and to move forward.

Director Bosch also reported that a counter proposal to the action the Commission took at the Special Commission Meeting of November 28, 2007 had been presented to Supervisors Burke and Knabe earlier in the week by LAUP. Executive Director Martinez was also sent a copy by LAUP which has been given to staff for analysis. Since the staff analysis of the counter proposal has not been completed, the item was not placed on the Commission agenda.

Commissioner Stockwell asked for clarification on the LAUP counter proposal. Executive Director Martinez commented that the proposal had been sent to the Commission Chair and she wanted to obtain direction from the Commission Chair as to whether a copy of the counter proposal should be distributed to all Commissioners. Chair Burke thought it would be a good idea for all of the Commissioners to get a copy of LAUP's counter proposal for their review.

Chair Burke stated that she had no intention of politicizing anything related to LAUP and First 5 LA. Chair Burke defined politicizing to mean a political person getting involved with the granting of money, or who it goes to, or the amount, if goes to them. Chair Burke also stated that she felt her responsibility was to resolve obvious problems that exist between both organizations. After speaking to Supervisor Yaroslavsky [immediate past Commission Chair], he seemed to feel it was his responsibility as well. Chair Burke further commented that it had been obvious to her, at her first Commission meeting, that there was tremendous disagreement between First 5 LA and LAUP.
Chair Burke commented that she realized that whatever was solved, it always helps if there can be some type of follow through, not just to the end of her term but for the future. Chair Burke also commented that it was obvious to her that it would be very important for the Vice Chair of the Board [of Supervisors], who is Supervisor Knabe, for him to join in any kind of discussion to try to resolve these issues. Supervisor Knabe was interested in doing this and felt that he had every right to be involved, just like he has the right to appoint someone to the Commission as well as the LAUP Board, as all Board [of Supervisors] members do.

Furthermore, Chair Burke also commented that she took issue when it was indicated that the process was being politicized because Supervisor Knabe was involved. Chair Burke commented that she did not believe this was the case. Chair Burke commented that she believed that any time you have a Chair and a Vice Chair of an organization, who is going to be the next Chair of an organization, it is appropriate for that person to be involved, if you are going to be talking about some of the things we were talking about which occurred two days before she took the position of Chair. Chair Burke said that while saying this, any time anything happens two days before someone takes an office, and it’s a specially called meeting, the person takes a look at it a bit closer than if the special meeting had taken place 30 days before they took over the responsibilities. Chair Burke said that she took a look at the statements made at the Commission Meeting of November 28, 2009 at 7 by staff of the both organizations, and subsequently sent a letter to First 5 LA and LAUP signed by both Supervisor Knabe and her. The letter stated “we have become increasing concerned about the disagreements and issues that exist within First 5 LA and LAUP. The problems between the two Boards and Executive Directors came to the forefront at a special meeting at the end of last year. We are eager to resolve these disagreements in order to move forward for the next two years in a manner that will allow for entities to magnify their potential to serve the greatest number of children. We acknowledge there are valid arguments on the side of each agency that must be recognized as well as personality conflicts that have developed, and these matters must be resolved right away. Please submit to us within the next two weeks the conflicts you have with the other organization and their Directors, we will ask them to do the same. When these areas of disagreement have been identified, we’ll set up a meeting for frank and direct discussion of how these issues can be resolved so that we can move forward. We hope that in the spirit of children, and their best interests, you will respond to our request so that the next two years can be met with greatest stability.”

Chair Burke stated that she did not consider these remarks to be interference. She considered this an attempt to work out a valid problem that cannot be swept under the rug. Chair Burke further stated that this is something that would be in the interest of everyone to resolve.

Chair Burke also mentioned that regarding the meeting that was to be held, there was never any intention to cancel to the meeting but to reschedule it hopefully after the meeting between the leadership of First 5 LA and LAUP had taken place as requested in the correspondence that had been sent. Chair Burke commented that she had received a number of things from each organization. For instance, Executive Director Martinez had shared that she felt LAUP did not respond to First 5 LA’s requests, that such responses did not come in a timely manner, and there were members of the LAUP Board who had said things that were unkind about members of the First 5 LA staff and the Commission. These issues have made it very difficult for First 5 LA to work with LAUP.

Chair Burke said that on the other hand, LAUP felt that there was antagonism and that they would be unable to carry out what they were required to do as a result of the November motion.
that was passed. If the number of children was increased, then capital expenditures could be worked for this year; but it would be difficult to serve the number of children being anticipated by the capital and facilities that were being developed. LAUP expressed that they had not had a clear expectation.

Chair Burke commented that as she understood it, the expectation First 5 LA has of LAUP is that they serve approximately 10,000 or 11,000 children. Her understanding is that LAUP, at present is serving 8,600 children.

Chair Burke said that she was the kind of person that if you have any difference with her, if you call her, and if you feel that there is something that is not based upon law or bylaws, first call me and you will get all the facts. She said she was not interested in causing consternation, not interested in causing problems, but if anybody believes there is no problem here, they have their head in the sand. Chair Burke said that there were serious problems and thought that a resolution to these problems should be attempted. Furthermore, Chair Burke expressed to everyone that if they felt that her trying to resolve these problems is a political act or violation of the bylaws, then the bylaws should be changed. As such, Chair Burke stated that a meeting did take place and believes that things are moving in some kind of direction. Chair Burke said that she was sorry that she had caused this type of consternation in trying to resolve problems, but believed these problems can be resolved and should be resolved. Chair Burke said that she thought that if there are things that LAUP is doing, they should respond and they should provide information. Chair Burke said that if the Commission has questions about LAUP spending money that is not in their budget, LAUP needs to have a budget and has to submit it in a timely manner. Chair Burke also said that she was not sure how the relationship should be between organizations but, there should be some consistency about what is the expectation based on the allocation of funds.

Chair Burke said that everybody has trouble with funds. Everyone knows there is less money coming to First 5 LA because of yearly declining revenues. Chair Burke recalled that she was present when the first $500 million was voted upon. Chair Burke also recalled that she had gone to all the taskforce meetings, chaired by Nancy Riordan and Bob Hertzberg, where there would be discussion on how universal preschool would be carried out. Out of this, it came about that LAUP would raise money. Chair Burke said that the money has not been raised. Everyone knows this but Chair Burke also thought that the Commission needed to look at this in terms of which came first. This was an organization that was created by First 5 LA and the Commission should approach it this way. Chair Burke encouraged a response to this issue.

Commissioner Stockwell commented that it was her understanding that First 5 LA and LAUP had ongoing meetings. Was this not accurate? Director Bosch responded that this was correct but that the meeting being referenced at today’s meeting was specific to the budget and scope of work.

Chair Burke commented that there was disagreement as to what happened prior to coming up with some kind of resolution and whether the Commission needs to vote to have further meetings to discuss the November 28th motion. Chair Burke asked for clarification from legal counsel.

Legal Counsel Steele commented that if the Commission was going to repeal the motion approved on November 28th, then yes. Furthermore, Legal Counsel Steele stated that if the Commission wanted to direct staff to engage in further discussions, then certainly the Commission can do this. Legal Counsel Steele commented that based on his correspondence (a
privileged document), the intention of staff was to set out where the Commission stood as of the day the motion was passed. There was a vote by the Commission in November, that directed staff to implement a motion and to come back to the Commission in March; and essentially, have the motion implemented with a report as to how the motion was being implemented.

Chair Burke inquired about staff having some direction as to not to do that. Legal Counsel Steele responded that staff felt that because meetings had been cancelled or postponed, staff was going to be delayed in implementing the motion.

Chair Burke commented that those meetings were on the budget for six months but these issues were different. Legal Counsel Steele commented that the point of the November motion was the six-month budget and six-month workplan.

Chair Burke commented that she thought the motion was a long term motion over a period of years. Legal Counsel Steele responded that the motion specified a short-term and a long-term implementation.

Commissioner Villaraigosa asked what was the purpose of the LAUP counter proposal. Chair Burke clarified that basically, it was to modify the amount that was allocated relating to the number of children that have to be served. The counter proposal was a response from LAUP to the November motion passed by the Commission.

Executive Director Martinez commented that in doing a quick review of the counter proposal, it amounts to LAUP requesting a no-cost extension and that any interest acquired on the $580 million investment should be allocated to them, which was approximately $58 million.

One of the concerns that Executive Director Martinez has was that First 5 LA had not been able to get a cost per child ratio. This is a key piece of information that is needed from LAUP to prepare an analysis of their proposal. At the meeting with Supervisors Burke and Knabe, LAUP agreed to provide a timeline as to when seats would become available, the costs for the new slots, the cost for the providers, and the number of providers receiving LAUP funding.

LAUP also agreed to provide First 5 LA with the number of contracts that LAUP had with providers, the number of children served under each of those contracts, a timetable of when seats currently under construction would come online, and the number of children coming on board over a period of time.

Executive Director Martinez commented that it is staff’s objective to provide unbiased information for the Commission to make its decision.

Chair Burke commented that there was never any discussion on changing the six-month budget. The discussion focused on how to move forward. In short, on November 28th, the Commission passed a resolution and a motion that made a considerable curtailment in terms of LAUP funding and future allocation of funding, year-by-year. LAUP’s response to that motion was the counter proposal as to how this affects them.

Chair Burke commented that the interpretation of the November 28th motion by LAUP was that they had 90 days to respond. Chair Burke also said it was reasonable to expect this type of response from LAUP given the level of curtailment in their funding.
7. UPDATE: Legislative Update

Director Baker reported that since Government Affairs staff members last updated Commissioners about health care reform efforts and other legislative matters at the Commission meeting of January 10th, a number of significant developments have occurred, including:

- the failure of the health care reform bill crafted by the Governor and state Assembly leadership. The proposal, which passed the Assembly, received only one vote in the Senate Health Committee, where it died. The bill would have drawn funding from First 5's Healthy Kids programs.

- the failure of a Republican health care reform funding bill authored by Senator Dave Cox (R-Fair Oaks) that would have stripped First 5's of their funding. This bill also died in the Senate Health Committee.

- assertions by Senator Cox and two of his GOP colleagues that First 5's are “sitting on” $2 billion in unspent funds and spending money on bogus programs. These allegations were made at a Capitol news conference covered by the Sacramento Bee and repeated in other media venues.

Director Baker also reported that of significant concern is the state's continued budget crises and the possibility that First 5 funds — now under intensified scrutiny by legislators — could be diverted to help fill the $16 billion budget gap. Senate Budget Chair Denise Ducheny made a public statement in a Budget Committee hearing last week to the effect that Prop 10 revenues need to be considered (along with other off-budget special funds) as a way to keep services intact, especially those services that can bring in federal financial participation, like Medi-Cal. So far, no formal budget proposal exists to seize First 5 funding, a move that would require a two-thirds majority vote.

Laying the ground work for a State-wide response to criticisms by Republican Senators, First 5 California and the First 5 Association have gathered information from County Commissions to explain fund balances and show positive outcomes. The intention is to share that information with legislators. First 5 LA and Commission staff members in Orange County, meanwhile, are tailoring a separate response that we hope to extend to other First 5's in the Southern California region for use as an educational tool with legislators.

8. UPDATE: Early Developmental Screening and Early Intervention Initiative (EDSI)

Director Nuno reported the EDSI project completed its second year at the end of November, 2007. The second year of the project focused on completing the planning, design and implementation of the learning collaborative, detailing the policy leveraging report and agenda, and piloting a parent education session within WIC centers in Los Angeles County.

Director Nuno also reported that as the EDSI project enters Year 3, areas of focus include continued work with the pilot Learning Collaborative, planning for the expansion Learning Collaborative that is slated to launch in several new geographical areas in September 2008, coordinating EDSI with STEP activities, planning for the policy meeting in June 2008, adapting the parent education curriculum for use in additional WIC programs, and working with the state ABCD team and local policy efforts to build a more favorable environment for EDSI goals.
With the implementation of Best Start LA, another area of focus during the third year will be pursuing opportunities for integration and joint leveraging with BSLA and other First 5 LA investments.

9. Public Comment

Gary Mangiofico, CEO, Los Angeles Universal Preschool

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:38 pm.

