AGENDA

COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, February 14, 2013
1:30 pm – 4:30 pm

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

Item 1 Call to Order / Roll Call

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 2 - 4)

Item 2 Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes
  ▪ Thursday, January 10, 2013
    ○ Mark Ridley-Thomas

Item 3 Approval of the Monthly Financial Statements
  ▪ Month Ending December 31, 2012
    ○ Raoul Ortega

Item 4 Approve Two Amendments and Authorize Staff to
  Complete Final Contract Execution Upon Approval
  from the Board
  ▪ Yolanda Bosch
  ▪ Antonio Gallardo

COMMISSION: (Items 5 – 15)

Item 5 Remarks by the Commission Chair of the Board
  ▪ Mark Ridley-Thomas

Item 6 Executive Director’s Report
  ▪ Kim Belshé

Item 7 Approval of Strategic Partnership and Contract
  with the University of Southern California School
  of Social Work to Conduct a Rapid Response Data
  Project as Part of the LA Children’s Data Network
  ▪ Armando Jimenez

Item 8 Approve Resolution 2013-02 Increasing the Research
  Partnerships Research and Evaluation Project Line
  Item FY 2012-13 Program Budget by a Total Amount
  of $404,837
  ▪ Raoul Ortega
Item 9  Approve Mid-Year Amendments to the FY 2012-13 Operating Budget  
- Raoul Ortega

Item 10  Strategic Plan Implementation Profile—Best Start: Implementation Update and Key Board Considerations  
- Marsha Ellis  
- Antonio Gallardo

Item 11  Harvey Rose Audit Implementation Profile—Human Resources: Compensation & Benefits Study Implementation Update  
- Maggie Martinez  
- John Wagner

Item 12  Policy & Advocacy Update: Sustainability Plan for Universal Assessment / Home Visitation  
- Jessica Kaczmarek

Item 13  Budget Update: 2013 Expiring Grants and Contracts  
- Yolanda Bosch

Item 14  Listening, Learning and Leading (L3) Exploration Update  
- Kim Belshé

Item 15  Public Comment
Item 1

Call to Order / Roll Call
Item 2

Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 10, 2013
CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

1. Vice Chair Fielding called the meeting to order at 1:33 pm. Quorum was present.

2. Election of the Commission Chair

   Nominations were opened for the position of Commission Chair. Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas was nominated by Vice Chair Fielding. There were no other nominations.

   M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Neal Kaufman)
   WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
   THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

   NOTE: Supervisor Ridley-Thomas assumes leadership of the meeting and proceeds with the next agenda item.

3. Election of the Commission Vice Chair

   Nominations were opened for the position of Commission Vice Chair. Chair Ridley-Thomas nominated Commissioner Kaufman. There were no other nominations.

   M/S (Mark Ridley-Thomas / Jonathan Fielding)
   WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
   THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 4 – 6)

4. Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes
   ▪ Thursday, November 8, 2012 – Regular Meeting
   ▪ Thursday, November 29, 2013 – Special Meeting

   M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Sandra Figueroa-Villa)
   WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
   THE ITEM WAS APPROVED

5. Approval of the Monthly Financial Statements
   ▪ Month Ending October 31, 2012
   ▪ Month Ending November 30, 2012

Executive Director Belshé acknowledged the organization made some important progress, in terms of moving toward an electronic agenda and background materials in the spirit of being a bit greener. She mentioned that she was surprised by the thickness (3-4 inches) of paper associated with the monthly financial reports. As part of her goals and objectives, one of the things she committed to undertaking was working with the Board to review the Committee structure, the role of the Board’s rationale and its composition.

After speaking to the Commission Chair, she will be making it a high priority of working with the Budget & Finance Committee to see how material can be streamlined that is provided to the Board as part of the monthly financial statements so that the Board can be provided with crisp, clear, accessible information that honors the commitment to transparency; but also ensures that the Board is receiving the needed information to inform their understanding of the financial situation. She will be working with the new leadership from the Budget & Finance Committee and, with the Board Chair's support, will be coming back in subsequent meetings with a more condensed and Board member friendly approach to financial statements.

Interim Finance Director Ortega reported staff was requesting approval of the monthly financial statements for the months of October and November, 2012. Both financial statements represented a soft close and were unaudited.

Commissioner Fielding expressed support of Executive Director Belshé comments in her future attempt of providing the financial information in a limited number of meaningful pages.

   M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)
   WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
   THE ITEM WAS APPROVED

6. Approve 10 New Agreements, Nine Amendments and Three Renewals and Authorize Staff to Complete Final Contract Execution Upon Approval from the Board

CAO Bosch reported staff was requesting approval of the Consent Calendar which includes 10 new agreements, nine amendments and three renewals. She highlighted
that six of the new agreements were with hospitals to implement the Welcome Baby program and to provide universal assessment for newborns.

Commissioner Au commented that she noticed that in a number renewals, focusing on the timeframe, there were a number of start dates and contact end dates, with some reflecting as little as three months or six months. She wanted to know how the grantee was going to implement and execute the terms of the contract in such a short period of time. For example, she referenced the contract with the Los Angeles Parks Foundation where the listed anticipated contract start date was January 1, 2013 and the anticipated contract end date was June 30, 2013. She asked for clarification as this contract was for a time span of three years.

CAO Bosch responded that contract authority was based on the annual budget approval pursuant to the Commission's directive. In June 2013, the contract with the Los Angeles Parks Foundation would be renewed for another year starting July 1, 2013 through the following year. As the contract was staring mid-year, there was only contract authority for the remaining six months of the year.

Referencing another contract in the packet, Commissioner Au commented there was a contract with a hospital that was expected to expend $400,000 within a relatively short period of time. She asked if this was a realistic expectation or if the Commission was to expect that there will be unexpended dollars prompting a need for carryover of funds.

CAO Bosch explained the contracted amount of $459,000 with Northridge for five months was what the contractor anticipated spending in those five months between February and June of this year. CPO Gallardo commented that contract estimates were developed by staff working closely with the hospitals. That was a realistic estimate from the hospitals for the contract period.

Regarding an amendment with the Early Childhood Education Workforce, Commissioner Au stated there was an amount requested of $8,000,142 and the timeframe was for six months. She asked if the expectation was for all of this funding to be expended in the six months. CAO Bosch replied in the affirmative and stated that funding not expended would be carried over to the next year.

Commissioner Fielding referenced paged 190 of the meeting packet. He applauded that a contract for a kindergarten readiness license-exempt provider needs assessment with Harder+Company was being requested. Commissioner Fielding said this was a particularly important segment and would also help the Commission with its child obesity project. This meant working directly with the license-exempt childcare providers. He felt this was a good example for how synergy could be obtained among different parts of the Commission's portfolio of projects.

Regarding the data systems integration contract, Commissioner Fielding said the project was for three years but he was interested in knowing the timetable to actually have the data system to the point where it had some utility. Also, if modifications had to be made to the system, were the costs included in the $1.3 million budget.

Director Jimenez reported that for the first phase of project development of the database for Welcome Baby, the amount included maintenance and revisions. The intent was to develop a data program to be able to make modifications to account for any changes that
the providers may need when doing the case management or comprehensive home visitation. The amount was for this fiscal year to be expended.

Commissioner Fielding asked how soon would there be something that could be employed. Director Jimenez responded the goal was to have a viable pilot or data to be out at the beginning of the new fiscal year.

Commissioner Fielding commented he was impressed with the percentage of parents who accepted the offer to be screened under the 211 scenario. This was good for reaching out to kids who may have developmental delays and being assessed in an early period. There was no down side to that screening. He said this was really good news.

Commissioner Curry asked if there were any efforts to integrate the services provided by visiting nurse and Welcome Baby programs with the DCFS hotline calls so that if a call was made to the hotline at DCFS and it was determined the baby would stay at home, was there some way to give some priority to offer visiting nurse or Welcome Baby services for an at-risk family.

Senior Program Officer (SPO) DuBransky responded that based on the screening assessment that was done in the pilot, what Commissioner Curry was asking happens fairly naturally. A strong policy decision could be put in place. Right now, DCFS workers, in that area, make quite a few referrals to the Commission’s pilot program for families that are in various components of the DCFS system.

Commissioner Curry commented she was referring to children who were not being brought into the system but because of a hotline call, perhaps the children or family were at-risk. She was wondering if a protocol or relationship could be developed with DCFS. SPO DuBransky commented the Bridges screening tool was being piloted, with any kind of interaction with the child welfare system resulting in increasing the risk screening score. Staff was also discussing options for individuals who have the DCFS contact, although they may not have high at-risk scores. As the screening tool is being pilot-tested, staff will be bringing back various recommendations to the Board.

Commissioner Au asked if the Commission would be able to get a report to see how the referral process, in terms of identification and referral to the hotline, was performing. Staff responded the data system that Director Jimenez reported on will be a tremendous help in providing this type of information.