The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be on:

February 14, 2008 at 1:30 p.m.
Multi-Purpose Room
750 N. Alameda Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Meeting minutes recorded by Maria Romero.
Item 3

Approval of Monthly Financials

February, 2008
Los Angeles County Children and Families First -
Proposition 10 Commission
Statement of Net Assets
February 29, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Assets:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>1,178,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash- Morlin Mgmt Corp</td>
<td>26,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating and Allocated funds *</td>
<td>868,367,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current assets</td>
<td>869,573,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building - Net</td>
<td>13,036,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Equipment - Net</td>
<td>515,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fixed assets</td>
<td>13,551,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$883,124,828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities and Net Assets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>1,782,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities</td>
<td>9,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current liabilities</td>
<td>1,791,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in capital assets</td>
<td>13,551,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>865,491,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreserved</td>
<td>2,290,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net assets</td>
<td>881,333,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</td>
<td>$883,124,828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Operating and Allocated funds - Included within this investment account is approximately $11.3 million intended for operating expenses for the next 12 months.
Item 4

Announcements by
the Commission Chair
Item 5

Executive Director's Report
To: Board of Commissioners  
From: Evelyn V. Martinez, Executive Director  
Date: April 10, 2008  
Subject: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

I. BEST START LA

First 5 LA staff attended the Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County’s 7th Annual Health Care Symposium in Long Beach on February 15, 2008. The subject of the symposium was “Innovations and Challenges in Caring for the Underserved.” More than 330 health care professionals were also in attendance. First 5 LA was an exhibitor at the event and promoted many of the Commission’s investments, such as Best Start LA, Welcome, Baby!, Oral Health and Nutrition, and Healthy Kids, to the health care community. The Commission’s Children’s Mental Health Policy Fact Sheet was also distributed at this event.

At the March 25, 2008 Best Start LA Commissioner liaison meeting Hershey Cause presented a series of options for the Best Start LA logo and liaisons selected a logo for this investment area. Commissioners were presented with the programmatic elements, timely leveraging strategies, sustainability considerations, and related costs for a potential investment in Family Place Libraries. Staff was directed to continue efforts to develop a final budget and investment approach for this program for presentation at the July 2008 Commission meeting. Staff and Commissioners also discussed potential investments to increase the role of hospitals in encouraging and supporting the initiation and duration of breastfeeding. Staff will continue to collect data and programmatic information to formulate a recommended investment approach to present to the Board in September 2008.

The Best Start LA Sustainability Request for Proposal was completed with input from the Best Start LA Commissioner Liaisons. A Strategic Partnership will be established as approved in September 2007 by the Board and the RFP to solicit candidates will be posted on the First 5 LA website in April.

The Commission’s strategic partnership with ZERO TO THREE will launch in May 2008. ZERO TO THREE will carry out the Best Start Workforce Development Building Block strategies.
II. STRATEGIC PLAN 2009-2014

As part of the current strategic planning activities, the consultant team has completed Commissioner and Director interviews. All Commissioners were contacted by the team and those available were interviewed. The objective of this engagement was to discuss key issues such as the overall role of the Commission in sustainability, accountability, and initiative development processes. The information gathered from these interviews will be used to organize thematic ad-hoc Workgroups where both Commissioners and staff will participate in order to begin the work of framing key Commission priorities and policy decisions. The proposed workgroups correspond to the following thematic areas: Role of the Commission, Measures of Success, and Early Learning. The consultant team anticipates that there will be other discussions that come out of these initial workgroup sessions. The outcomes of these workgroups will be shared in public planning meetings.

It is anticipated that these workgroups will begin in early April 2008 and run through early May 2008. Workgroup assignments will be made by the consultant team in accordance with the expressed areas of interest stated by each Commissioner. All Commissioners will be contacted by the staff strategic planning team in order to ensure participation across all thematic areas of discussion as well as to begin scheduling the workgroups.

III. HEALTHY BIRTHS INITIATIVE

Since receiving Board approval of the Healthy Births Initiative (HBI) Expansion Framework at the November 2007 Commission meeting, staff released a Request for Proposal (RFP) on February 15, 2008. The approval of the Healthy Births Expansion extended the existing Initiative infrastructure to include funding for an additional two years for the current Best Babies Collaboratives (BBCs) and three years for the Los Angeles Best Babies Network (LABBN) in addition to detailing plans to fund three additional BBCs. The purpose of the Initiative Expansion is to continue the ongoing effort to create a comprehensive, integrated model of continuous perinatal care for at-risk women throughout Los Angeles County.

Through this RFP, First 5 LA seeks one Lead agency in each of three additional geographic areas to form collaborative partnerships with at least three other agencies to provide a comprehensive set of perinatal services to women at-risk for poor birth outcomes. The three BBCs selected through this process will be funded for three years and located in the following geographic areas: Harbor Corridor north, San Fernando Valley, and San Gabriel Valley. Proposals were due March 28, 2008. Following a comprehensive review process, grantees will be selected and contract negotiations will begin. The three new BBCs are expected to begin implementation July 1, 2008.

IV. ORAL HEALTH NEEDS ASSESSMENT STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

The California Endowment has recently joined the Strategic Partnership formed by First 5 LA, the Annenberg Foundation, and California Wellness Foundation to jointly support a $711,000 Oral Health Needs Assessment (OHNA) Project conducted by the University of Southern California (USC) School of Dentistry to: 1) collect information about the status of children's oral health needs in LA County for 0-5 population only, and 2) survey and assess the capacity of oral health care resources available to children in LA County.

First 5 LA will leverage up to $236,500 of its funding from the Oral Health and Nutrition (OHN) Expansion and Enhancement Project. In December 2007, the California Endowment approved an allocation of $130,500 for the OHNA Project; the Annenberg Foundation and California Wellness
Foundation had previously approved $159,000 and $185,000 respectively. The OHNA Project will produce critically needed data that will inform the OHN Project’s policy, public education, and direct services objectives. Furthermore, the data produced through this strategic partnership will help inform other county-wide planning and policy development efforts as they relate to improving the oral health status of children and families.

As the contract with USC is finalized, staff has met several times with USC School of Dentistry to provide input and guidance on the Scope of Work for this Project and to ensure that the final product meets the Commission’s expected outcomes. This partnership is a unique opportunity to collaborate with other foundations and explore other possible leveraging opportunities.

V. ORAL HEALTH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

First 5 LA launched its second funding cycle for the Oral Health Community Development (OHCD) Project and released a Request for Proposals (RFP) to prospective water agencies on January 31, 2008. First 5 LA is conducting outreach to eligible water agencies interested in implementing an OHCD Project. Information Meetings regarding the OHCD Project were held in February 2008 at First 5 LA. Four water agencies submitted Letters of Intent to submit an OHCD Project proposal by the March 7, 2008 due date. OHCD Project proposals are due April 17, 2008. OHCD Project funding to water agency(ies) will begin in September 2008 following a thorough review and selection process.

First 5 LA also released a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to prospective water systems design expert(s) on January 25, 2008. First 5 LA seeks a qualified water systems design expert(s) to assist staff in the OHCD Project proposal review and Project implementation process. Staff conducted extensive outreach to water design engineers and firms. Staff contacted more than twenty (20) firms in Los Angeles, Orange, and Riverside counties to announce the release of the RFQ. In response to staff’s request, the American Water Works Association (AWWA) notified AWWA California members of this RFQ. Proposals were due on March 7, 2008 and no proposals were received.

The $20 Million OHCD Project was approved by the Commission in September 2007. The Project will allow communities in LA County to optimize fluoridated water level to prevent tooth decay, especially in young children. The OHCD Project leverages existing fluoridation efforts of the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) by assisting cities throughout LA County achieve optimally fluoridated water levels. This Project supports First 5 LA’s efforts to effectively integrate its initiatives. It enhances infrastructure in services and education established through previous Commission investments and builds on existing community strengths and assets by coordinating efforts in First 5 LA Priority Areas. Funding priority for this Project will be given to water agencies proposing to provide optimally fluoridated water to First 5 Priority Areas. Staff continues to consult with Commission’s liaisons and the expert panel identified by the Commissioners in the development of this Project.

The implementation of the OHCD Project is affected by the high level of concentrated and extensive public education needed at municipal level by which water agencies move their policy decision-making to obtain local approval for providing optimally fluoridated community drinking water.
VI. CROSS CUTTING APPROACHES (CCA)

First 5 LA has entered into a contract with the Economic Roundtable (ERT) as approved by the Board in November 2007 to build on the resource maps initially created for Best Start LA to further support the Cross Cutting Allocation (CCA). The Best Start LA report will be expanded to include population indicators and services for four to five year olds and map additional indicators specifically related to CCA's outcomes of civic engagement, parental supports, and social connections which as key components of the CCA approach will be applied at the community level.

The intent of community mapping is to understand not only the demographic profile of the twelve priority communities as outlined by the resource maps but to also engage local stakeholders to present their neighborhood-based perspective of the assets and resource gaps in their communities. Data collected is expected to inform our strategic planning process and the communities we engage. The Economic Roundtable's contract period spans from February 2008 to January 2009. The Commission liaisons on CCA include Commissioners Nancy Au, Harriet Williams, and Neil Kaufman.

VII. EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

The Commission's Early Care and Education (ECE) Workforce Development Initiative (Initiative), with an approved allocation of $15 million, is multifaceted in order to address the continuum of needs of the ECE workforce and the complexity of barriers faced by this group.

Staff has been consulting with Commissioners Harriet Williams, Carolyn Wilder, and Angie Stockwell on various aspects of the development of the Initiative's six components, including the High School Recruitment (HSR) Pilot Program component. The goal of the HSR Pilot Program is to encourage more young people to consider ECE as a career goal by providing high school students with information, resources, and internship opportunities in the ECE field. First 5 LA received proposals on April 4, 2008 from collaboratives requesting funding to implement a HSR Pilot Program. Through HSR Pilot Programs, First 5 LA aims to ascertain what strategies are effective in recruiting high school students to participate in ECE career preparation activities. HSR Pilot Program proposals were required to include a collaborative consisting of at least one high school and one two- or four-year college or university. Collaboratives could also include community-based organizations. Four million dollars has been allocated to fund HSR Pilot Programs. Programs submitting a proposal for funding can request up to $800,000 over a four-year period. More than 40 people representing 33 organizations attended Information Meetings held in March 2008. HSR Pilot Programs will be selected after a comprehensive internal review process which will include external reviewers. Contracts for selected agencies are expected to begin July 2008.

VIII. POLICY AGENDA

On January 24, 2008 First 5 LA hosted the Best Start LA (formerly known as Prenatal Through Three) Policy Roundtable to discuss the progress on the policy goals relating to infants and toddlers that were previously established by the group. There were representatives from over 23 government and community-based organizations along with the participation of five Commissioners including Nancy Au, Neal Kaufman, Angie Stockwell, Deanne Tilton, and Harriette Williams. All present exchanged updates and ideas in areas of interest: prenatal/pregnancy, family nurturing practices, strengthening families, early childhood education/childcare, neighborhood/community environment, and early intervention. Staff
presentations included an update on other Best Start LA activities and a briefing on the First 5 LA Policy Agenda.

Dr. Sam Chan gave a presentation to the Policy Roundtable relating to the Mental Health Services Act: Prevention and Early Intervention Component. He gave an in-depth overview of the process being utilized to receive information and feedback from the community regarding the disbursement of funding, focus on non-traditional settings for prevention and early intervention work, and types of program models sought. Meeting participants exchanged ideas on collaboration strategies for educating colleagues and decision-makers about early childhood mental health.

On March 3, 2008, the Policy Liaison Workgroup was convened to discuss the Policy Department’s activities and accomplishments since the September 2007 approval of the First 5 LA policy agenda. The Liaisons, consisting of Commissioners Marvin Southard, Angie Stockwell, and alternate Cynthia Harding, received updates on the projects that policy staff is currently engaged in and offered feedback and strategy suggestions. Activities discussed include research and monitoring of the 22 items contained in the policy agenda; community outreach and engagement efforts; providing policy support to all internal teams on development and implementation of First 5 LA initiatives; working together with Public Affairs to develop an internal legislative agenda that complements the policy agenda, and analysis of state and federal legislation. Staff also relayed information to the Liaisons regarding current developments, successes, and challenges encountered on the three ‘immediate action’ items on the Policy Agenda—health care reform, preschool, and the Mental Health Services Act as well as plans that are underway for action on other items in the Policy Agenda.