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Nancy Au) WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION, THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

COMMISSION: (Items 7 – 14)

7. Remarks by the Commission Chair

Chair Ridley-Thomas thanked everyone for the opportunity of being at First 5 LA and looked forward to the next 12 months of service on the Commission. He acknowledged the work of the previous Chair (Supervisor Yaroslavsky) and his staff for providing leadership that was pivotal in the transitional nature of First 5 LA.
The new leadership is poised to make a difference in terms of what First 5 LA is about and what it can do. Chair Ridley-Thomas stated he was pleased to have the opportunity to work with the new Vice Chair (Neal Kaufman) and the entirety of the Board in seeking to fulfill the mission of the organization—fundamentally to improve the quality of life aimed at basic issues, not the least of which is health, for these young people and their families. He said there was a lot to do. Furthermore, he has been persuaded by the few conversations, to date, that he has had with the new senior team, and they are ready to go forward and make something of consequence happen; to build on the strength of the work that has been done by the staff to date; and, to take it to the next level. He stated he felt this was the obligation and hoped that was what the Commission was going to do.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said he was guided by a fundamental question, “How we do and continue to do and make a substantive impact on the population that the Commission serves. How is it that the Commission will make a substantive impact on the population that is served.” Chair Ridley-Thomas said he was committed to this and was confident of the Board and the staff, in its entirety, found themselves equally committed. There are strategic opportunities; there are tactical considerations the Commission can be thoughtful and transparent about. Notions related to place-based investments to strengthen families can make a substantial impact. He believed the Commission could explore ways to sustain investment in early education that place children on a pathway to college and beyond; rather than other alternatives that seem to be too plentiful to mention.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said that he felt very good about what could happen and was prepared to roll up his sleeves with all of the Commissioners to pursue this. There were a couple of innovations that he trusted could be made. For example, he has asked the Executive Director to implement a process where verbatim transcription of the Commission meetings would enhance transparency and accountability. Those who come to the public microphones should identify themselves so that the recorder knows who is speaking and no erroneous remarks would be attributed to the Chair.

Chair Ridley-Thomas made the following committee assignments.

**Executive Committee**
- Neal Kaufman (Chair)
- Antronette Yancey (Vice-Chair)
- Sandra Figueroa-Villa
- Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas

**Budget & Finance Committee**
- Marv Southard (Chair)
- Sandra Figueroa-Villa (Vice-Chair)
- Jane Boeckmann
- Jonathan Fielding

**Program & Planning Committee**
- Antronette Yancey (Chair)
- Arturo Delgado (Vice-Chair)
- Duane Dennis
- Philip Browning
- Deanne Tilton

**Public Affairs Liaisons**
- Deanne Tilton
- Patricia Curry

**Best Start Liaisons**
- Nancy Au
- Antronette Yancey
- Duane Dennis

In closing his remarks, Chair Ridley-Thomas said he was reminded of the credo of the Children’s Defense Fund, in that there is one among us known as Marion Wright
Edelman that embodies so much of what has been thought of and said about children, and what we ought to afford them. Chair Ridley-Thomas commented he thought children should be afforded a head start, a healthy start, a fair start, a safe start, and a moral start, and successful passes to adulthood with the help of caring families and communities can make a huge difference. Chair Ridley-Thomas further stated that he hoped, trusted, and thought that this was what the First 5 LA Commission was about. He pledged his commitment to work with the Commission and urged everyone to get to work.

6. Executive Director’s Report

The written report was received and filed as submitted. In addition to the written report, the following items were highlighted:

- **Chief Operating Officer:** John Wagner was introduced as the Chief Operating Officer. At the Board meeting, at the end of November, the Board authorized the creation of a COO position which reflected the Board’s investment in the strength and effectiveness of the organization. Bringing someone of John Wagner’s caliber, background, and skills was a testimony to the Board, staff, and the work of First 5.

- **Board Presentations:** At each Board meeting, one of the Commission’s important initiatives, as part of the strategic plan, as modified, will be highlighted to give everyone an opportunity to have a shared understanding of what the critical issues are and challenges that are arising, and; using it as an opportunity to lift up those Board-level policy decisions for consideration and potential further action. The first presentation will focus on universal assessment of all newborns, as well as Welcome Baby, Best Start and Home Visitation.

- **Harvey Rose Audit:** Over the course of the next year, presentations will be made to the Board on the recommendations that emerged from the Harvey Rose audit.

- **Listening, Learning and Leading Initiative** – An update will be presented at each of the Board meetings in terms of the process, some initial learning, as the organization moves towards identification of more specific implementation issues associated with the strategic plan.

- **Public Policy:** The Executive Director will be working with the Board Chair, Vice Chair and Program & Planning Committee to see if it makes sense to include a more consistent agenda item around public policy. The success, as an organization, in terms of a more systematic, sustained program advancing the overarching purpose should not be depended exclusively on what is funded; but rather, it is about the larger set of partnerships and public policies that will influence a change over the long term.

- **State Budget:** As a result of both the progress made in spending cuts and bringing down the deficit in recent years, as well as improvements in economy and voter approval of Proposition 30, the budget picture is much improved. In terms of the issues First 5 LA cares about—health, obesity prevention, child welfare service, early childhood education—the picture is a much more positive one that it has been in the past.
A really good example of the different context is that there is now a $40 million general fund augmentation to effectively backfill the state First 5 dollars that had been used in recent years on a "one-time basis" to support programs that, otherwise, would have been supported with the general fund. This represents a significant change. Symbolically, this is really important.

Regarding education, a significant infusion of additional resources has been proposed of approximately $2.7 billion. What is most interesting is the governor's continued focus on a new funding formula for K-12 education; and to the extent it is grounded in efforts to allocate resources to those districts and those schools where there is the most academic need. There may be interesting opportunities for the Commission, from a pre-K perspective, to look for ways to participate in that conversation.

This is a very significant proposal, in terms of health care, in moving forward with the implementation of the Medicaid expansion as called for by the Affordable Care Act effective January 1, 2014. Of note to the Commission is that the administration has indicated that there are a couple of different approaches for pursuing the Medi-Cal expansion, one of which is to have the state Medicaid program expand to cover all low income populations, 138% of poverty and below, effectively taking back the County responsibility for indigent care. Alternatively, the Counties would implement the expansion on a County basis. As a part of that first path, the administration seems to be proposing an approach whereby the state would assume full responsibility for indigent care. In so doing, it would repurpose State dollars that are currently going to support County indigent care responsibilities. It would be redirecting what are now considered County realignment or County Indigent Care dollars pulling them back at the State level.

Given the complexities of the state budget, the state cannot really take money back. What the state does is give more responsibility to the counties. In the context of this proposal, the Administration has said that the counties would undertake new programmatic responsibilities including the area of childcare. The state responsibilities for child care, under this approach, would devolve and be realigned to the counties.

The budget reaffirms the shift of nearly 900,000 children from the Healthy Families Program to the Medi-Cal program and makes a number of changes in terms of funding shifts and streamlining of process around childcare and CalWorks.

Upon concluding with highlights of her written report, Executive Director Beishé made a presentation to the Commission on the Listening, Learning and Leading Initiative.

The intention of the Listening, Learning and Leading Initiative is to review and assess implementation of the strategic plan, as modified. The intent is not to revisit and reconsider the strategic plan. The intent is to do what most organizations or many organizations do, as a healthy business practice, which is midway through a strategic plan, one steps back, one reflects, one reviews, considers and makes course corrections, as necessary and appropriate.

In terms of context, the Commission reached the midpoint of implementation of the 2009-2015 strategic plan, as modified, in the fall of 2010.
There is a new executive director and a new operating officer. Transitions in leadership also provide an opportunity for review, consideration, and organizational growth. This is an opportune time to listen—to listen to the Board, to listen to the staff and grantees, as well as the broader stakeholders and key informants about how the Commission is doing and where it is with implementation and the strategic plan—what is working well, what needs improvement, how greater impact can be made in terms of improving the quality of life of young children in this community.

The intent is also to engage a variety of stakeholders and to learn by synthesizing what is heard through the conversations with staff, the Board, grantees, and many others. The learning process will also be looking internally at the amazing amount of data, the amazing amount of information and evaluations, that the research and evaluation team, working with the broader staff and grantees, has put together.

Part of this approach will also be leading. What is learned and heard through this process will be synthesized with an eye toward identifying common issues and themes related to implementation. Critical issues will be identified that will really need to be lifted up for the Board’s consideration and possible midcourse corrections in the work still to be done.

There are four goals to the exploration.

1. The building of a common understanding among staff and Commissioners about where we are with implementation of the strategic plan.
2. Identifying what critical implementation issues need to come to the Board.
3. Identifying if there are opportunities for the Commission to do its work better. One component will be to really look at the ability to execute and strengthen external relationships.
4. Taking stock of the strategic plan with the final goal being to provide a road map. By doing this, staff hope to clarify the strategic direction, identify those midcourse directions, and determine how to fundamentally achieve greater impact for the populations being served.

The approach will be a very focused, collaborative and time-bound. Unlike strategic planning, the approach cannot go on for months and months. This is a project that is beginning now, and will be wrapped up by the late spring or early summer. The project is an exploration centered on how do a better job by way of children.

There are three strands of the inquiry that will be undertaken:

1. An external focus on the strategic plan and its completion; clarifying the strategic direction and identifying those opportunities for greater impact. Conversations will be taking place with a diversity of stakeholders. This is a very important strand of the inquiry process.
2. A review of the internal financial management and administrative systems; focusing on staffing, organizational structure, contractor relationships, and contractor processes and procedures.
3. A review of the external environment seeking out individuals who share the Commission’s aspirations for kids around zero to five; and, identifying the
political, social and economic trends that influence the populations and communities the Commission serves.

In order to carry out the work, an internal planning team has been assembled, comprised of representation from each of the departments. Team members represent a diversity of roles within the organization and also represent a diversity of tenure—new and long standing employees. Consultants will be engaged. Cecilia Sandoval (The Sandoval Group) will be playing an overarching coordinating role as part of this process. She brings a terrific sensibility, set of skills, and expertise to this work. Blue Garnet will be engaged as a second consultant in this process, bringing a very important focus on impact and how organizations best align their strategic plan, their internal processes, and how to maximize impact.

The Board has an important role to play. Staff want to listen to and learn from the Commissioners. This engagement has already begun through the one-on-one discussions with the Executive Director. Most Commissioners, if not all, are having meetings with the Edelman Consulting Firm around brand perception, and awareness of First 5 early childhood development issues.

A diversity of stakeholder engagement strategies from small groups to larger groups will be undertaken. Commissioners are welcome to participate, as interested and appropriate, in those conversations. This will provide an opportunity for learning and listening as the project moves further along and begins to identify some of critical themes and issues that emerge from the conversations. Those issues will be brought back to the Board for purposeful engagement.

Regarding next steps, communication has taken place with stakeholder partners through website postings. More recently, a statement was posted along the lines of "I've been here one month. Here's who I am. Here's initial observations," and then, at a broad level, what is the intent of undertaking the listen, learning, and leading exploration. The postings have been done in such a way to facilitate feedback from those who wish to provide it. This does not seem to have been done before.

Executive Director Belshé acknowledged Commissioners Dennis and Browning for suggesting that direct communication take place with the Best Start communities. Communication has taken place directly with the Best Start communities, being sensitive to the communities with whom the Commission is working, partnering and investing. Additionally, staff will be engaging the community regularly; and FAQs will posted on the website and will also be used in follow-up conservations.

The internal planning team and the consultants are in the process of finalizing the project design. Some of the key decisions points include identifying the categories of stakeholders but also specific stakeholders (staff, Board); but more importantly, stakeholders outside the organization through the broader community.

The project is time bound with resources being limited. It will not be possible to meet with everyone. Technology will be deployed in as appropriate and useful a way as possible, looking at some of the different and various outreach and engagement strategies that can be employed to secure meaningful input in a credible way.
Interview protocols are also being developed. There needs to be consistency to the questions being asked of key informants regardless of outreach approach.

In terms of product expectation, there will be a series of reports and a series of deliverables to the Board. The Board will be presented with a pretty detailed snapshot of where we are in implementation of the strategic plan, as modified, tentatively as early as March.

It is anticipated that some very specific issue briefs will shine a light much more concretely on critical decision points that the Board really is going to need to grapple with. Staff intends to be presenting options, considerations, and trade-offs to help frame and inform those decisions.

Executive Director Belshé said she had been gratified by the enthusiastic engagement of staff across the organization around the listening, learning and leading exploration. This will be an organization-wide undertaking.

Commissioner Au stated she was assuming this exploration approach was talking about some unfinished conversations that the Commission had prior to engaging in a search process. These unfinished conversations had to do with the strategic plan, in essence. It also had to do with a number of skepticism that was being articulated outside the organization and among new Commissioners regarding the strategic plan being finalized, particularly about place-based. The question in the air at the time was a need for the Commissioners to engage in a conversation to clarify further what was the expectation as well as the understanding of what Best Start place-based was about.

Commissioner Au said she was going to assume that part of the process being engaged in terms of listening, learning and leading will encompass and embrace, and specifically, address this unanswered question. Referencing prior comments made by Executive Director Belshé, each Commissioner had a different definition and/or understanding of place-based.

Commissioner Au stated that her goal, as the newly appointed Liaison to Best Start, was to begin with clarification. She said the Commission needed to be clear because from her vantage point, as she listens to community folks, they have been excited about place-based work with Best Start but are also getting confusing messages. That confusion was really reflective of the confusion that is here among the Commissioners. She also commented that everyone needed to be on the same page.

Chair Ridley-Thomas commented he thought it was a very helpful intervention for the Commission to come to grips with. It would seem to him that this should be a priority consideration for the Commission in collaboration with the staff, so that there was a full clarification as a result of the appropriate vetting; and then reaffirmation of what was originally intended, if in fact, that should be the decided view of the Commission.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said that to have it be nebulous or ambiguous in any way was not helpful to the stakeholders and not helpful to staff. Obviously, the Commission has an obligation to clarify place-based. He suggested that such clarification be made among the highest priorities and the issue be revisited at the next Commission
meeting, perhaps, and on an ongoing basis until the Commission can be satisfied with the clarification.

Executive Director Belshé supported the comments of the Commissioner Au and Chair Ridley-Thomas. The lack of clarification is an example of a critical implementation issue associated with the strategic plan. The process being started is not solely about the Best Start Initiative. It is about the strategic plan broadly, as modified by the County-wide augmentations in the fall of 2010.

Best Start is going to be a critical piece of the listening and learning component. The broad proposal to the Board, as part of the process, is to give time to staff, as discussed at the November meeting, to undertake the exploration to do some of the outreach with the Board, staff members, and the broader community and then come back to the Board with the crystallization of some of the critical decision points that need to be raised and a roadmap for solving them. This is a good example of some outstanding and unfinished business that needs to be lifted and clarified. Executive Director Belshé stated she would like to be afforded time to listen to the community colleagues, the Board and staff, and then come back with best thinking about what has been heard and how to move the initiative forward.

Chair Ridley-Thomas commented that perhaps this ought to be pursued iteratively in the sense the Commission should make sure that whatever it is the Commission is doing in this area and that, at least, the Board has clarification about that. If the Commission wishes to critique that, it is wholly appropriate. If the Commission wishes to modify that, it seems there a way to do that; but, it would seem rather fundamental that the Board have clarity as to what it, minimally, is talking about.

Furthermore, Chair Ridley-Thomas commented that it would be appropriate for the next agenda to make sure that the Commissioners were all talking about the same thing. Presently, he said he was not persuaded that such was the case at this minute.

Executive Director Belshé said that she was not persuaded either. She also said this was one of the challenges being faced organizationally. It was an issue with the Board and the broader community as well.

Executive Director Belshé said staff would take back this strong interest in accelerating an approach on Best Start and maybe an initial discussion could take place at the next Board meeting about the history and how, organizationally, the Commission arrived where it is, shining a light from a Board perspective on what some of the key elements or questions that would be a helpful investment of the Commission’s and staff’s time.

Commissioner Dennis commented that part of the issue was how to measure success, not only with Best Start, but with all of the Commission’s initiatives. Part of implementation around any strategic plan deals with what are the success criteria. He thought this was a challenge, not only with Best Start, but also, with everything else the Commission does. In developing the learning, listening and leading framework, how is success determined, how does the Commission know what has been done, what needs to be done, and the impact in the community. Knowing this would help the conversation considerably.
Vice Chair Kaufman commented that he appreciated the overview and thought it was masterful in terms of what were the challenges. In addition to what has already been mentioned, one area to emphasize was that the Commission had a committee structure. It has evolved and continually changed in various ways but it is a solid structure. Under Commissioner Yancey's direction, as the Chair of the Program & Planning Committee, Vice Chair Kaufman asked what the role of that committee was and what issues were referred to that committee versus coming to the Board. The Program & Planning Committee is a Brown Act entity, everyone is invited, and there are certain members who comprise the committee. Votes are taken, in principal, as the committee has no decision-making authority and recommendations come to the full Board.

Vice Chair Kaufman said that one of the key things that committee allows is an informal way for anyone of the public to come and give their opinion. This also gives the opportunity for, often very rich group discussions and other methods. The basic structure is that the Commission delegates to the Program & Planning Committee a question or task. That task is then decided how it will be approached in consultation with the committee chair and members. What the Commission needs from staff is help on determining what should be referred to the committee.

Chair Ridley-Thomas weighed into the point being made by Vice Chair Kaufman. He thought the process could and should be interactive and dynamic in that regard. It would the Chair's expectation that the committees are able to generate the discussion items from the Board to consider; maybe spontaneously generated in the context of a discussion that this too weighty or too massive for the Board or the committee to dispose of itself.

Chair Ridley-Thomas further commented that therefore, dialogue with staff would be a process by which there would be a full airing, in a variety of context, of a given policy matter and/or initiative. Chair Ridley-Thomas stated that it would not be his view that the staff sets the plate for what committees discuss but staff would have input and contribute to that process; but matters could come from the Board and/or the committees themselves—broadly, fully active in terms of the dynamic nature of how policy is formed but everybody gets a chance to be involved.

Vice Chair Kaufman said his understanding of the Chair's comments was that the Commission delegates an idea to the committee to develop into more detail. He clarified that his comment was relating to those times when the Executive Director will be able to ask the Board if an issue should be brought to the committee to have a more detailed conversation prior to bringing the issue back to the Board for final approval.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said this was not what he was saying but it did not preclude it. Chair Ridley-Thomas said that he was suggesting that processes ought to be defined by a high level of transparency with respect to the discussions at the Board level, obviously, and at the committee level as well. How those issues are generated or manufactured can happen in a variety of ways; as long as the range of noted stakeholders know what is going, then the Commission is in good shape.
Executive Director Belshé commented that specifically as it relates to the listening, learning and leading initiative, she anticipated that as part of the reporting back to the Board, it would include what is being heard, what is being learned in terms of synthesizing or distilling those findings as well as what is being learned from internal information and resources. Staff will be identifying issues and it will be at that point that direction will be sought as to how to most appropriately engage the proper committee in terms of helping to further flesh out, air, consider alternatives and situations which would then come back to the full Board. The committee’s structure has an important role to play in terms of this exploration; but, it is going to be a function of what is heard, what is learned, and what comes back to the Board.