Notable movement on the outcomes the Commission identified as priorities in the First 5 LA Policy Agenda at the federal and state level include: federal approval of requested improvements in Head Start and Early Start; inclusion of social-emotional indicators in the California Preschool Standards; and the setting by the state of a minimum percentage of the Mental Health Services Act: Prevention and Early Intervention funds for children, transitional-age youth, and families. Staff is monitoring the participation of local hospitals which have earned UNICEF “baby-friendly” status, which is shown to improve breastfeeding outcomes. Positive progress was seen in increasing the number of hospitals that have earned full “baby-friendly” status and others have committed to working towards this goal.

Outreach to existing and potential allies has been an important focus. Staff is active on a variety of coalitions and policy networks to ensure that opportunities to forward the goals are captured. In an effort to educate the community-at-large of First 5 LA’s policy efforts, staff has presented the policy agenda to numerous groups including the County’s Child Care Policy Roundtable, the Early Identification and Intervention Collaboration, the Alliance for Better Communities, Public Counsel, First 5 grantees and funding applicants. Staff is coordinating with the Public Affairs Department to design and publish a document communicating First 5 LA’s first public policy agenda to partners, potential allies, opinion leaders and decision makers. The brochure which is anticipated to be completed in April will be used as a tool to promote both the policy agenda and the organization’s newly heightened role in policy reform.

In addition to staff’s regular participation in the Los Angeles County Perinatal Mental Health Taskforce, staff recently attended a conference held in L.A. on March 19, 2008. It was entitled “Building Capacity to Address Maternal Depression”. Hosted by First 5 LA’s Strategic Partner the L.A. Best Babies Network, the conference featured workshops which addressed the following issues: the impact, impairment, and importance of maternal depression; an overview and discussion of current county resources available to assess, counsel, and treat women with
maternal depression; and training on the use of a maternal depression screening tool (the PHQ-9). Dynamic in nature and richly informative, the conference offered substantive ideas and strategies for increasing maternal depression screening in Los Angeles County.

IX. IMPLEMENTATION OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

In July 2007, the Commission approved the implementation of grantee capacity building and sustainability activities during FY2007-2008. This approval included authorization to begin the 18-month grantee leadership development program, the Annie E. Casey Leadership in Action Program, during FY 2007-2008 at an estimated cost of $280,000. In October 2007, after significant staff research, planning and discussion, the Commission was informed of the decision not to continue with the strategic partnership development with the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Commissioners supported this decision but also reiterated the importance of implementing leadership development program(s) for First 5 LA grantees in the immediate future. The attached overview details the updated plan for implementing two leadership development programs for current and former grantees beginning July 1, 2008.

X. GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

First 5 Funds

First 5 Association
In efforts to preserve First 5 funding and to dispel concerns raised about commission fund balances, First 5 Association Executive Director Sherry Novick and local commission executive directors from Riverside and Imperial counties recently met with Democratic Sen. Denise Ducheny, Chair of the Senate Budget Committee, who earlier had expressed interest in tapping First 5 funds to help close the state budget gap. During the meeting Ducheny specifically stated her interest in how Prop. 10 revenues might be used to leverage federal dollars, meet federal maintenance of effort requirements, or otherwise relieve pressure on the state budget. She also suggested that the First 5 Association reps testify at future Budget Committee hearings to explain local commissions’ use of funds. Later, First 5 reps who spoke to Ducheny said she seemed to have a greater understanding and appreciation of First 5 funds, although declining federal dollars in health care and other programs most likely will diminish dollar-leveraging prospects.

First 5 LA is working with the Association to outreach to the state’s Latino Caucus in an effort to rally their support for protecting local commissions’ funding. Outreach will be initiated by a letter to caucus leaders signed by Latino commissioners throughout the state.

First 5 LA
First 5 LA’s Government Affairs team has met with fiscal and policy analysts for the Assembly Republican Caucus to talk about the importance of First 5 LA local investments, provide information about the organization, and answer any questions that they might have, especially about the fund balance. The team also met with staff for a number of members of the L.A. delegation. Within the next few weeks leading up to the governor’s May (Budget) Revise, the Government Affairs team will continue to meet with Democrat and Republican members of the L.A. delegation – particularly members of the Budget, Education and Health committees – to inform them, and their staff, about the positive impact that First 5 LA investments make in the districts the lawmakers represent.

Since January 2008, Government Affairs has met with staff for the following elected officials:
Senator George Runner (R)
Senator Bob Margett (R)
Senator Mark Ridley-Thomas (D)
Senator Sheila Kuehl (D)
Senator Edward Vincent (D)
Assemblymember Robert Huff (R)
Assemblymember Cameron Smyth (R)
Assemblymember Audra Strickland (R)
Assemblymember Sharon Runner (R)
Assemblymember Hector De La Torre (D)
L.A. City Councilmember Jose Huizar (has agreed to be First 5 LA Champion)
L.A. City Councilmember Wendy Greuel (has agreed to be First 5 LA Champion)

The Government Affairs team met with staffs of several other key Los Angeles Councilmembers and met directly with Councilmember Tony Cardenas.

In April, First 5 LA plans to meet directly with:

- Assemblymember Mike Eng (D)
- Assemblymember Audra Strickland ©
- Assemblymember Paul Krikorian (D)
- Senator Alan Lowenthal (D), with Commissioner Corina Villaraigosa
- L.A. City Councilmember Ed Reyes, with Commissioner Corina Villaraigosa
- L.A. County Lobbyist Dan Wall

In addition, First 5 LA is coordinating meetings with Democratic Assemblymembers Kevin De Leon, Mike Feuer, Edward P. Hernandez, and presumptive Assembly Speaker Karen Bass. We also are coordinating meetings with state senators Gil Cedillo and Alex Padilla, who are both members of the Latino Caucus.

All offices thus far seem to be very receptive to and supportive of First 5 efforts.

Attachment (1)
Implementation of Leadership Development Programs Overview

The Commission’s commitment to organizational capacity building stems from a recognition that strong, effective, adaptable and sustainable organizations are critical to achieving long-term, positive outcomes for children and families. The foundation for launching two pilot leadership development programs for current and/or former grantees has been established over the course of the past year through the implementation of the Sustainability Project; financial management and analysis training; social enterprise training; organizational assessment pilot; and cultural competency training. Through feedback from grantees, internal dialogue and research on leadership development, staff has identified two leadership development programs (forums) focused on improving organizational effectiveness and anchored by sustainability planning.

As sustainability planning is a long-term commitment and technical assistance beyond the completion of the Sustainability Project’s seven-month curriculum is part of the program model, the leadership development forums will be designed to provide on-going organizational capacity building support to eligible Sustainability Project graduates (or other agencies that can demonstrate an equivalent level or readiness) via one of two forums -- either the Organizational Leadership Development Forum or the Social Enterprise Leadership Development Forum.

The design of the two forums is similar in that peer networking, facilitation and consultation are hallmarks for both programs. Each forum will also include a training component relevant to executive-level leadership or social enterprise. Agencies will have the option to apply to participate in either one of the two forums, as relevant, given their long-term sustainability strategies and demonstrated readiness. The programs will be conducted through a minimum of monthly engagements (training, peer forums or coaching components) over the course of 12-18 months.

Organizational Leadership Development Forum
The Organizational Leadership Development Forum is designed to support agencies ready for on-going support and training focused on building leadership skills through the implementation of specific sustainability strategies. The leadership development program will be developed to emphasize effective and strong mission-driven leadership to produce and sustain positive outcomes in support of children 0 - 5. The forum will enroll both an agency’s executive director and senior manager.

During FY2008-2009, approximately 10 agencies will be served through the forum during the 18-month program. As this is a pilot program, two approaches to related coaching will be provided to further test the model and effectiveness with participating grantees. After completing the initial training session, the cohort will be divided into two smaller groups. One group will complete the program through a peer coaching model and the other group will be assigned an organizational coach to provide individualized organizational assistance.

Two strategic partners have been identified to facilitate the forum including the Fieldstone Foundation and Executive Consulting for the Nonprofit Sector, Inc.

Social Enterprise Leadership Development Forum
The Social Enterprise Forum is proposed to support agencies with specific interest in establishing or expanding earned income strategies. This forum will provide participants with the opportunity to develop the skills and networks needed for establishing or growing successful
social enterprises. The forum will provide ongoing social enterprise-related training and will facilitate peer to peer leadership components focused on significantly improving the social and financial performance of participating organizations. The forum will not only help organizations develop build leadership capacity while establishing earned-income streams but also supports a "shift in paradigm" which is often necessary to secure, deploy and sustain new resources.

During FY2008-2009, approximately 15 agencies will be served through the forum during the 12-month program. In addition to the forum structure, emerging social enterprise leadership training components will be integrated into the design. First 5 LA grantees have consistently expressed interest in establishing social enterprise mechanisms as part of their sustainability strategies; however, specific training for creating, testing and launching a social enterprise is necessary.

The Social Enterprise Institute has been identified as a strategic partner for this forum.

Implementation
Implementation for each of these two programs will begin as of July 1, 2008 and will be funded via the $280,000 set aside initially approved for the grantee leadership development program, Annie E. Casey Foundation Leadership in Action Program, in July 2007.
Item 6

Receipt and Acknowledgement of the 2006-2007 Annual Report from First 5 California
Memo

To: Board of Commissioners
From: Evelyn V. Martinez, Executive Director
Date: April 10, 2008
Subject: RECEIPT AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE 2006-2007 ANNUAL REPORT FROM FIRST 5 CALIFORNIA

The California Health and Safety Code stipulates under Sections 130150 (2) and 130150 (c) that the State Commission shall:

1. Prepare a written report that consolidates, summarizes, analyzes, and comments on the annual audits and reports submitted by the all of the County Commissions for the preceding fiscal year. This report by the State Commission shall be transmitted to the Governor, the Legislature, and each county commission.

2. Make copies of each of its annual audits and reports available to members of the general public on request and at no cost. The State Commission shall furnish each County Commission with copies of those documents in a number sufficient for local distribution by the County Commission to members of the general public on request and at no cost.

First 5 LA has received two copies of the 2006-2007 First 5 California Annual Report submitted to the Legislature and Governor.

The report is available on the First 5 California website (www.ccfc.ca.gov) under “Annual Report for 2006/07 Now Available” link and on the First 5 LA website (www.first5la.org).
Item 7

Discussion
on LAUP Counter Proposal to
First 5 LA Commission Action of
November 28, 2007
Funding of LA Universal Preschool (LAUP)

April 9, 2008

Christina Altmayer
Altmayer Consulting, Inc.
Introduction

- **Scope of Analysis**
  - Altmayer Consulting was engaged to conduct a high-level analysis of the First 5 LA Board Action in November 2007 and compare the major provisions with the subsequent proposal submitted by LAUP in March 2008. A brief background on the LAUP initiative and related investments is also included.

- **Source Documents Reviewed:**
  - First 5 LA contract with LAUP executed September 2004
  - LAUP Annual Report FY 2006-07
  - LAUP Sustainability Proposal dated September 2007
  - November 28, 2007 First 5 LA Approved Board Motion
  - March 10, 2008 Proposal from LAUP to Supervisor Yvonne Burke
  - Financial reports and budgets related to LAUP
  - Related staff and financial analyses memos.
# Background - Timeline of Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of LA Universal Preschool Master Plan</td>
<td>February 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA First 5 Agreement with LAUP for Universal Access to Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>Approval of LAUP Board of Directors – July 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term July 15, 2004 – September 30, 2009</td>
<td>Executed September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contract: $580 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Advance: $10 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Limit: $116 million (plus any approved carryover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Term</td>
<td>July 15, 2004 – June 30, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year Term</td>
<td>July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 82 Fails – 1.7% income tax on individuals over $400,000 in annual income to support universal preschool for 4 year olds</td>
<td>June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year Term</td>
<td>July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report Completed August 31, 2007; revised November 16, 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUP submits the 2007/08 Scope of Work, Annual Business Plan and Budget for $109.6 million for fiscal year 2007/08</td>
<td>June 14, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Timeline of Key Dates (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First 5 LA Board Motion to direct LAUP to develop Sustainability Plan</td>
<td>June 14, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LAUP to submit long-term, multi-year self-sufficiency plan by September 14, 2007 with realistic plans for securing graduate levels of outside funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Plan should show a decrease in total amount of Commission funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Plan should detail of the projected preschool spaces and children to be served by June 30, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staff delegated authority to work out issues and obtain clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial LAUP Sustainability Plan submitted to First 5 LA</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff analysis of Sustainability Proposals</td>
<td>September – November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 5 LA Board of Directors Motion Stipulating Renewal Terms and Conditions (see attached outline)</td>
<td>November 28, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum to Supervisor Yvonne Burke From Gary Mangiofico regarding Long-Term Financial Plan Proposals (LAUP)</td>
<td>March 10, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Review Analysis</td>
<td>March 31, 2008 – April 10, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background – Reported Trends in Preschool Spaces

Total Number of Preschool Spaces per LAUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual As of Period Ending</th>
<th>Projections 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations 1</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>6,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Development 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>10,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
LAUP 2007/08 Scope of Work Quarter 2 Update, Data 3.20/08 for data for December 2007.