Executive Director Belshé said she was trying to get her arms around the committee roles, composition, and rationale in trying to understand what the committees do relative to the strategic plan, relative to either building upon an existing initiative or considering a new one. She hoped that as the committees are engaged more fully, they are being engaged in the development of ideas or resolving issues that are grounded in the implementation work, which is very distinct than generating new initiatives entirely. There may be some new initiatives that emerge but she would hope they are grounded in the overarching goals and the strategic framework that has been put forth.

Chair Ridley-Thomas suggested that the strategic framework needs to be rearticulated and presumably reaffirmed. He said he thought it was a mistake to assume that there was full embrace of that which was, in light of, the obvious transition that First 5 LA was in. He appealed to everyone to have an open mind toward reassessment of those things as deemed appropriate. He was not an advocate of reinventing the wheel or change for the sake for change. But, in fact, he thought the opportunity presented itself for the Commission to build, as he said in his earlier remarks, on the strengths that have been made obvious. At the same time, be appropriately prepared to make the adjustment that may be rather obvious and in need of happening.

Commissioner Dennis commented that in his committee designation, Chair Ridley-Thomas also discussed a Best Start liaison. He asked what would become the role of the liaison along with the Program & Planning Committee in the doing work. One would not want to be repetitive. As a Commission, the role of the liaison versus the role of the committee needed to be defined as well as how would the liaisons interconnect with the committee work in that piece.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said Commissioner Dennis brought up an excellent point. As the Commission moves forward, appropriate midcourse corrections would be made. If something was obviously duplicative, as a result of an appropriate vetting of that duplication, the Commission would adjust the item at hand and figure out new ways of innovation. He thought it was best to do that with palms up so that the entire Board would have an appreciation for the direction in which the Commission was headed. This would result with the appropriate level of input from senior staff.

NOTE: At the recommendation of staff, Item 9 was deferred to the end of the agenda. Chair Ridley-Thomas concurred stating that by doing so and following the budget presentations, this would be a more coherent way to digest the information being presented.
10. Approve Resolution 2013-01 Increasing the FY 2012-13 Program Budget by a Total Amount of $2,593,566; Approve Additional Contract Authority of $250,000 for the Infant Safe Sleeping Public Education Campaign Countywide Initiative Line Item

Interim Finance Director Ortega reported staff was requesting approval of Resolution 2013-01. This action formalizes the earlier discussion during Consent Calendar of approving actual dollars in the fiscal year into the FY 2013 program budget by a total amount of $2.6 million.

The $2.6 million is comprised of four specific pieces starting with data system. This action moves funds from the contract authority represented in the 2012-13 workplan into the FY 2012-13 budget to cover the high up front cost necessary to build the requested database to improve reporting. This action will reduce the uncommitted fund balance by $459,000.

Under workforce, the program budget was increased by $664,000 in this area. This amendment accounts for increased target, number of coaching hours and sessions, and adding milestones for several of the subcontractors.

With Tot Parks, the overall program budget was increased by $974,000. This increase is spread between three contracts for the following reasons: (1) accelerated completion of park projects to June 30, 2013; (2) support of an increase in capital cost resulting from accelerated design for construction scheduled for park projects; (3) addressing safety and accessibility issues identified during the park planning phase.

Under universal assessment, an increase in the program budget of 495,000 was made. The amendment accounts for hospital participation in FY 2012-13 exceeding the original projections.

In addition to the resolution, staff is also requesting contract authority of $250,000 for the Infant Safe Sleeping Public Education campaign. The current budget and workplan only accounted for estimated fiscal year expenditures. The additional $250,000 is needed to authorize the execution of the contract renewal prior to June 30, 2013. This contract will cross fiscal years from January 26, 2013 through January 25, 2014.

Chair Ridley-Thomas commented that he was pleased to see the Commission was prepared to make progress in the public education campaign around safe sleeping. Each year, in the County of Los Angeles, approximately 70 babies die as a result of unsafe sleeping practices. A number of people have had to learn quite a bit about this. It was a matter of disbelief for many; and, yet, this is a very important matter for the Commission to give attention. This is an important issue that needs to be addressed, in his opinion, because these deaths are in fact preventable. Unfortunately, in too many communities, too many youngsters are at risk for unsafe sleeping practices. Chair Ridley-Thomas believed that public education could make a difference; it has made a difference, and he saluted those who have been working on this issue. There is an abundance of data that is rather compelling and it is high time that more people learn about it, and embrace it for the good of those babies and their parents who want to do better; but, have not full cognizance of the harm that they are engaging in.
Commissioner Fielding said it was exciting to see that there are four new hospitals and six contracts with hospitals by next month in terms of universal assessment of newborns. This was really good news and it was great to see things moving along at a proper pace.

Commissioner Tilton commented how important were the words of Chair Ridley-Thomas regarding the significance of the campaign reaching the general public about the dangers of unsafe sleeping. The support by Chair Ridley-Thomas made a huge difference. She referenced an LA Times article from several days prior that quoted professional opinion about the positive nature of safe sleeping practices. There is a challenge in front and it is a difficult topic. The Commission has enormous opportunity to save the lives of infants. More infants die each year in LA County because of unsafe sleeping practices than from auto accidents, flu, pneumonia, fires, falls and injuries. It is the leading cause of infant deaths in LA County. She thanked the Chair for his support of this issue and for his comments. She thanked the Commissioners who were also supporting this initiative because it was a long overdue effort to save the lives of babies in the county.

Commissioner Au commented that one of things she wanted to highlight was a reflection of the broad thinking the Commissioners engaged in with the toddler park initiative and how the Commission was able to leverage First 5 dollars with identifying some potential partners in creating a number of these parks. She said she did not want the Commission to lose sight of that. It was not just First 5 LA that was funding the creation of these parks; but, the Commission was actually working in partnership in leveraging dollars and in making certain many of these parks became a reality as well. She acknowledged the Community Investments department in their efforts of doing that and cautioned the Commissioners to not forget either.

M/S  (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)
WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

11. Receive and File the FY 2012-13 Quarter 1 Progress Report and Improvement Plan

Executive Director Belshé reported that Director Jimenez would be proving an update on the FY 2012-13 first quarter progress report and improvement plan, which was a product of the direction provided by the Board associated with recommendations from the audit; and represents a really important step forward in terms of the ability of the Commission, as an organization, to support a more accurate and realistic expenditure forecast, and improve the way that it is done.

Director Jimenez commented he was going to present the staff report on the quarter one progress for the workplan. In this presentation, he briefly touched upon the background, the purpose of the workplans and provided a brief snapshot of where staff was with regard to activities completed and expenditures for the first quarter. Additionally, key learnings were identified through the analysis of the reasons why activities were not completed in the first quarter when they should have been; and when the expenditures were not at target set; and most importantly, actions were articulated that were underway and actions that would be done in order improve.
The Harvey Rose Audit in 2011 specified the need to create an detailed workplan. This, along with several other recommendations, expressed the need for more transparency and greater accountability. As a result, the first workplan was presented to the Commission in June of 2012. The primary intent of the workplan was to serve as a management tool for staff to guide its work in implementing the program workplan and to provide staff with a sense of being more accountable to the work that set was out to be done.

This report only includes activities completed and expenditures for the first quarter, July 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012. It is important to note that the report includes data for 59 workplans, which includes 113 discrete projects and 272 active contracts and grants. It is an incredible amount of work; and doing this report basically reaffirmed that an enormous amount of efforts are being done by the Commission.

This is not a report on the status of Commission's progress in achieving the four major outcomes. This is not a report on where the Commission is with regard to implementing the strategic plan nor is it a report providing an organizational assessment of First 5 LA.

The extent of pure data provided by finance includes invoices processed through November 30, 2012, and the activity completion rate is a percentage of all activities that were completed based upon all the activities that were going to be completed in the first quarter.

A tremendous amount of work has been done. Director Jimenez commended grantees and contractors because there has been a significant amount of effort and work that has been done in the first quarter. In grouping the major investment categories, it was found that the county-wide strategies, and the prior strategic plan work surpassed a goal of 75 percent, which had been identified. Across all 59 workplans, 66 percent of the activities were completed. Roughly 50 percent of all of the workplans actually met the 75 percent target.

Along the same groupings of place-based initiatives, county-wide strategies, county-wide initiatives, prior strategic plan, research and evaluation, and new projects, spending was looked at. Unfortunately, there were no groupings that actually met the 20 percent expenditure goal that had been identified although county-wide strategies, prior strategic plans, and research and evaluation were very close.

Across all 59 workplans, 11 percent of the total FY 2012-2013 budget was completed. Staff was asked about why activities were not completed and why expenditure goals fell short of the target. All of that information across all the 59 workplans was coded and themes were identified. Four major themes were identified: (1) planning/workplan development; (2) internal systems; (3) grantee contractor issues; and, (4) governance and policy.

Some of the salient issues were highlighted including:

1. Considerable inconsistencies in how the workplans were developed in terms of cost estimation methods used.
2. Inconsistencies in how activities were articulated across the 59 workplans. In some cases, staff did not expect to have expenditures in the first quarter but expenses would be incurring the contracting phase.
(3) Staff transition issues related to staff moving from project to project within a department and staff moving from department to department. Several of these led to delays in completion of activities as well as expenditures. Associated with transition is the culture of reinvention, most often associated with the reinvention of the wheel. There is a tendency for tinkering to happen on scope of work negotiations that lead to extended time frames and delays.

(4) There were challenges expressed by staff with working with large institutions that have their own governance structures and procedural issues to account for.

(5) Issues of underperformance related to grantees and contractors, in spite of increased emphasis on staff monitoring the performance of directors, contractors, and grantees to make sure the projects moved back on target.