Notes:
1 Operations refers to the number of spaces in operation or enhanced as a result of investments. Actual enrollment (not spaces) provided for 6/30/05/2
2 Operations refers to number of spaces in development through facility or related capital investments and/or pending applications.
3 Report noted that the reduction in spaces was due to adjustment for spaces for other age groups included in prior counts.
4 Projections based on scheduled completion of all current construction projects results in 3,706 spaces by June 2009.

Based on LAUP's most recent Facilities Development Monthly Status Report (2/28/08), projects completed through January 2008 resulted in a total number of new spaces 1,784 with associated costs of $5.86 million.

LAUP recently reported that expenditures incurred through February 2008 totaled $6.9 million (LAUP Memo to First 5 LA, First 5 LA Data Request, 4/3/08). The total budget for all contracted facilities construction is $21.8 million to build 3,706 spaces ($5,900 per space). No further space development beyond existing contractual agreements is planned at this time.
### Background – Summary of First 5 LA Investments

#### First 5 LA Funding From Fiscal Year 2005 through 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 注</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-Up Expenses</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$3,594,530</td>
<td>$3,922,225</td>
<td>$2,483,244</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$3,243,494</td>
<td>$22,548,528</td>
<td>$44,649,798</td>
<td>$70,441,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenses</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$6,838,025</td>
<td>$26,470,753</td>
<td>$47,133,042</td>
<td>$80,441,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data provided does not readily allow for accurate calculations of cost per space nor cost per child for operations and/or capital.
  - To determine cost per space data required:
    - Monthly breakdown of spaces by status (in operation, construction, pending approval, etc)
    - Actual expenses by program (not by object/line item). Information on direct payments to providers is available on monthly invoices and in annual financial audit, but further analysis is required to accurately determine direct costs, overhead, and related support costs such as fundraising.
  - To determine cost per child data required:
    - % of spaces filled vs. available spaces (average unfilled capacity)
    - Assumptions regarding time lag between space available and space filled
## Comparison of First 5 LA Board Action and LAUP Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Element</th>
<th>First 5 LA (Based on November 2007 Board Motion)</th>
<th>LAUP (Based on March 2008 Memo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding for fiscal Year July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008</td>
<td>$60 million (includes $40 million allocated in June 2007 (F5LA Motion, ¶ 3)</td>
<td>$60 million in operating (LAUP Memo, ¶ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Period of Funding</td>
<td>2018 (F5LA Motion, ¶ 4)</td>
<td>2016 (LAUP Memo, ¶ 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Funding</td>
<td>$20 million Preschool Capital Contingency Fund (F5LA Motion, ¶ 7) restricted to existing contractual obligations</td>
<td>SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Funding Amount of from FY09 Through Proposed Period</td>
<td>$40 million annual, less 17% each successive year through 2018</td>
<td>$61.4 million, reduced by varying percentages through 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$260 million in base funding (F5LA Motion, ¶ 3 and 4) including FY 2007/08</td>
<td>$508 million (excluding endowment funds) (LAUP Memo, ¶ 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Funding</td>
<td>$200 million dedicated to Early Learning Endowment (F5LA Motion, ¶ 5)</td>
<td>$72 million of Endowment interest dedicated to LAUP (LAUP Memo, ¶ 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Endowment Interest Earnings</td>
<td>Interest reinvested from until FY2012. Beginning in FY2012, $5 million annually earmarked for LAUP totaling $35 million. Additional interest earnings dedicated to create $40 million LAUP Contingency Fund by FY2018. Specific provisions on accessing contingency funds.</td>
<td>LAUP will draw down $3.75 million annually through 2016 from Endowment Fund (LAUP Memo, ¶ 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Fund Target</td>
<td>LAUP funding will match the corresponding 17% annual decrease in funding from First 5 LA (F5LA Motion, ¶ 4). Total matching funds will be approximately $200 million (LAUP Memo, Appendix)</td>
<td>LAUP funding will match the corresponding annual decrease in funding from First 5 LA which will vary between will be 4% and 16% annually. Total LAUP matching funds will be $117 million (LAUP Memo, Appendix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Provisions</td>
<td>Loss of funding if failure to complete a scope of work (¶ 4); Failure to meet fundraising targets impacts subsequent years funding.</td>
<td>No penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted # of Children Served through Term</td>
<td>TBD by First 5 LA planning process (F5LA Motion, ¶ 2)</td>
<td>10,500 spaces annually; total 104,368 (LAUP Memo, ¶ 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¶ Refers to source document paragraph.
First 5 LA: Summary of Approved Fund Allocations

Original Allocation

$580 mil

Actual Expenses

- Actual Expenses through 6/30/07
  $80 mil

Budget through 6/30/08
- $60 mil

Operating Budget from 7/1/08 through 6/30/18

Future Allocations

- Capital Contingency through 6/30/08
  $20 mil

$275 mil

Early Learning Endowment Fund
- $200 mil

Contingency Fund
- $40 million accessible beginning in 2009-10
  up to 25% per year of balance

Earmarked Fund
- $5 million annually beginning in FY2012;
  Total $35 mil

Annual Support
- $40 mil declining by 17% annually
  Total ~ $200 mil

Interest from Endowment

Note: Principal of endowment fund remains reserved for future First 5 LA Early Learning Investments. Potential for additional funds if LAUP does not meet fundraising obligations from Earmarked Fund. Penalties may also apply if fundraising goals are not met.
LAUP: Summary of Recommended Fund Allocations

Original Allocation

$580 mil

Actual Expenses

- Actual Expenses through 6/30/07
  - $80 mil

Budget through 6/30/08

- $69.6 mil

Future Allocations

Operating Budget from 7/1/08 Thru 6/30/16

Capital Contingency through 6/30/08

$20 mil

$388 mil

Early Learning Endowment Fund

$60 mil by FY2016

Annual Support

- $61.4 mil declining to $28.3 mil by FY2016.
  - Total = $358 mil

Early Learning Endowment Contribution

- $3.75 mil annually
  - Total = $30 mil

Note: Assumes $72 million endowment declining to $60 million by FY 2016.
Comparative Summary: Five Major Differences

- **Term**
  - First 5 LA term planned through 2018
  - LAUP term planned through 2016

- **Annual Budget**
  - First 5 LA projects an annual budget for LAUP beginning in FY2008/09 of $40 million
  - LAUP projects an annual budget beginning in 2008/09 of $61.4 million

- **Annual/Total Contribution from FY2008/09 forward**
  - First 5 LA - $40 million declining by 17% annually, total of ~$200 million through 2018
  - LAUP - $61.4 million declining by variable percentages annually, total of $358 million

- **Matching Fund Requirements**
  - First 5 LA - LAUP generates $200 million through 2018
  - LAUP - Generates $117 million in matching funds through 2016

- **Size and Purpose of Endowment Fund**
  - First 5 LA - Dedicated Early Learning Endowment Fund with no changes to principal; interest earnings available to support LAUP through 2018
  - LAUP - Endowment fund of approximately $72 million declining to $60 million by FY2016; interest on endowment supplemented by principal provided as annual support to LAUP
Findings

- Findings
  - The comparative analysis highlights key differences between the Board Action and the LAUP Proposal: (see page 10)
    - Proposed Term of Agreement
    - LAUP Annual Operating Budget from Fiscal Year 2008-09 through term of agreement
    - First 5 LA Funding of Operating Costs vs. Matching Fund Targets
  - Available reported data does not readily support calculations of budgeted vs. actual capital or operating cost per child or per space.

- Key Contract Variables Requiring Resolution
  - Term of Funding
  - Targeted number of spaces and children enrolled annually
  - Budget and related annual cost for space and child enrolled
  - First 5 LA’s contribution per space for capital, operating, and startup for base and future years (Example: what is targeted subsidy per child and how should this decline based on matching fund targets?)
Conclusions and Recommendations

- **Recommendations**
  - A per child cost and associated First 5 LA subsidy should be developed as the basis for future agreements.
  - First 5 LA should consider moving to a performance-based agreement to incentivize and prioritize continued enrollment of four-year olds in quality preschools. Performance-based agreement should rely on a cost per enrolled child method for payment and include performance incentives and rewards.

- **Performance Based Contracts**
  - **Key Elements**
    - Contracts that are monitored and/or managed on the basis of the RESULTS achieved, rather than on activities conducted.
    - Provides a basis for incentivizing and rewarding performance based on agreed-to performance objectives (Number of children enrolled, Improvements in quality rating)
    - Focuses evaluation and monitoring on agreed-to targeted results
  - **Considerations**
    - Opportunity to reflect November 2007 Board directive framework in performance contract reflecting defined incentives and performance targets
    - Include cost inflation factors for annual update; periodically review and update cost methodology.
    - Annually review planned vs. actual performance.
Addendum – Performance Based Contracting

- Elements of Performance-Based Contracting
  - Clearly defined desired results
  - Measurement and reporting processes
  - Incentives for achieving targeted results
  - Ongoing system and contractor performance evaluation

- Performance-Based Contracting Goals
  - Encourage contractors to be innovative by shifting focus from process to results
  - Identify successful practices
  - Create an effective framework for contractual compliance
  - Allow for benchmarking between contractors and with peer agencies
  - Provide decision-makers with key performance data
  - Effectively assess program costs

- Performance Based Elements for Consideration Regarding LAUP Agreement
  - Determining Target Cost Per Enrolled Child
    - Actual experience in LA County and LAUP
    - National experience and reported costs (adjusted for LA County)
    - Cost differential associated with lower or higher quality centers
    - Start-up and outreach costs
  - Incentive Opportunities
    - Quality Improvements – e.g., provisions for full-inclusion schools; increases in quality ratings
    - Successful enrollment in targeted geographic areas
    - Achieving or exceeding matching fund targets
Item 8

Approval of the 14 Recommended Applicants as Outlined in the COF Funding Recommendations Report
SUBJECT:
Community Opportunities Fund (COF) Cycle One Funding Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION:
Approval of the 14 recommended applicants, as outlined in the attached COF Funding Recommendations Report.

BACKGROUND:
As approved in November 2006, COF reflects a responsive giving strategy to respond to community needs and changing social trends. Staff have worked with consultants to further operationalize the funding of capacity building and policy and advocacy projects through the development of outreach materials, a logic model to guide project design, and application and review processes and documents.

In July 2007, an online Letter of Intent (LOI) was released. In response, 117 applicants submitted a LOI by the September 2007 deadline. Following an interdepartmental staff review of the applicants, 36 were selected to write a full proposal. Staff are presenting the Board of Commissioners with 14 recommended applicants following a thorough assessment of proposals by both an external and internal team of reviewers.

DISCUSSION:
The attached COF Cycle One Funding Recommendations Report outlines the comprehensive application and review processes employed to evaluate the proposals. A description of each applicant agency and proposed project is also included within the report for the Board's review. Pending the Board's approval, staff will proceed with grantee contract negotiations.

Staff will be providing feedback to those applicants declined for Cycle One funding and will offer assistance for reapplying for the second cycle. In preparation for Cycle Two, staff are assessing and reflecting upon aspects of the first funding cycle processes and documents that may benefit from further development or revision. The Cycle Two application process is anticipated to commence in July 2008.
Community Opportunities Fund

Cycle One
Funding Recommendations Report

Prepared for:

Board of Commissioners Meeting
April 10, 2008
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I. Executive Summary

First 5 LA staff are recommending to the Board of Commissioners approval of funding for 14 agencies through the first cycle of the Community Opportunities Fund (COF) for a total award amount of $3,137,160.

COF reflects a responsive giving approach in support of two types of activities – organizational capacity building and policy and advocacy. The Cycle One application and review processes and documents were greatly informed through the development of both a white paper and a logic model. The white paper was commissioned to identify best practices in the funding of capacity building and policy and advocacy activities, while the logic model provided an illustration of the theory linking capacity building and policy and advocacy activities to long-term outcomes within the COF Funding Priority areas.

In September 2007, First 5 LA received 117 Letter of Intent (LOI) submissions for the first cycle of the fund. All LOIs were submitted online which initiated First 5 LA’s utilization of an electronic application system. Following LOI review, staff selected 36 applicants to submit full proposals which were reviewed both internally and externally resulting in the selection of the 14 recommended applicants identified within Appendix A.

Following final funding decisions by the Board of Commissioners, next steps for staff will include Cycle One grantee contract negotiations and implementation of a grantee support and technical assistance plan. Staff will also be conducting a thorough assessment of the first funding cycle process in coordination with planning for the rollout of the remaining three cycles which will include a review of the current outreach, application, and selection processes.

II. Community Opportunities Fund Background

First 5 LA’s Community Opportunities Fund (COF), formerly known as the Responsive Giving Fund, as approved in the November 2006 Open Grantmaking Implementation Plan establishes a new funding mechanism for the Commission. COF reflects a responsive giving approach with a focus on funding sustainable change within both organizations and communities.

COF was developed out of the Open Grantmaking investment area to address changing social trends and allow flexibility to respond to community-specific needs. Therefore, while COF has outlined specific long-term outcomes in order to assess the cumulative impact of the fund, and has identified two broad funding approaches, a large degree of flexibility in project design has been included.

A total of $13 million was allocated to COF with $3.25 million available for each of the four funding cycles.
A. Types of Grants

Because COF is intended to initiate sustainable and systematic change at the organizational and community levels, COF is not designed to fund direct services. Instead, two specific types of support are funded: (1) organizational capacity building and (2) policy and advocacy grants.

Organizational Capacity Building
Organizational capacity building is defined within the COF Funding Guide as organizational development activities that build and sustain growth and effectiveness. The funding of organizational capacity building activities is intended to achieve sustainable and meaningful results in an organization’s target community by improving its overall management or programmatic capacities.

Eligible agencies may apply for a maximum of $150,000 to be distributed over no more than three years. The maximum amount and duration was determined based upon a literature review and interviews with other funders and grantees. This research indicated that the identified amounts were sufficient for implementation of internal capacity building activities, but were also small enough to minimize reliance on First 5 LA as a single funder, and therefore encourage sustainability planning.

Policy and Advocacy
Policy and advocacy are defined as generally related activities that build public support for private and/or public goals. Policy is a plan that guides decisions and actions, while advocacy is the effort to raise public awareness and influence public policy through various forms of persuasive communication and education. The funding of policy and advocacy activities is intended to increase community awareness and support for policies that improve the quality of life of children prenatal to age five and their families.

Eligible agencies may apply for a maximum of $500,000 to be distributed over no more than five years. As identified above for the capacity building grants, these amounts were determined through literature review and interviews. The duration and amount maximums are higher for policy and advocacy than for capacity building because research indicates longer periods of time and additional resources are required in order for advocacy efforts to successfully result in systems change.

It is the intent of COF that all funded projects lead to long-term sustainable impact on one or more of 13 outcomes within one of three Funding Priority areas: supportive parents and caregivers, good health (nutrition, physical activity, and oral care), and prevention of unintentional injuries (see Appendix B for a list of all associated long-term outcomes).

B. Development Process

As approved in the Implementation Plan, consultants with extensive expertise in the fields of grantmaking, organizational capacity building, and policy work were employed to develop a white paper that explored best practices in funding capacity building and
policy and advocacy activities. Following a thorough literature review and interviews with key stakeholders including members of the philanthropic community, former and current First 5 LA grantees, other community-based organizations, and experts on capacity building and policy and advocacy work, the white paper identified several recommendations that were utilized in the rollout of the first funding cycle. Recommendations from the white paper informed application development, review processes, and outreach strategies.

III. Application and Review Process

As outlined in the Implementation Plan, the first funding cycle of COF employed a two-stage application process. The first stage required submission of a letter of intent (LOI). Selected applicants were then invited to submit a full proposal.

A. Letter of Intent Phase

The LOI form was released on July 30, 2007 with information sessions held in early August. Applicants were able to access an online LOI form through the First 5 LA website. This represented the agency’s first time utilizing an electronic application format. The online application system provided significant benefits including ease of access by applicants and reduction of data entry time by First 5 LA staff.

The focus of the letter of intent was to elicit a sense of the agency’s work, an overview of the proposed project, and to establish a connection between the activities proposed, the agency’s mission, and the selected Funding Priority area. By initiating the process with an LOI application, staff were able to narrow proposal selection from a large number of submissions without requiring a substantial amount of work by the applicant.

Information Sessions

In early August 2007, following the release of the LOI form, staff held six information sessions throughout Los Angeles County at which representatives of organizations had the opportunity to learn more about the intent and requirements of the fund, hear instructions on how to apply, and have questions addressed by staff. Over 250 individuals, representing more than 150 organizations, attended the sessions. Following the information sessions, ongoing support and TA were made available to applicants via phone and email throughout the LOI process. A full list of the dates and locations of the information sessions is included in Appendix C.

LOI Review Criteria

First 5 LA received 117 submissions, including 78 capacity building and 39 policy and advocacy LOIs, by the deadline on September 14, 2007. The Letters of Intent were reviewed by an internal interdepartmental staff team and were assessed based upon the following criteria as was identified within the COF Funding Guide:

a. Potential for impacting the prenatal through age five population
b. Potential for impacting the selected Funding Priority area
c. Project design and alignment with the COF definitions of capacity building or policy and advocacy
d. Identification of the target population’s needs and their connection to the selected Funding Priority area  

e. Evidence of relevant organizational strengths, experience, and readiness  

f. Financial capacity  

g. Compliance with past and current grants  

h. Overlap with currently funded projects  

LOI Review Process  
The members of the staff team composed of representatives from the Planning and Development (P&D), Grants Management and Legal Compliance (GMLC), Research and Evaluation (R&E), and Policy departments reviewed and scored each applicant individually utilizing a standardized tool developed to assess each criterion identified above in relation to responses to LOI questions. Utilizing an interdepartmental review further facilitated the holistic assessment of the applicant by soliciting the vantage point of each department.

Following individual scoring, reviewers met in pairs coordinated across each department to discuss applicants in depth and determine a single consensus score for each applicant. This provided an opportunity to vet each applicant in detail in relation to particular LOI responses. Pair scores were averaged across departments, and applicants were ranked based upon the scores. A final consensus meeting was held among representatives from each review pair. The consensus team reviewed the ranking and discussed the applicants based upon the review criteria. A final ranking was approved by the team, and from the ranking the top 26 capacity building and 10 policy and advocacy applicants were selected to submit proposals.

Feedback  
In early November 2007, LOI applicants were notified of their selection status. Those applicants who were not invited to submit a proposal were offered the opportunity to speak with a Program Officer regarding the reason for the declination. Feedback was provided as to the justifications for the reviewers’ decisions. Interested applicants were also informed of a future opportunity to discuss their LOI in detail in relation to second cycle submission. These in-depth conversations will be coordinated with the release of the second cycle Letter of Intent upon request.

B. Proposal Phase  

Of the 117 Letters of Intent reviewed, 36 were invited to submit full proposals, including 10 policy and advocacy submissions and 26 capacity building submissions.

The focus of the proposal was to further develop the initial project introduced in the Letter of Intent. Applicants were required to develop a logic model based upon the COF model provided to them and submit it as an attachment to the proposal narrative. The narrative required an in-depth explanation of the theory supporting the achievement of short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes through the implementation of the proposed activities. The proposal also elicited a detailed evaluation plan.
Proposal Workshop
Upon invitation to submit a proposal, applicants were requested to attend a proposal workshop held at First 5 LA in early November 2007. Nearly every applicant agency was represented. Attendees participated in an overview of the proposal questions and review criteria, a hands-on logic model exercise, and a question and answer session. Following the workshop, ongoing technical assistance via phone and email was made available to all proposal applicants.

External Review
Full proposals were submitted by 35 of the 36 invited agencies in time for the first cycle deadline of December 21, 2007. Proposals, consistent with the LOI process, were largely submitted online and were comprised of the proposal narrative, a project logic model demonstrating the proposed activities’ connection to impacting the short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes, a project budget, and other supporting financial documents. The proposals were reviewed by both internal and external teams to assess the different components of the applicants’ submissions.

An external review team was recruited from the nonprofit, public, and funding sectors. From the strong pool of resumes submitted, staff were able to select a total of ten capacity building and seven policy and advocacy reviewers. Each participating reviewer was selected for his/her expertise in developing and/or implementing capacity building or policy and advocacy programs, as well as his/her experience in one or more of the Funding Priority areas. The reviewers comprised an extremely accomplished and committed group that provided assurance that applicants were assessed appropriately and fairly.

Each reviewer rated all capacity building or all policy and advocacy proposals submitted utilizing a tool created by staff to measure, with as little subjectivity as possible, the criteria outlined below. The reviewers participated in a training prior to beginning review to develop consistency among reviewers’ interpretation of the tool and to provide oversight of the process. Following individual scoring, the reviewers participated in group consensus meetings with capacity building and policy and advocacy reviewers meeting separately. Consensus discussions allowed the reviewers to vet their individual evaluations with one another in relation to the criteria identified below, and allotted time for rescoring applicants based upon justifications made during discussions. The specific LOI and proposal questions are identified in Appendices D and E.

The external panel members were responsible for reviewing and discussing the proposal narrative based upon the following criteria:
  a. Project design, clarity, and viability
  b. The project’s connection to the applicant’s mission
  c. Viability of the project to impact the identified long-term outcome within the Funding Priority area
  d. Viability of the project to address the target population’s needs
  e. Preparedness for and recognition of the impact of potential external forces upon the project
  f. Evaluation plan design and viability in measuring outcomes
Internal Review
Following the external review, the proposals were assessed by the internal staff review team. The internal reviewers held a separate consensus meeting to discuss the applicants in relation to staff-specific criteria. The internal review was designed to complement the external review process and to identify questions raised by the proposals to be addressed at the site visits. The internal review focused upon the following aspects of the proposal:

a. Overall project alignment with COF definitions of capacity building and policy and advocacy
b. Alignment between the LOI and proposal in project components and scope
c. Alignment of the project budget with the proposal narrative

Financial Review
Following the programmatic review identified above, staff lead by the Finance department reviewed financial documents including those agency’s independent audits that had been revised since the LOI review. Finance staff additionally reviewed the project budgets and assisted in identifying questions to address during site visits.

Site Visits
First 5 LA staff conducted site visits of those applicants that were rated highly by both external and staff reviewers. Site visits allowed for reviewers to gain additional knowledge regarding the applicant’s relationship to its target community, its capacity and readiness to implement the project, the value-added to the agency by the project, and to address specific questions that were identified during the proposal review.

Following each site visit, a tool was completed that assessed the viability of the project, the agency’s readiness or capacity, the value-added to the agency’s work, the ability to address budget questions, and the applicant’s understanding and connection to its target population. Applicants that did not demonstrate that the proposed project would be viable or would add value to the agency’s ongoing work were eliminated from further consideration.

Additional Considerations
During both the LOI and proposal review processes, considerations of equity and prioritization were made following programmatic review. As identified within the Implementation Plan, priority applicants included those focusing on the prenatal to age three population, those proposing a countywide impact, and those serving one or more of the 12 “targeted communities” as identified in the Revised Programmatic and Fiscal Policies in November 2005. Equity in funding distribution among geographic spread and target community diversity was also considered. These additional priorities were only taken into consideration, however when all was equal in regard to programmatic assessment of the applicant.