(6) The need to get clarity on Best Start as it does affect several projects since the workplan budget for Best Start alone is over $31 million.

Specific actions that are already underway include staff doing more to improve work moving forward; including having focus groups with staff as well as several discussions with leadership in order to identify the most appropriate actions to move forward with.

One action that is already underway is the Executive Director appointing the Chief Operating Officer to be a lead in working with the senior leadership team to be the central point of contact for future workplan development. To insure that there is consistency, there is quality, comprehensiveness to the workplans and that everyone has the same understanding of definitions with regard to activities, objectives, and timelines.

Based on lessons learned, a much more effective workplan tool will be created in the future. Processes will be created that will help ensure consistent definitions. Clear benchmarks will be defined specifically for expenditures and to help streamline the data that is received from grantees and contractors. Not only will it help internal assessment of performance; but, it will help reporting to the state Commission on an annual basis.

Staff is also beginning to implement electronic work flow processes that will help track projects from idea to execution. Employing a comprehensive time and resource study to help in understanding the time it takes to move from allocations made at the Commission meeting, to the first payment of invoices, to finding areas where we can expedite our work.

Staff will be developing protocols to help transition staff as they come into the organization and as they move from project to project or from department to department in order to avert any delays.

In terms of grantee/contractor issues, one thing that is already underway and moving forward is a master agreement with the County of Los Angeles. Staff is also moving forward with the templates to help our negotiation and contract process with major universities. Speaking on behalf of the research community, Director Jimenez said one of the issues that have caused delays is the negotiating of data ownership and proprietary rights with universities. Staff will be conducting an independent survey of First 5 LA grantees and contractors to help us understand how we can be more efficient.

With regard to governance and policy in terms of actions, discussions with Commissioners are under way to help staff understand the information needs and
priorities and staff will be working with the Commission to clarify the policy direction and outstanding implementation issues related to Best Start.

The Commission may consider that a midyear report may be a more accurate reflection of staff's ability to implement the workplan and spending dollars that were set out at the beginning of fiscal year.

Executive Director Belshé thanked Director Jimenez for his whirlwind tour through the first quarter. She underscored Director Jimenez's observation, from his vantage point as a long time veteran of First 5 LA. She said this was a very important step in terms of providing management with a much needed and long overdue tool to understand the work of the Commission. As an organization that is committed to transparency and accountability, this is an enormously helpful and important step forward. No one is happy with the results but the red needs to be embraced with an acknowledgement to do better.

Executive Director Belshé also underscored the team effort and the amount of activity this organization was involved with. The 59 workplans do not include an additional three initiatives supported by the Commission, such as the separate housing initiative which is enormously exciting and important but additional work. The Commission does a lot—59 initiatives, 113 discrete projects, 272 active grants.

Executive Director Belshé further commented that all of the projects and initiatives of the Commission have implications in terms of workload, in terms of allocation of human resources, allocation of financial resources, which all have implications on the opportunity to have impact.

Executive Director Belshé also said the L3 exploration will help to clarify and better understand roles and responsibilities in an organization-wide effort. She was delighted to have a Chief Operating Officer who would be leading the very extensive comprehensive improvement plan mentioned by Director Jimenez in his presentation.

Commissioner Fielding thanked staff and said it was helpful to have this very frank assessment of some of the issues with moving ahead at the appropriate pace or not. He said that problems cannot be fixed if they are not identified.

He said he noticed one of the issues was that staff had difficulty appreciating the difference between objective and activity. It made it very hard to have an effective workplan with smart initiatives if the difference is not known between objective and activity. He suggested internal training as important as that impact could not be assessed to decide what data elements would need to be collected if that confusion exists. If the Commission was really interested in impact, then there needed to be an understanding of what the contractors put in place.

Commissioner Au said that she started to feel like a broken record. Going back to an earlier conversation about how First 5 LA views itself in terms of the work that is done and its role in terms of establishing some positive relationship to the community served and with the partners—community-based organizations and County agencies.

Commissioner Au cautioned about “gotcha” policy and not wanting the Commission to engage in such policy practice. Additionally, Commissioner Au said that the
Commission should be clear on what will be tracked and on expectations. Many times, the Commission makes decisions about initiatives based on a lot of theory, studies and research. But when it comes to implementing, it may be that the Theory of Change and the logic model are not appropriate for LA County. Therefore, this may be reflective as to the struggle that the partners whom the Commission engages with to do the work.

Commissioner Au reiterated caution about not necessarily holding onto these expectations so that the Commission loses sight of the actual work that the Commission is really about.

Vice Chair Kaufman commented that it was an excellent report. He said he was quite proud of the fact that the Commission, as an organization, can open up to the world, as a public document, the fact that things are not perfect. He said that the Commission was not bluffing over the last year but it had not done the analysis to show that things were not perfect. Everyone knows that money was not getting out the door quick enough, which is a simple metric that led to a lot of county-wide initiatives. Yet, money still did not get out the door last year. Perhaps the Commission was trying to solve it in the wrong way. This kind of analysis should have been done then but maybe the Commission was not ready.

Vice Chair Kaufman said it was kind of exciting and he did really feel proud. This kind of reporting was really quite helpful. The experience in medicine around malpractice avoidance and quality improvement says that you have an organization that celebrates people finding mistakes, finding problems, telling people about them, is the kind of the organization that is not going to cut off the wrong arm in the medical setting.

Vice Chair Kaufman said that the Commission has not done well as it should in helping to define the simple rule that the Commission wants to live by. The Commission should not have to decide what its role with every single grantee and contractor. There should be a definition of what Commissioners do and what staff does. Unless there is a reason for it to be different with grantees and contractors, there needs to be a factual nature of how things get done.

He also stated that part of the listening that will be done should answer the questions of whether Commission is too intrusive, not intrusive enough and whether it is helpful. In his view, whether guiding principles or cultural credo are established, that will be left up to staff to see how it gets done.

Regarding future reporting, Vice Chair Kaufman mentioned that three months was a short period of time. Although the Harvey Rose Audit report recommended internally reporting every three months, he deferred to Executive Director Belshé to come back to the Commission with a suggested frequency for reporting, perhaps quarterly reports in which one-fourth of the organization is looked at in more detail on a rotating basis.

Chair Ridley-Thomas commented that if one was serious about organizational transformation and the issue of audit, and how it served as a guide for both the Board and staff, it has to routinely and regularly be in front of the Commission in a public way.

For the foreseeable future, the more the better; hopefully, not at nauseum but to the extent that it serves as a strategic complement to the policy work that was being done. These processes have to be revisited with the kind of regularity that causes the
Commission to build consensus and to engage in the appropriate levels of transformation of the culture of First 5 LA. That is essentially what needs to be happening and there is really no easy way around that.

Chair Ridley-Thomas stated quarterly reporting was the minimum. The level of detail would be left up to senior staff in consultation with the Chair as to the frequency needed to keep the Board on point because whatever critique has been brought to bear, it is not borne by any single individual or any single sector of First 5 LA.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said his point was that there was a collective sharing of responsibilities for the highs and the lows. The objective was to offset those “lows” in the interest of progress. This could not be done unless the issue was maintained front and centered.

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION,
THE REPORT WAS RECEIVED AND FILED

12. Implementation Profile—Key Board Consideration: Update on Family Strengthening Investments (Welcome Baby and Home Visitation)

Executive Director Belshé commented that at each Commission meeting, a light will be shined on important implementation activity associated with the strategic plan. The staff presentation will walk the Board on “where we have been,” “what has been learned,” “where we are,” and also raise Board-level considerations.

Senior Program Officer (SPO) DuBranskey reported that the presentation would be reviewing the Best Start Family Strengthening investment and the Universal Assessment of Newborns countywide initiative, as well as the seamless approach to implementation intended for these efforts.

In order to review where we have been, staff briefly reviewed the major components of these investments. One of the most fundamental of those components is newborn risk-screening, which allows providers to assess the needs of families and the relative level of risk among all families being screened. Next, home visitation is defined, as this is the core service provided to the families being impacted by this investment.

Throughout the Commission’s history, while investing in home visitation strategies, the Board has relied on review of:

- national peer reviewed studies
- the results of the Commission's own investments
- scans of opportunities to leverage resources
- opportunities to maintain foundational resources in communities

The commission has invested in a variety of initiatives that, while home visitation was not its sole or core strategy, home visitation was available for some families.

The Commission has also implemented initiatives that were focused specifically on working with families in their homes. The first was very early on and was a very broad initiative allowing applicants doing and form of home visitation to apply.
Black Infant Health was the next home-visitation specific investment. This program also included a significant level of wrap around services and additional resources. And, finally, in 2009, the Welcome Baby pilot began.

Referencing the slide presentation, the visual presented (diagram) indicated what Welcome Baby participants receive, including when and where each contact takes place, as well as the various incentives to continue participating that are offered throughout the life of the program. Families living outside Best Start communities would receive one or more of the contacts in the shaded area at the center of the diagram.

SPO DuBranksy said it was also important to note that there have been many partners along the way that have contributed to the design, coordination, integration and implementation of Welcome Baby. These include representatives from local service delivery systems, including a key role in integrating with the work of the Public Health Department to promote high-quality early childhood home visitation.

There have been lessons learned as various home visitation approaches were designed and implemented. First, the Board has invested in both evidence-based practice and programs. Where evidence-based practice was implemented, results have been mixed, which catalyzed the Commission’s intent to invest in evidence-based intensive home visitation models. Where evidence-based practice has been promising, it has been backed by strong theories of change and rigorously standardized practice.