Proposal Recommendations
The 14 proposal recommendations presented to the Board of Commissioners for approval represent 11 capacity building projects and three policy and advocacy projects. The proportions of awards between the two types of grants is based upon
the distribution outlined within the Implementation Plan, with some variance due to
the re-allocation of a portion of the Community Opportunities Fund to the Social
Venture Fund, as requested by the Commission in November 2007.

A description of each recommended project is identified within Appendix A. As
intended by the responsive nature of the fund, the recommendations include a span
of long-term outcomes, target communities, and a vast range of activities and
sustainable goals.

The selected applicants have exhibited excellence in relation to their organizational
strengths, relationship to their target population, project design, capacity to
implement the proposed activities, and potential to impact the selected long-term
outcome. They have each demonstrated success at the external, internal, and site
visit components of review among a pool of exceptional proposal applicants.

IV. Next Steps

A. Feedback Opportunities

Similar to the opportunity allotted to those agencies declined at the LOI stage, all
proposal applicants not funded for this cycle will have an opportunity to discuss the
review of their proposal and identify what aspects could be improved in preparation for
submitting an application for funding in subsequent cycles. This feedback will be timed
in coordination with release of the second cycle LOI anticipated for June 2008.

B. Contract Negotiations

Following the decision made by the Board of Commissioners, staff will begin contract
negotiations with the selected applicants. Approved proposal applicants will be invited
to attend a new grantee orientation in order to begin the grant agreement process.
Attendees will also be informed of opportunities for grantee support and facilitated peer
learning that will be available following contract finalization and throughout the grant
duration.

The determination of the final selections and funding amounts awarded are dependent
upon the Board of Commissioners approval as well as a successful grant agreement
process. The grant awarded will not exceed the amount recommended, however in some
cases it may be less depending on the final grant negotiation process. Grant
agreements for the first funding cycle are expected to be executed by August 1, 2008.

C. Assessing Cycle One

In consideration of Cycle One as a pilot for COF, First 5 LA staff are assessing and
reflecting upon aspects of the first funding cycle processes and documents that may
benefit from further development or revision.

In particular, staff are assessing the outreach plan for Cycle Two to address those
disparities apparent in the submission of applications in Cycle One. Staff are revising
the outreach plan for Cycle Two to further diversify the pool of applicants in relation to their target populations, geographic location, and Funding Priority area. For example, few agencies submitted applications that identified "prevention of unintentional injuries" as their target Funding Priority area. Similarly, SPAs one and seven were underrepresented in application submissions (see Appendices F and G for detailed information on the geographic spread of applicants). Staff will seek input from liaison Commissioners as well as members of the community to further develop a detailed outreach plan.

To continue to reflect upon and further develop the Community Opportunities Fund in subsequent cycles, members of the P&D, R&E, and GMLC departments are developing a system to coordinate feedback from project implementation and evaluation to ongoing planning efforts for the remaining COF cycles. A timeline identifying perspective deadlines associated with each of the funding cycles appears in Appendix H.
Appendix A
Applicants Recommended for Cycle One Funding

CAPACITY BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT 1</th>
<th>CURRENT GRANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name:</td>
<td>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bienvenidos Children's Center</td>
<td>(Not to exceed):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$149,613.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Duration of Project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building to Promote Oral Health</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Community:</td>
<td>Long-Term Outcome:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast and East Los Angeles</td>
<td>Good Health - Families' access to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Planning Area:</td>
<td>appropriate oral health care resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief Project Description:

Project Goal:

Bienvenidos will improve access to oral health care for children in Southeast and East Los Angeles by increasing its own capacity to assess children's dental needs and provide oral health education to families.

Primary Activities:

- Conduct an oral health needs assessment, in coordination with other community partners, of children 0 – 5 in Southeast and East Los Angeles, with a focus on Bell, Huntington Park, and South Gate. The assessment will include a review of existing data sources, as well as primary data to be collected from focus groups, surveys, and interviews.

- Identify existing oral health screening tools, as well as culturally and linguistically appropriate educational materials on oral health for young children.

- Implement an oral health screening protocol, train staff to use dental screening tools, and distribute oral health educational information to parents.

- Conduct a feasibility study to assess the agency's capacity to carry out oral health care, and the potential coordination of care with local Schools of Dentistry.

Expected Long-Term Results:

Bienvenidos will increase its capacity to assess the oral health care needs of the children within its target communities and provide educational materials to parents, which will lead to improvements in its own effectiveness in identification and referral of children in need of oral health services. Through outreach coordinated with local dental resources, Bienvenidos will expand families' access to oral health care.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPLICANT 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>CURRENT GRANTEE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong> Catholic Healthcare West</td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> Hope Street Family Center (HSFC) Resource Development Capacity Project</td>
<td><strong>(Not to exceed):</strong> $149,179.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Community:</strong> Central Los Angeles</td>
<td><strong>Duration of Project:</strong> 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong> 4</td>
<td><strong>Long-Term Outcome:</strong> <strong>Supportive Parents</strong> – Parents' knowledge of parenting and child development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

**Project Goal:**
Catholic Healthcare West will sustain and grow the Hope Street Family Center's (HSFC) parenting and child development programs by expanding its operational capacity through the development of diversified funding streams and creation of a sustainability plan.

**Primary Activities:**

- Recruit and hire a Director of Development to focus solely on the sustainability and growth of HSFC programs. This position will work closely with HSFC staff to provide oversight in conducting the development activities.

- Conduct an assessment of HSFC fund development efforts to analyze current funding streams, and identify potential new funding sources as well as funding gaps. Based upon the development assessment, draft a sustainability plan designed to increase funding resources in order to maintain programming at its current level and increase the number of children and families served.

- Organize a Resource Development Advisory Group composed of program parents, local business leaders, community leaders, and representatives from other agencies to provide guidance over ongoing resource development efforts.

- Prepare promotional and public awareness materials and establish a website that will expose more people to HSFC and generate online donations.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**
Catholic Healthcare West will expand the operational capacity of HSFC’s fund development program to support services that meet the needs of children 0 – 5 and their parents. The proposed activities will institutionalize ongoing resource development for the sustainability and expansion of the center’s core programs which are focused upon improving parents’ knowledge of parenting and child development through home and center-based education, school readiness, family literacy, and case management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPLICANT 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>NEW PARTNER</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Alliance of Pasadena</td>
<td>(Not to exceed):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$143,472.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Duration of Project:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUSH – Building Resources for Utilization</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Services for Oral Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Community:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long-Term Outcome:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel Valley Low-income children (less</td>
<td>Good Health- Families’ access to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 200% FPL)</td>
<td>appropriate oral health care resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

*Project Goal:*

The Community Health Alliance of Pasadena (CHAP) will increase the number of children served by its dental clinic through the development of a sustainable, diversified payer revenue base.

*Primary Activities:*

- Hire a dental care manager to provide training to CHAP’s medical providers on conducting oral health screenings, utilizing the dental referral system, and providing culturally competent dental education.

- Implement an outreach program, in coordination with community partners, including local schools and community-based organizations, that will include health insurance eligibility education and enrollment, and oral health care screening.

*Expected Long-Term Results:*

CHAP’s dental clinic currently has the physical capacity to accommodate more young patients, however children make up only a small proportion of their dental patient population. Conducting outreach to enroll children in medical and dental public benefits and educating parents on the importance of dental services will both increase access of families to oral health care, as well as provide sustainable revenue through reimbursements for children eligible for insurance, offsetting the costs of uninsured dental care.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT 4</th>
<th>CURRENT GRANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong> Connections for Children</td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(Not to exceed):</strong>&lt;br&gt;$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> Board and Business Development Project</td>
<td><strong>Duration of Project:</strong>&lt;br&gt;3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Community:</strong> Westside and South Bay</td>
<td><strong>Long-Term Outcome:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Supportive Parents/Caregivers- Parents knowledge of parenting and child development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong> 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

**Project Goal:**

Connections for Children will expand its parent education programs by developing long-lasting, mutually beneficial relationships with local businesses in order to strengthen the Board of Directors and cultivate new funding sources.

**Primary Activities:**

- Assess strengths and identify critical gaps in expertise and resources of the current Board of Directors, develop relationships with businesses and allied agencies to target prospective Board members, expand the size of the Board, and provide ongoing training for all members.

- Conduct a baseline analysis of organizational strengths and challenges to use to develop annual goals and plans for leadership training of Board members and staff.

- Research potential new funding streams, including corporate donors and fee-for-service partnerships, and train Board members in basic fundraising skills and strategies.

- Craft a public relations plan to increase awareness of Connections for Children.

- Build alliances with employers to expand at-work parent support services.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**

Connections for Children will improve its agency infrastructure by expanding fund development and fostering Board leadership. By developing a Board that is actively engaged in fundraising and programs, Connections for Children will increase the sustainability and scope of its core programs and expand the resources made available for parents to increase their knowledge of parenting skills and child development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name:</th>
<th>Foothill Family Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Technology Capacity Building Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Community:</td>
<td>San Gabriel and Pomona Valleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Planning Area:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FORMER GRANTEE**

| Total Amount RECOMMENDED (Not to exceed): | $150,000.00 |
| Duration of Project: | 3 years |
| Long-Term Outcome: | Supportive Parents/Caregivers - Parents knowledge of parenting and child development |

**Brief Project Description:**

*Project Goal:*

Foothill Family Services will improve its parenting and family intervention programs by modernizing the clinical and administrative information system through the implementation of a new electronic health records system (EHRS), which will facilitate ongoing evaluation and program improvement.

*Primary Activities:*

- Install and customize the EHRS, and recruit and hire an in-house EHRS Coordinator to implement and maintain the technology.
- Train staff (190 staff across five sites) to effectively use the EHRS system to document and improve program implementation.
- Develop outcome modules that will be tracked by EHRS, and will be designed to provide ongoing feedback for valuable program evaluation.

*Expected Long-Term Results:*

Foothill Family Services will implement EHRS to increase the agency's capacity for effective self-evaluation and ongoing program improvement. Data will be utilized to increase coordination of service delivery within and outside of the agency and to improve program implementation. Program evaluation will focus on improving service delivery to parents, as well as agency decision-making regarding parent programs, both of which are expected to improve parent education and understanding of child development – core components of Foothill Family Services' programs.
**APPLICANT 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name:</th>
<th>FORMER GRANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Redesign Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Community:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Los Angeles with a focus in central/northeast San Fernando Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Amount Total RECOMMENDED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not to exceed): $150,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Duration of Project:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Long-Term Outcome:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Parents/Caregivers- Parents integration into social networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

**Project Goal:**

Friends of the Family will decrease isolation and improve social networks for parents by developing an agency-wide evaluation plan that will enhance its ability to provide evidence of the impacts and effectiveness of programs, improve program management, and drive decision-making for future operations.

**Primary Activities:**

- Assess existing evaluation protocols and instruments, map current strengths, and identify gaps and desired benchmarks.

- Conduct staff, participant, and community interviews to allow program participants and partner agencies to provide feedback on what communities desire to attain from an evaluation process, and identify the relevant evaluation questions for programs.

- Train staff on the use of evaluation software and utilization of feedback.

- Launch a pilot evaluation, implementing data collection, utilizing instruments, and monitoring evaluation protocols.

- Refine measurement tools and data collection protocols based upon pilot findings, and launch evaluation of other programs.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**

Friends of the Family serves many parents that have been identified as isolated and do not participate in positive social networks. Improving capacity to determine the degree to which individual and coordinated program services are reducing isolation and helping parents to become more supportive of one another will strengthen capabilities to have significant positive impact in increasing and improving the social networks of parents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPLICANT 7</strong></th>
<th><strong>FORMER GRANTEE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong> INMED Partnerships for Children</td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</strong> (Not to exceed): $150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> MotherNet L.A. Capacity Building Project</td>
<td><strong>Duration of Project:</strong> 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Community:</strong> South Los Angeles with a focus in Compton</td>
<td><strong>Long-Term Outcome:</strong> Supportive Parents/Caregivers- Parents knowledge of parenting and child development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong> 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

**Project Goal:**

INMED’s MotherNet L.A. program will improve its programs’ parent education outcomes by developing fiscal flexibility to sustain outcomes for families beyond time-limited grant funding.

**Primary Activities:**

- Develop strategic communications, including organizational branding and positioning, relationship building with policymakers, key community leaders and the media, and targeted marketing materials.

- Diversify revenue by cultivating and sustaining unrestricted funding through individual and corporate sources, including fundraising events, utilizing donor management software to enhance giving and donor retention, and expanding current focus of diversification between public and private dollars to focus on multi-year funding.

- Foster relationships by creating a relationship-building action plan, including increasing its presence in collaborative organizations, and establishing L.A.-area representation on INMED’s international Board.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**

MotherNet L.A. will institutionalize a more flexible funding system to allow the organization to sustain and grow programs. Reducing restrictions on funding will facilitate the opportunity to coordinate, improve, and expand MotherNet L.A. programs, including perinatal home visitations, center-based parent education and support groups, and child development classes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name:</th>
<th>Total Amount RECOMMENDED (Not to exceed): $149,999.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach Day Nursery</td>
<td>Duration of Project: 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Long-Term Outcome: Good Health – Children’s consumption of the recommended daily intake of nutrients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Food Equals Better Chances for Educational Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Community:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Planning Area:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Project Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Goal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long Beach Day Nursery (LBDN) will improve the consumption of the recommended daily intake of nutrients for the children served in their day care and preschool settings by increasing the agency’s capacity to incorporate more fresh produce and whole grains into the children’s meals both on site and in their homes.

**Primary Activities:**

- Engage a dietician to review the LBDN meal program and advise on improving overall quality and nutritional content.
- Audit current food vendors to improve purchasing practices resulting in cost savings, better access to fresh produce, and increased use of whole grains.
- Train Long Beach Day Nursery staff to implement improvements.
- Identify culturally appropriate parent education for nutrition and food preparation, and partner with organizations to leverage use of existing, high-quality health educational materials.
- Increase exposure of children to fresh produce through in-class activities and field trips.
- Partner with Long Beach Nonprofit Partnership (LBNP) for evaluation of project.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**

LBDN will increase its capacity to provide high quality nutritious meals to children in its care, as well as its capacity to provide culturally appropriate nutrition education to parents. Through the development of in-class and field trip activities coordinated with dietitians and support from other CBOs, Long Beach Day Nursery will increase children’s consumption of the recommended daily intake of nutrients.
APPLICANT 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name:</th>
<th>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Club Community Center</td>
<td>(Not to exceed):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Duration of Project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Program for Generation X</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Community:</th>
<th>Long-Term Outcome:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Pasadena</td>
<td>Supportive Parents/Caregivers- Parents knowledge of parenting and child development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Service Planning Area: | |
|------------------------| |
| 3                      | |

Brief Project Description:

Project Goal:

Mother’s Club will increase its capacity to sustain its services to parents with young children and enhance the efficacy of its parent education programs by recruiting younger volunteers (ages 25-40) who will provide a future generation of long-term financial and leadership support to the agency.

Primary Activities:

- Recruit and hire an experienced Volunteer Program Manager who will develop and implement a formal volunteer program to attract members of “Generation-X.”

- Coordinate volunteer activities with the program staff.

- Identify and cultivate donors from the volunteer pool, and provide ongoing assessment of program effectiveness, volunteer recruitment and retention.

Expected Long-Term Results:

Mother’s Club will increase its capacity to recruit a younger core of volunteers, while simultaneously cultivating long-term donors. By developing an expanded base of younger donors, Mother’s Club will increase the sustainability of its parenting programs and will have long-term impact on parents’ understanding of child development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPLICANT 10</strong></th>
<th><strong>CURRENT GRANTEE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong> Para Los Niños</td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> Capacity Project to Enhance Parent Engagement in Early Childhood Development</td>
<td><strong>(Not to exceed):</strong> $150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Community:</strong> Los Angeles County with a focus on SPA 4</td>
<td><strong>Duration of Project:</strong> 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong> 4</td>
<td><strong>Long-Term Outcome:</strong> Supportive Parents/Caregivers: Parents knowledge of parenting and child development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

**Project Goal:**

Para Los Niños will engage parents of children in the agency's early childhood programs by increasing its capacity to better integrate parent-involvement strategies into their early childhood curriculum and further engage parents around issues of educational development.

**Primary Activities:**

- Visit other early childhood programs to study parent involvement strategies in practice.
- Hold weekly curriculum meetings at each program site to assist in curriculum development, and observe teachers as they engage parents in the classroom setting.
- Implement teacher-training workshops, field-study, curriculum planning, one-on-one teacher tutorial sessions, and classroom facilitation and evaluation.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**

Para Los Niños will enhance its curriculum with the design of new parent-involvement tools. The agency will establish opportunities for parents to spend more hours in the classroom and to provide input on classroom activities and projects. Parents will identify learning opportunities that nurture their child's growth in a variety of developmental areas, and will communicate with lead teachers on their child's developmental progress outside the home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT 11</th>
<th>CURRENT GRANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong> Westside Children’s Center, Inc.</td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED (Not to exceed):</strong> $149,011.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> Building Staff Resiliency</td>
<td><strong>Duration of Project:</strong> 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Community:</strong> West Side of Los Angeles.</td>
<td><strong>Long-Term Outcome:</strong> Supportive Parents/Caregivers: Parents knowledge of parenting and child development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong> 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

**Project Goal:**

Westside Children’s Center will improve the consistency and effectiveness of its parenting and child development programs by improving its capacity to build staff resilience.

**Primary Activities:**

- Hire a Human Resources Assistant to absorb some of the HR Director's responsibilities which will be displaced by the proposed project.
- Develop, disseminate and analyze a staff survey to gauge strengths and weaknesses relative to resiliency and the need for and interest in different strategies for staff support.
- Hire a professional development consultant to oversee implementation of monthly staff development programs.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**

Westside Children’s Center will increase its capacity to foster staff resiliency and provide comprehensive staff training and support. Greater staff resiliency will increase the agency’s staff retention and competency, and improve the consistency and effectiveness of services to parents.
# POLICY AND ADVOCACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT 1</th>
<th>NEW PARTNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong> California Center for Public Health Advocacy</td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(Not to exceed):</strong>&lt;br&gt;$499,857.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> Healthy Communities for Healthy Kids (HCHK)</td>
<td><strong>Length of Project:</strong>&lt;br&gt;5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Community:</strong> Baldwin Park, Bell, El Monte, Huntington Park, La Puente, Lynwood, and South Gate</td>
<td><strong>Primary Long-Term Outcome(s):</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Good Health</em> - Children and families' access to fruits and vegetables within their community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong> 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Brief Project Description:

### Project Goals:

California Center for Public Health Advocacy (CCPHA) will implement a place-based grassroots advocacy initiative to improve access to healthy eating opportunities for young children and their families.

### Primary Activities:

- Establish community task forces and train community members (parents of children 0-5) to compile local needs assessments, asset maps, and walkability assessments.

- Generate local data into policy briefs and community-specific fact sheets for community and policymaker training.

- Select five communities within which to conduct in-depth advocacy.

- Support advocacy groups as they select healthy eating policies for their cities, develop materials to advocate for these policies with city councils, and monitor implementation of these policies after they are adopted.

### Expected Long-Term Results:

CCPHA will improve access to healthy foods by engaging families to advocate for city policies that improve community food environments. The policies adopted in each of the five communities will institutionalize a nutritional environment that will lead to improved access to fruits and vegetables in those communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPLICANT 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>CURRENT GRANTEE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong> Los Angeles Best Babies Network</td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Not to exceed): $500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> Los Angeles County Perinatal Task Force</td>
<td><strong>Length of Project:</strong> 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Area:</strong> Los Angeles County</td>
<td><strong>Primary Long-Term Outcome(s):</strong>&lt;br&gt;Supportive Parents/Caregivers - Parents' integration into social networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Planning Area:</strong> 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

**Project Goal:**
The Los Angeles Best Babies Network (LABBN) will work through the Perinatal Mental Health Task Force to improve parents' support networks by advocating for increasing access to perinatal mental health services for women experiencing perinatal depression.

**Primary Activities:**
- Develop and implement a policy agenda aimed at increasing awareness and legislative support for the need to train providers to screen for perinatal depression.

- Convene quarterly meetings of the Perinatal Mental Health Task Force to develop a community outreach strategy to bring additional stakeholders into the policy discussions.

- Support and coordinate the Task Forces' effort to identify key policy issues around perinatal depression by creating position papers, policy briefs and collateral materials to aid in the advocacy strategy.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**
LABBN will have a long term impact on parents' integration into social networks by improving the mental health of women, their intimate ties to social services and other parents. The Task Force will develop a policy agenda to gain the attention of key legislative representatives who can work to ensure the issue of perinatal mental health is addressed through systemic change and budgetary support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT 3</th>
<th>CURRENT GRANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Name:</strong> Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center</td>
<td><strong>Total Amount RECOMMENDED</strong> (Not to exceed): $496,029.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> All Families Welcome</td>
<td><strong>Length of Project:</strong> 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Population:</strong> LGBT families in Los Angeles County</td>
<td><strong>Long-Term Outcome:</strong> Supportive Parents/Caregivers - Concrete support to parents in times of crises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPA(s) to be Served:</strong> 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Project Description:**

**Project Goal:**

The Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center (LAGLCSC) will advocate for systems change within a variety of social institutions as a means to provide LGBT families with equal access to critical concrete services.

**Primary Activities:**

- Develop materials that are designed to assist LGBT families in navigating social service systems.

- Establish concrete recommendations for public and social service institutions to improve access and reduce barriers for LGBT families to access services provided by those institutions.

- Advocate for systems/policy changes within key social institutions.

- Develop a social marketing campaign designed to shift public opinion regarding acceptance and inclusion of LGBT families.

**Expected Long-Term Results:**

LAGLCSC will advocate for systems change within social institutions that are instrumental in assuring families have the concrete support that is needed in times of crises, such as emergency housing, foster care services, or public benefits. The agency’s advocacy efforts will improve equality in LGBT families’ access to the critical services provided by the targeted community resources.
Appendix B
Long-Term Outcomes

Funding Priority 1: Supportive Parents and Caregivers
- Parents’ integration into social networks through increased contact and communication with other individuals and promotion of parents’ development of intimate ties
- Parents’ knowledge of parenting skills and child development through the promotion of strengths-based family centered assistance
- Concrete support to parents in times of crises – specifically support that meets families’ most immediate needs of food, shelter, clothing and health care

Funding Priority 2: Good Health
- Children’s Consumption of the recommended daily intake of nutrients, including fruits and vegetables
- Children and families’ access to fruits and vegetables within their community
- Children and Families’ access to appropriate locations and opportunities for physical activity
- Families’ access to appropriate oral health care resources
- Parents’ awareness of early childhood oral health needs and milestones
- Families’ utilization of preventive and therapeutic dental health services

Funding Priority 3: Prevention of Unintentional Injuries
- Parents and caregivers’ awareness of how to keep children safe at every stage of development
- Improved child safety regulation
- Communities providing a safe environment where young children can grow and thrive
Appendix C
LOI Information Sessions: Locations and Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 3, 2007</td>
<td>First 5 LA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| August 6, 2007        | Azusa Pacific University  
                       | 901 E. Alosta Ave.  
                       | Azusa, CA 91702   |
| August 7, 2007        | Inglewood City Hall,  
                       | Community Room  
                       | One W. Manchester Blvd.  
                       | Inglewood, CA 90301 |
| August 8, 2007        | Valley Presbyterian Hospital,  
                       | 15107 Vanowen St.  
                       | Van Nuys, CA 91405  |
| August 10, 2007       | Lancaster Library,  
                       | 601 W. Lancaster Blvd.  
                       | Lancaster, CA 93534  |
| August 13, 2007       | Barbara J. Riley Community and Senior Center, Auditorium  
                       | 7810 Quill Dr.  
                       | Downey, CA 90242   |
Appendix D
LOI Questions

1. Provide a brief overview of the proposed project (including the expected progression of key activities, overall goal, and how the proposed project relates to your organization's work).

2. At the completion of your grant, what specific outcomes in your organization's capacity or policy and advocacy programs will you have accomplished? How will you know that you have succeeded?