The Commission has also recognized that monitoring fidelity of program implementation will be crucial as it moves forward, as this has not been a strong focus for the Commission in the past, which may contribute to some of the Commission’s less favorable results.

The Commission has invested in efforts to increase agency capacity for strong program management and implementation. This effort will continue to be a key to success. Throughout Commission investments, the Board has also needed to consider whether secondary or ancillary results were meaningful and indicative of progress toward long-term goals.

The Commission has recognized that rigorous evaluation approaches, particularly for unproven program models, will be crucial to making intermediate- and long-term decisions about maintaining, expanding and/or leveraging investments. This data will be crucial for incentivizing investment by other organizations and sectors, including health insurance providers and the public sector.

Focusing more specifically on the Welcome Baby pilot, SPO DuBranksky spoke about what has been learned. As a reminder, the Welcome Baby Pilot is housed in California Hospital in the southern part of downtown, very near the 110/10 intersection. Almost a third of families have at least one risk factor affecting them and less than half have a high school diploma or GED.

In the first three years of implementation, the partners and Commission staff have worked to refine the program based on lessons learned in implementation. Areas that have been refined include linking participants with existing resources, which have been found to be grossly scarce.
In light of the Commission’s investment in more intensive programs for families who may benefit, the pilot is currently working to implement the family risk screening tool into its program protocols. The risk-screening captures risks in the areas of physical and behavioral health and child welfare. The risk screening tool has been utilized in Orange County for over 10 years and has been tested for reliability and validity.

The Urban Institute conducts the evaluation of the Best Start pilot, including Welcome Baby. Early results are promising. Differences between the participant and comparison group at 12 months include improvements in breastfeeding practices and on a measurement tool “The Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment” which consists of measures the impact of the home environment on child development. Children in the program are also more likely to have received all required immunizations and to utilize formal child care arrangements.

SPO DuBranksy reported that the “where are we now?” is informed by the policy decisions that the Board has made. Previous to the strategic plan, the Board approved the launching of a Best Start pilot, which included a Welcome Baby Pilot. Through the Strategic Planning process, the Board opted to expand both Best Start and Welcome Baby. Welcome Baby was intended to ensure universal contact with parents of newborns. However, the Board, having been provided reports on the level and types of needs that families were presenting in the Welcome Baby pilot, discerned that First 5 LA had a role in providing additional resources in communities to ensure that children, who were assessed to be at risk of poor child outcomes, be offered additional resources to prevent these poor outcomes from coming to fruition. The Commission decided that in offering these more intensive services that they had an opportunity to invest in programs with strong evidence of effectiveness in preventing child abuse and neglect and ensuring children were ready for school. The Board approved a selection of models that communities were authorized to select and implement. Staff refers to these more intensive programs as Select Home Visitation programs.

In 2011 the Board approved a county-wide initiative intended to enhance the Commission’s Family Strengthening efforts outside the Best Start communities. The Universal Assessment of Newborns initiative created an expansion of Welcome Baby that offered a briefer version of the Welcome Baby model targeting the over 100,000 births outside of Best Start communities. The Universal Assessment of Newborns Initiative assumes that most families will be assessed and will require no further services and perhaps some referrals that will be provided in the hospital. The remaining families, who demonstrate a moderate to high level of risk will receive up to three of the Welcome Baby visits, including a visit from a nurse within the first week of returning home. All of these policies were approved for implementation within the time parameter of the strategic plan.

Upon Board approval of 24 early target hospitals in June 2012, staff released a Letter of Invitation to enter into Strategic Partnerships with the hospitals. Staff also held a luncheon, attended by 11 of the hospitals. Contracts with six of the hospitals that will implement Welcome Baby for Best Start and Non-Best Start families are on the consent calendar today. Two additional hospital contracts will be on consent calendars in the next four months. Based on 2010 data, these hospitals deliver 32,130 births countywide, representing 24% of all births. Just under a third of those births are to families residing in Best Start communities, which represents 37% of Best Start births.
SPO DuBranksy reported that additional next steps include the implementation of a home visitation provider pool. This pool will serve two purposes: (1) it will be available to hospitals to provide options for subcontractors to assist in the implementation of Welcome Baby; (2) it will also be utilized by communities to select providers for the Select Home Visitation programs in Best Start communities.

Staff is also currently reviewing the response to an RFQ released to identify an oversight entity that will play a key role in ensuring success of Welcome Baby and Select Home Visitation. Staff also continues to work toward integrating these investments with other First 5 LA investments, particularly those that contribute to the same outcomes and work to strengthen families, as well as existing resources throughout the county.

Referencing the map included in the presentation, hospitals serving Best Start communities are not necessarily located within the communities. It is also worth noting that market shares or number of births from any given community within one hospital can be quite diffused. Largest market shares for the 14 communities, excluding Antelope Valley, range from 14% to 41%. What this reveals is that it will take partnerships with multiple hospitals to achieve a high penetration in each Best Start community. If all 24 hospitals were to participate each community would have a penetration of 75% to 94%, with one outlier of 64% (SELA). These initial 8 hospitals achieve a range of penetration from 24% to 50%, with a few outliers, one being 14.4% and the two Antelope Valley Communities, both under 4%.

Given the strong early interest in Welcome Baby and staff's analysis of program cost, there are several considerations that the Board will want to discuss in the near future. First, staff has shared the estimated per child/family cost. For Welcome Baby, these are based on ongoing analysis of expenditures in the pilot, as well as various policy decisions about targets. Select Home Visitation's per child cost is based on national data. Utilizing these per child costs, staff has developed a long-term projection which informs the Commission on what the cost of implementing these programs will be over time. These are undergoing continual refinement as data is received. Annual cost is currently projected to reach $94 million at full ramp up, which is defined as 80% acceptance rate for Welcome Baby and 100% acceptance rate for Select Home Visitation, as this program is expected to receive referrals until slots are filled. Staff will continue to utilize data to refine these costs. Data to be incorporated include inflation, enrollment and utilization and birth trends.

The Commission will want to consider both various implementation issues that arise, as well as the impact of this work on First 5 LA Resources and Capacity in the areas of oversight, policy and advocacy, and evaluation. Staff will bring both of these issues to the Program & Planning Committee at a future meeting.

In light of the Commission's ongoing commitment to leveraging significant resources to be invested in this work, the Board will continue to consider the nature and level of its commitment to these investments. This will be discussed in the context of the policy and advocacy approach, and key policy decisions about First 5 LA targets and timelines for these programs. Staff will bring to the Program & Planning Committee issues related to sustainability.
Referencing the remarks made by SPO DuBransky about a lot of babies within the Best Start communities not necessarily being delivered at Welcome Baby hospitals, Commissioner Swilley ask if there was any other way to into the program other than at the time of birth or before such time be it through the WIC program or anywhere else young babies are still seen.

SPO DuBransky said that the outreach strategy is diverse and clinics play a large role in that. The WIC program can play a role in that as well. The hospitals were chosen because these are the hospitals that deliver the most Best Start babies. It just takes several hospitals to get a strong penetration rate. In the pilot, anyone who is planning to deliver at California Hospital is attempted to be reached prenatally. This will be the continued practice for Best Start babies. Based on policy decisions by the Board, non-Best Start babies will be contacted in the hospital as the first intent.

Commissioner Fielding commented that the summary provided was excellent. He felt that the Commission should define screening as more than looking at risks; it should include referrals. Screening along is not very helpful unless something is done. One of the most striking things is the high percentage of mothers who have not completed high school. A linkage with education institutions is particularly important. It is known that outcomes for kids improve a lot with the formal education of their caregivers. He felt the Commission should focus on that issue. Health literacy is a critical issue, not just with health care services, but with parenting and other opportunities to enrich child development. He suggested that the health literacy linkage be better thought out.

Commissioner Fielding also commented it was really important to try to the degree possible, to quantify two types of benefits from the program: (1) health benefits; (2) health care utilization benefits. On one side there are health and development benefits which affect public funding and other areas like the likelihood of being in foster care, DPSS, and other things. If the Commission could relate those potentially to a reduction in health care costs compared to the control condition, that would be extremely important because what is needed from a policy perspective is to try and get the other healthcare providers to come on board. If this is cost-effective, health effective and developmentally effective, then LA Care should not support the babies that are in their coverage. The same applies to Kaiser. There is a huge policy issue and the Commission should not look forward to carrying the sole burden because it cannot.

Commissioner Au commented that she was glad Commissioner Fielding ended his remarks about First 5 LA not being able to carry the whole burden of providing for this very vital service. She agreed with Commissioner Fielding. As an example, Commissioner Au recalled that she lived in Hawaii during the plantation era, when her mother had babies, the plantation provided a public health nurse to actually come to the home.

Commissioner Au commented that she did not think there was any debate as to the effectiveness of Welcome Baby and the home visitation component. The question still becomes that of finance. The $94 million seemed to be a very conservative estimation as it is probably more than this amount. Referencing Commissioner Fielding comments on the financial burden to carry, she felt that a conversation needed to take place because she would hate to see the Commission face the same issue with universal preschool. That is a vital service and children and families definitely benefit from it. They (LAUP)
are facing a fiscal cliff for themselves because the Commission cannot carry them. She would hate to see that happen with this project and program.

Commissioner Southard asked the extent to which (hospital) staff was able to identify perinatal and post-partum depression in the mothers; and the extent to which there was a referral network available to provide care for those problems once identified.

SPO DuBransky responded that staff actually does assess for maternal depression at every visit and every time the parents are contacted. Staff has been successful at identifying the depression but finding the services has been the challenge in the metro side as there are not enough services ad it is a struggle for the team.