3. Describe the organizational capacity building needs or policy and advocacy issues you plan to address through the proposed work, how these needs were identified, and how the proposed project/activities will address these needs.

4. Describe the demographic and geographic characteristics of your target population. What are the target population needs related to the selected Funding Priority area? How will the proposed project/activities lead to addressing these needs? How will the proposed work have long-term impact on the selected Funding Priority?

5. Describe your organization and staff's past and present activities and accomplishments related to the selected Funding Priority area.

6. Has your organization ever conducted capacity building or policy and advocacy activities before? If so, please describe the activities and their results.

7. Describe your organization's strengths, resources, and readiness that will contribute to the successful implementation of your proposed project. Include as relevant: leadership, staff/board/volunteer expertise, working relationships with other organizations, community resources, and other related strengths.
Appendix E
Proposal Questions

1. Briefly describe the core services and/or programs your organization currently offers and explain why these services and/or programs address your organization's mission and goals.

2. Provide a brief description of your organization's proposed project, including the following:
   A) Project goal
   B) Primary activities
   C) How the project will impact your organization, children age 0 - 5, and the selected Funding Priority area
   D) Include an explanation of the "value added" from the project. That is, how will this work expand upon or enhance the work that is already being conducted by your organization?

3. If you plan to collaborate with other organizations on the project, please list the organizations if know, and/or identify the types of organizations you intend to partner with. Include the following information in your response:
   A) How you will enhance your own work on this project by collaborating with others
   B) The challenges you expect you may encounter in the collaboration.
   C) The type of decision making process you plan to use within the collaborative or coalition
   D) The level of formality of informality that is planned for the structure of the collaborative

4. Describe your proposed activities in detail. Include the following information:
   A) The logical progression of activities
   B) Who within the organization (staff, volunteers, board) and/or outside the organization (consultants, coalition members, community members, etc.) will be responsible for implementing each activity and the specific role each will play
   C) The frequency and/or number associated with each activity
   D) The expected timeline for commencing and completing each activity

5. Describe the connections between your organizational resources and proposed activities (as indicated in your logic model). Include the following information:
   A) An explanation of how and why specific organizational resources/strengths will facilitate implementation of the proposed activities. Be sure to link specific resources to specific activities
   B) Include as relevant: organizational structure, organizational experience, staff expertise and/or experience, knowledge of target community, etc.

6. Describe the connections between proposed activities and short-term outcomes. Include an explanation of how each proposed activity will lead to the activity's expected short-term outcome (project-level outcomes).
7. Describe the connections between identified short-term outcomes and intermediate outcomes. Include the following information:
   A) An explanation of how each short-term outcome will result in achievement of specific intermediate outcome(s) (outcomes related to organizational effectiveness to be achieved by the end of the grant)
   B) An explanation of how achievement of the intermediate outcomes addresses the identified organizational need
   C) An explanation of how the intermediate outcomes identified will be sustained following the close of the grant period (without future funding from First 5 LA)

8. Describe the connections between identified intermediate outcomes and the selected long-term outcome. Include an explanation of how each identified intermediate outcome will eventually lead to a sustainable impact on the selected long-term outcome within the Funding Priority area (this may not occur until after the completion of the grant). Please note that this refers to the long-term outcome selected at the beginning of the proposal.

9. Explain how the impact on the selected long-term outcome will address the identified target community need(s).

10. Describe the external forces (changes that impact the project but are outside of the applicant agency's control) that may facilitate or challenge implementation of the proposed project. How do you expect this to potentially impact your timeline for project implementation?

11. Describe how you intend to integrate evaluation activities in the implementation of your proposed project. Include the following information:
   A) Who will evaluate your proposed project
   B) The roles of your project evaluator and project staff in program evaluation
   C) In addition to program evaluation at the project level, First 5 LA will conduct an initiative-level evaluation of the Community Opportunities Fund. In light of this, describe your organization's readiness in participating in this type of evaluation

12. Describe how you propose to document the effectiveness of your project.

13. Demonstrate how you plan to address the question, "Is the project achieving its intended short-term and intermediate outcomes?" Include the following information:
   A) A sequence of detailed activities that will be conducted to assess the degree to which short-term outcomes are attained
   B) A sequence of detailed activities to be conducted to assess the degree to which intermediate outcomes are attained

14. Describe how you will use your evaluation data to ensure timely feedback in your project for these purposes: (1) to modify and enhance the project over the course of implementation; and (2) to cull lessons learned on "promising practices." Include the following information:
   A) Feedback mechanisms including forms, frequency, and participation
B) An explanation of how you propose to utilize lessons learned regarding "promising" or "best practices"
Appendix F
Number of Applicants Located Within Each SPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPA Location</th>
<th>LOI Submissions (117 Total)</th>
<th>Proposal Invites (36 Total)</th>
<th>Proposal Submissions (35 Total)</th>
<th>Recommended Proposals (14 Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPA 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H
Funding Cycles Timeline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOI Due</th>
<th>LOI Decision Made/Proposals Requested</th>
<th>Proposal Due</th>
<th>Staff Review Complete</th>
<th>Commission Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth Funding Cycle</strong></td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>Oct. 2010</td>
<td>Nov. 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dates included are estimates, and may be subject to change.
Community Opportunities Fund

Cycle One
Recommendations Report
Board of Commissioners Meeting
April 10, 2008

Community Opportunities Fund (COF)

- Introduces a new funding mechanism developed from a responsive giving model

- Seeks sustainable change within organizations and within communities

- Distributes $13 million over four cycles
Funding Strategies

• Types of Grants
  – Capacity Building
  – Policy and Advocacy

• Funding Priority Areas
  – Supportive Parents and Caregivers
  – Good Health
  – Prevention of Unintentional Injuries

Application Process

• Letter of Intent
  – Introduction to the agency
  – Overview of project
  – Fit within the fund
  – Connection to the Funding Priority area

• Proposal
  – Logic model
  – Pathway to the long-term outcome
  – Evaluation Plan
Review Process: LOI

117 Letters of Intent submitted

Review for completeness, duplication, and compliance

Individual scoring

Pair consensus

Applicant ranking

Group consensus

36 applicants selected for proposal

Review Process: Proposal

35 proposals submitted

Review for completeness

External review

External reviewer consensus

Applicant ranking

Staff review

Staff consensus

Site visits

14 applicants recommended for funding
Funding Recommendations

- Recommendation to fund 14 projects

- 11 capacity building and 3 policy and advocacy

- Total amount recommended to be awarded: $3,137,160
Next Steps

- Feedback Sessions
- Grant Agreement Negotiations
- Grantee Assistance
- Cycle Two rollout
Item 9

Approval of the Staff Recommendation in Response to Proposed Revised Requirements for Future Funding Approvals
To: First 5 LA Board of Commissioners

From: Evelyn V. Martinez, Executive Director

Date: April 10, 2008

Subject: STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION IN RESPONSE TO PROPOSED REVISED REQUIREMENTS FOR FUTURE FUNDING APPROVALS

As noted in the attached correspondence from Commissioner Jonathan Fielding, it is proposed that the Commission consider a motion to incorporate revised requirements for future funding recommendations. Based on staff’s review of this item, it is in agreement that a more systematic application of cost effectiveness, cost benefit analysis (when applicable and feasible) and a comprehensive analysis of the use of evidence based practices be provided to the Commission when considering funding decisions. Staff considers this a timely issue to address given the Commission’s history, lessons learned, and its current strategic planning activities.

Staff recommends that the proposed item by Commissioner Fielding be considered not as a stand alone Board item for Discussion and Approval but as a key component of the Strategic Planning process for the following reasons:

A. A Sunsetting Process and Tool is currently utilized by the Commission and will be ending with the current Strategic Plan. Hence, the Commission will need to determine whether to continue with this renewal process or replace it with a new set of sunsetting policies and procedures.

B. The internal assessment and Commissioner Interview phase of the current First 5 LA Strategic Planning activities being conducted by our Consultant team has highlighted extensive feedback regarding the need to establish core outcomes, agreed upon methodologies for assessing impact and the allocation of resources required to support these analyses.

Based on the above, staff has identified a number of discussion points that need to be addressed in order for staff to move forward with the development of an approach to financial and impact analysis. These points are as follows:
1. What is the Commission's definition of "impact"? What will be the criteria for "success" when considering the refunding of an initiative?

2. What will be the agreed upon approaches to analyzing cost? For example: Cost-benefit? Cost savings? Return on investment? Cost avoidance? Each of these approaches answers different questions and requires a different amount of time and resources to answer.

3. How "large" does an investment need to be in order to warrant a financial analysis and what is the Commission's definition of a "large investment" is it based on funding amount, the spread of investment? Will there be a differential application of the agreed upon methodology that corresponds to the level of investments made?

4. Will the approach allow for mid-course corrections - for example, if a program is not making sufficient progress toward intended outcomes, what will be the funding policy decision? How will the Commission take into account different target populations, communities and challenges faced by different programs within an initiative during implementation?

5. With regard to the Commission's interest that evidence based practice be built into the development of initiatives, what will be sufficient (amount, quality, and type of) evidence of an intervention's effectiveness? Will this mean that the Commission will only fund well-established, well-evaluated interventions and no longer fund new innovative, "promising" demonstration projects?

6. Will the proposed analysis only apply to those outcomes that fall within the domain of "health and obtained/expected developmental outcomes" as referenced in Commissioner Fielding's memo? For example family and community level impacts?

7. Given that it is generally easier to determine the impact and cost savings of focused health interventions than more complex community interventions, what are the implications for non-health centered programmatic strategies and models such as those that focus on building capacity, creating social capital, and changing complex behavior patterns?

8. Is the Commission interested in the "real" (total) cost of interventions or only the cost of First 5 LA's investment (i.e., attribution)?

9. How will the Commission's approach consider the impact of external policy context such as changing federal funding levels and its impact on local and county systems?

10. Will the Commission invest the time and money into the type of in-depth longitudinal study that would be needed to answer questions about the long-term impact and cost benefits of First 5 LA's investments?

11. Will the Commission add the additional time and resources necessary during the initiative development phase in order to set the groundwork for a sound impact analysis?

12. How should the timing of the analysis coincide with the "life cycle" of the intervention or effort being studied (e.g. ramp up versus full implementation)?
13. How will the Commission's approach allow for graduated adjustment to cost? Most interventions initially impact lower risk families and therefore cost less at the beginning, as they become more established in the community, they are often able to outreach to the higher risk families who require more intense interventions, and hence costs rise over time.

14. How will the Commission's approach consider all drivers of initiative costs such as staffing, operations, etc? This analysis should also consider the financial impact on First 5 LA for conducting such an analysis (e.g. costs of data collection, consultants).

Given the complexities of the issues outlined above, staff is proposing that this discussion be incorporated into the Commissions current strategic planning process.

Attachment (1)
February 4, 2008

FUTURE FUNDING APPROVAL OF SUNSETTING INITIATIVES

First 5 LA has supported many worthwhile activities that have benefited families in Los Angeles County. However, the events of the January 2008 Commission meeting left me concerned over a situation that we have faced before. At the last meeting, we approved full Cycle 2 funding of the School Readiness Initiative, having neither definitive findings on the program’s 5-year impact, nor financial outcomes, such as the cost-effectiveness. Further, we also were not provided with basic financial information such as the annual cost of the program per child or per family, of the range of these costs for different contractors. We also lacked information on the evidence-based practices were built into the intervention.

The Commission is often asked to approve substantial levels of funding without complete knowledge of program costs, benefits, and scientific merit. Given our fiduciary obligations and reductions in annual revenue to First 5, we owe it to our communities to support cost-effective programs that have a high chance of success through the use of practices shown to be consistently effective when correctly implemented. Evaluations are necessary to determine whether projects are achieving their goals, but we also need to know about costs, benefits, and the science behind projects to make informed decisions about scalability and sustainability of these investments.

Therefore, for all future large investments of funds or renewals of sunsetting initiatives, I move that the Commission require:

- A financial cost analysis, including cost per unit of service or client, and a benefit effectiveness analysis for health and obtained/expected developmental outcomes.

AND

- A qualitative and quantitative analysis of the degree to which the best evidence-based practices were/will be employed within and across programs.
Item 10
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