Vice Chair Kaufman referenced slide 19 of the presentation. He asked if the 2,750 total for the select home visitation was in addition to the Best Start Welcome Baby total of 1,700; or was that the total overall. SPO DuBransky responded that was the total of the cost of the home visitation program. Although not itemized, the $94 million does account for women having received prenatal visits and the hospital visit before going into the program.

Vice Chair Kaufman thought it was helpful to have the marginal cost. He also said that he believed First 5 LA is the R&D wing of government and agent of sustainability and scalability. He asked if that meant doing a large enough intervention, a large enough program to be able to prove that things work, and identify other people who have money (i.e., health insurance). What this means is that the Commission knows that it will not be able to serve everyone. The Commission will not be able to get to 85% whether it is $50 million or $100 million. This annual amount is just not feasible.

Commissioner Fielding said the real challenge is how large, how robust, how diverse and what kind of proof was needed for the sites to be used to be able to bring in other people (i.e., hospital, funders, governmental agencies) to allow the Commission to generate revenue for the pilot; but, more importantly, for the rest of the kids who could not be covered. This is the fundamental first question that needs to be understood from the agents of sustainability and scalability. For example, what would it take for LA Care, with a large population of vulnerable babies, to be given enough evidence for them to be on board. The same would apply to DCFS and home visitation programs.

Vice Chair Kaufman asked the Commission to make sure that such is being done. He reminded the Commission that the purpose of what was being done was not for the Commission to fund the entire program as it goes to scale in perpetuity.

Executive Director Belshé said Vice Chair Kaufman’s question was not philosophical but an example of a very important consideration that was lifted through the creation of the presentation. The staff recommendation would be for a directive to work with the Program & Planning Committee to tease out some of the key issues. She asked if it made sense for the Commission to have these different strands of activity that are all about family strengthening but each are called something different.

In the spirit of program efficiency and transparency, she asked what would it take to accomplish integration and what would be some of the budget implications. For example, some programs are zero-based support and others are part of an allocation. The administrative implications of integration to the hospital partners would also need
to be looked at as well as the service delivery implication. These are interesting and important questions for staff to work through with the Program & Planning Committee.

Executive Director Belshé also commented the issue of financial commitment as an organization relative to other funders is philosophical but it is also very practical because of important implications. There are implications for how the initiative is implemented. If the role of the Commission was to be a seed funder and to be the R&D player, by bringing in the research advisory committee to help inform the development of these research protocols and approaches, then we need to know the sample size. There is also the policy pathway that needs to be worked through in terms of what is allowable under federal and state law to know what is currently allowable as a funding source to secure additional funding and what kind of evidence is required, which gets back to the sample size and research.

Executive Director Belshé further commented that Vice Chair Kaufman’s question was philosophical but also practical. For instance, if the sample size was 40,000, the Commission is at that point right now with eight new contracts and the pilot. The Commission would effectively be saying that it has the sample size for implementation doing so, in a sequenced way informed by research, and then making the case to other funders with the expectation of additional funds coming in. This is the kind of implementation work staff needs to undertake and bring back to the Program & Planning Committee or to the full Board. From a staff perspective, it is more than philosophical.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said that was the distinction between a Board and staff. The Board philosophizes and the staff executes.

Chair Ridley-Thomas referenced page 274 of the meeting packet where there is a reference to Welcome Baby select home visitation universal assessment. Three different home visitation strategies are described. He suggested that there could be a branding issue that the Commission should address in terms of how the Commission thinks of this initiative in its totality. He called it out for consideration as there may be a need for clarification.

Chair Ridley-Thomas referenced pages 275 and 276 of the meeting packet regarding the various home visitation programs. He would like to know how they interact. He called that out for the record and asked for clarification.

Chair Ridley-Thomas referenced page 279 of the meeting packet where reference was made to the fact that there is no candidate hospitals in the Antelope Valley and South LA; but, it is also noted that these are the highest areas of infant mortality rates. It seems that the Commission needs to come to grip with what is being done to address that issue.

Chair Ridley-Thomas commented that the other point he wanted to make related to the specific steps that First 5 LA has taken and will continue to take in terms of pursuing a federal and state legislative, as well as a philanthropic and education organizing campaign to sustain these investments. This is, in part, some of the issues that have been raised otherwise. He stated that more was to be said on both of these points but wished to lift them up at this point for the purpose of the Commission’s collective consideration.
Chair Ridley-Thomas offered a motion for consideration:

Direct staff to come back with a proposed advocacy plan to sustain First 5 LA investments in universal and more intensive home visitation programs for at-risk families. The plan should describe the specific federal and state legislative efforts, as well as efforts with the philanthropic, academic and community-based organizations to sustain these investments. It should describe how LA County as well as other counties, that have also invested in home visitation programs, can also be partners in these efforts. It would be appreciated if the report back would materialize for the next meeting.

M/S Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard

The following friendly amendment proposed by Commissioner Southard:

Part of the plan could look at the ACA as it is currently configured. There may be some components that are fundable as prevention measures even without further legislative new actions.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said the request from Commissioner Southard was well taken and accepted it as a friendly amendment.

Executive Director Belshé said this was an important observation within the changing context which we (staff and Commissioners) collectively are developing and will be advancing a sustainability agenda. As an organization moving forward with this initiative, before the Affordable Care Act, one of the critical changes in the ACA is the creation of essential health benefits. Basically, under federal law, nearly everyone has to buy insurance and federal law had to define what needs to be bought to comply with that mandate. That is called the essential health benefits. Federal government has provided states with a lot of direction in terms of how to define that. There was an opportunity, nationally, to provide input to the pending federal rule in terms of definition of essential health benefits which we, as an organization, weighed in on December 26.

Executive Director Belshé said she was eager to see how many other organizations shared the observations. One of the points made in the letter sent was how important it was that in the definition of maternity and newborn care, which is one of the categories of services that comprise essential health benefits, that there be clear recognition of the value and support for screening, assessment, and home visitation services. In the absence of the essential health benefits including that kind of specificity, the issue a state will need to navigate is if policy makers go beyond that minimum, it will be at the state’s expense. The world got a lot better with the Affordable Care Act; it also got more complicated. Making everything everyone has said about sustainability absolutely spot-on, COO Wagner, Executive Director Belshé and the staff team have begun to really flesh out what is already being done to help inform this very question of what does a comprehensive, actionable sustainability agenda look like. The insurers are viewed as critical partners but it may be making the case, voluntarily, for them to add these benefits because if state policy makers add it, the state will have to pick it up.
Commissioner Fielding commented he appreciated the urgency of the issue but wondered about the timeline that would only give staff a couple of weeks to do this, which probably was not enough time. He felt the short period of time would impact the quality of the report being requested.

Chair Ridley-Thomas commented the point made was the consideration for the process to begin and it did not have to be conclusive. If staff was having difficulty meeting the timeline suggested, they were always free to say that more time was needed, to get more data, to make it more meaningful.

Executive Director Belshé commented she appreciated the sense of urgency and commitment the Chair brings to this issue and Commissioner Fielding's question about timing. She would like to see what staff can do over the course of the next number of weeks. At a minimum, staff would be able to bring a “where are we today” update—“what activities have been undertaken,” “what have we learned,” “where are the gaps. Staff would be able to provide some broad brushes about next steps. A truly detailed multi-year actionable, comprehensive, sustainability agenda was going to take more time and would require resources—it would require coming back to the Board for financial support.

Chair Ridley-Thomas said his point was that staff correctly interprets the directive; treat it in an ongoing, evolving manner such that as Commissioners learn, it is added to, as appropriate.

Commissioner Dennis commented on Vice Chair Kaufman’s philosophical assertion that First 5 LA is perhaps the R&D. He felt this was worthy of some debate. The reality does not suggest that. First 5 LA has become the life blood of certain initiatives in this County and has been purposeful and direct by this Commission, with Black Infant Health being one. Originally, the thought was that First 5 LA would be the R&D; but, this is definitely not the reality. He felt that the strategic or philosophical discussion as to where the Commission was and what was should be done with regard to how initiatives are framed.

WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION,
THE REPORT WAS RECEIVED AND FILED

13. Long Term Financial Projections

COO Wagner reported the topic of sustainability is a perfect segue to the long-term financial projection. As background, when the FY 2012-13 budget was passed back in June, the Board directed staff to develop a long range financial projection which is what will be presented today.

The Rose Audit, from 2011, had some key recommendations involving the need to report on Board actions related to allocations and contracts; and also some recommendations regarding the reporting on fund balance. These are key components contained in the long range financial projection.

The goal of the analysis is really to establish a framework for the Board to help guide and inform the Board's financial stewardship role. The analysis does not commit additional funds but it is staff's best thinking reflecting on Board decisions to date.
The long term financial projection represents First 5 LA’s first efforts to really develop and provide a comprehensive forecast that includes three key components: (1) revenues and fund balances; (2) expenditure commitments and projections which reflect the best thinking on Board policy decisions and actual program expenditures; (3) a projection of the operating expenses.

The time period of the forecast is five years, from 2013 to 2017. It is noteworthy to note that this forecast does go two years beyond the strategic plan, which provides a fuller longer range picture to allow the Commission to consider the long term implications of some of the initiatives that are just beginning to ramp up. It also reflects the Board’s acknowledgment that some investments will take longer than the five-year period.

In summary, some of the key findings include:

- In the short term, the resources are adequate to cover the committing obligations through the course of the current strategic plan.
- In the longer term, a combination of declining revenues, fund balances and increased program expenditures indicate that expenditures will exceed incoming revenues of the next strategic plan, which will depend on the remaining and declining fund balance and/or outside resources for sustainability.

As the Commission prepares for the next strategic planning period to cover the years 2016 to 2020, the commission will face important choices to align annual funding commitments with annual revenues. Staff recommends working with the Budget & Finance Committee to identify and raise key policies and fiscal issues as well as options for Board consideration to inform an actual financial plan for moving forward.

**NOTE:** Upon the conclusion of COO Wagner’s remarks, the floor was yield to Interim Finance Director Ortega.

Interim Finance Director Ortega continued with the presentation and began by referencing “Attachment 2” on page 14 of the electronic packet and page 297 of the printed packet.

Building upon the findings, revenues are projected to decline by 13 percent from the current fiscal year through FY 2016-17. The unaudited fund balance as of July 1, 2012, was $821 million of which $646.5 million, 79 percent, has been obligated through Board approved actions. The five year projection shows that the overall fund balance will decrease a total of $522 million from the current fiscal year through the FY ending 2016-17. That is a total of $299 million with a decline of 64 percent.

A graph illustrating the declining fund balance and revenue was shared with the Commissioners. The graph reflected fidelity to Board decisions in key investments ending such as LAUP in FY 2015-16. The graph illustrated the significant decline of fund balance and then the softening in FY 2015-16, when the LAUP contract ends.

A significant finding was what staff is concerned about projected cost. The program costs for family strengthening and universal assessment is projected to be 65 percent of the annual tax revenue as of FY 2016-17. By FY 2019-20, absent policy changes, the
program cost for family strengthening and universal assessment is projected to be $71 million. That will represent 99 percent of projected tax revenue for that year.

Two slides were shared with Commissions in which visuals of above stated projections were illustrated. Specifically, these slides projected family strengthening and universal assessment on an annual basis through the end of the long term financial projections. As stated earlier, the projected costs would represent 65 percent of the projected tax revenue for FY 2016-17. It is to be noted that these costs continue to be analyzed while, at the same time, opportunities to curtail cost and encourage sustainability are being pursued. Absent a policy change, projected program costs for family strengthening and universal assessment will reach $71 million by FY 2019-20, which represents 99 percent of the projected tax revenue for that time of $71.6 million.

The next piece of the long term projection plan focused on the assumptions that staff built in developing the long term financial projections. Revenues were based from the state department of Finance projections, which are updated on an annual basis. The projections reflect an annual basis decline of 3 to 4 percent which translates to a decline over 13 percent over the next four years.

Assumptions that staff made under operations include the estimated cost representing the 15 program and administrative departments within the organization. Costs are primarily staff salaries, benefits and other operating expenses. It assumes a two percent increase to the FY 2016-17 and flat for the last year of the long term projections, as well as compliance with the five percent administrative limit.

It should be noted that with the listening, learning and leading, currently underway, management is committed to ways to improve efficiencies within the operations of the organization.

Program assumptions include that cost assumes fidelity to decisions made by the Board. It assumes that allocations will be spent down and end as supported by Board actions. It also assumes that annual funding is appropriated for programs under the current strategic plan. Specifically, items under the zero-based platform.

During the development of the long term financial projections, with input from the Budget & Finance Committee, management looked to the Commissioners for the following Board consideration—ensuring that existing allocations are reasonable, accurate, and aligned with the strategic plan.

Staff sees this as taking form in two approaches:

(1) In the short term, staff will focus on items that will help the development of the FY 2013-14 budget process. By identifying allocations with no activity and developing recommendations for the Program & Planning Committee to consider.

(2) In the longer term, staff will reevaluate the allocation levels made by the Board and identify allocations that are not projected to spend their balance, by the end of the long term financial projections, through analyzing cost as programs move into full implementation. Staff will then make recommendations to the Program & Planning Committee and, based on their input, staff will provide recommendations for Commission approval.
As the organization continues to implement the strategic plan and to build upon efforts to align with the Harvey Rose recommendations, staff will urge the Board to consider integrating programs to promote efficiency and transparency. For example, examine the integration of family strengthening strategies and, in addition, clarify the First 5 LA's financial commitment to such strategies.

Staff will work with the Program & Planning Committee to identify the fiscal and programmatic implications and issues to raise for Board consideration. Staff also wants to promote sustainability of major Commission investments. The Board should also consider a major sustainability policy. A policy will be developed by staff working with the Program and Planning committee to establish guidelines.

In addition, the Board should consider adopting a policy to establish a fund balance reserve. The long term financial projection is projected to decrease by $522 million through FY 2016-17. The long term financial projections demonstrate that First 5's LA Commission will need to make strategic decisions about balancing future investments in the next strategic plan and will need to limit its reliance on fund balance budget to support its operation. Staff will develop options to present to the Budget & Finance Committee for input and for the Committee to provide recommendations to the Commission.

Interim Finance Director Ortega stated, that in summary, this document did not formally obligate or commit any funds. It was to provide a framework for further dialogue as the Commission moves into developing the FY 2013-14 budget and the next strategic plan.

Upon the conclusion of the presentation, Commissioner Dennis commented that since the projections were based on spending the full budget allocation for those years and the information provided earlier on the percentages that have not been spent, it did not take into consideration where the Commission projected to be at the end of this fiscal year. Therefore, he asked if the projections were based on spending the budgeted amount.

Interim Finance Director Ortega responded not specifically. Referencing Attachment 3 of the staff report, it showed that in some areas there will be unspent funds from allocations. The assumptions are based from program officers looking at their projects and really thinking about how much they're going to spend down from their allocation. The Commission is on a zero base platform. The assumptions are based on the design of the program and what the program officers feel will go out the door.

Commissioner Dennis asked for further clarification, specifically asking if the projections were not based on the budget amount.

Executive Director Belshé responded that it was actually building upon the Q1 findings and trying to bring a more granular estimation of projected expenditures. This is one of the considerations of the budget going forward. The expectation, given this deeper analysis, notwithstanding the allocation, is that there is going to be some unexpended resources. That will a policy decision for the Budget & Finance Committee to decide, in terms of how to reallocate those dollars. It is an effort to really capture a better estimate of expenditures of allocations.
Chair Ridley-Thomas asked what the specific number of uncommitted funds was over the course of five years.

Executive Director Belshé replied that $65 million was the unexpended estimate of dollars from previously approved allocations.

Executive Director Belshé further explained that the $65 million were currently committed as allocations approved by the Board; but, based on this deeper analysis and longer term financial expenditures, staff believes there will be unexpended funds associated with those allocations. The question then is whether the Board can consider reallocating those dollars sooner rather than later, if there is a level of confidence in the allocations exceeding anticipated expenditures.

Chair Ridley-Thomas further asked if a distinction was being made between unspent and uncommitted funds.

Interim Finance Director Ortega replied in the affirmative. Furthermore, he stated that $65 million represented what was committed in allocations and programs. He said he would be hesitant to answer that question because he thought further analysis needed to happen. Because, in some of the cases, slow implementation of some of these programs generated the cost savings.

Chair Ridley-Thomas asked if the unspent funds were $65 million over the five year period, was there a number for that same period of time which was uncommitted. Interim Finance Director Ortega replied in the affirmative and that such number was $233 million.

Chair Ridley-Thomas stated that both numbers needed to be in the focus of the Commission to have a fuller appreciation of that which the Commission is speaking about.

Commissioner Fielding commented on what Executive Director Belshé said earlier about the importance of having policy at the top tier of the Commission’s agenda on a continuing basis and which was highlighted by the recent discussions at this Commission. He seconded that and thought it was extremely important.

Commissioner Fielding also commented that with respect to sustainability, his guess was that not all the initiatives, projects and programs have the same risk or same potential for sustainability. He said that he would hope staff would look at that realistically and determine what had a reasonable chance, what had a small chance and what had no chance because the Commission needs to treat these initiatives, projects and programs commensurate with that if the Commission is concerned about sustainability.

Commissioner Southard commented there was a policy issue that the Commission needed to decide. The Commission needs to decide if it was going to allow a roll forward from one month to the next or not; because if funding is not expended in the fiscal year, then it can be harvested and placed in the pool. If the Commission does not want to do this, then there is a policy matter for the Commission to consider.
Chair Ridley-Thomas stated that was an issue for the Budget & Finance Committee to take up and bring back to the full Board for consideration. With respect to the major program cost projections that include universal assessment as well as home visitation, a lot of detail was presented. He then asked about the projections for the other major investments that the Commission has undertaken such as LAUP.

Interim Finance Director Ortega stated the specifically with LAUP, cost projections were based on their contract; and based on fidelity to Board decisions. This consistent approach was applied to all investments and it is based on allocations or based on the contracts.

Chair Ridley-Thomas commented that was a discussion he was going to ask the Budget & Finance Committee to go into some greater detail on. In terms of the respective major investments, pound for pound, methodologically speaking, there needed to be the same drill down. There may be a reason for that approach and that is fully justified; but, as of this moment in time, he was not sure that such was the case. LAUP would be an example or Best Start would be another example. Although the Commission did not need to spend its entire meeting time on it, he did think it was worth having the discussion.

Executive Director Belshé asked a question for clarification. In terms of parallel treatment, as Interim Finance Director Ortega endeavored to characterize, the long term financial projection captures to the best of staff’s ability its understanding of Board decisions made. The previous strategic plan investments are all slated to end as the very detailed, small and hard-to-read chart in Attachment 3. Those investments reflect allocations that are slated to end at varying periods of time over the course of the next five years. The same is true with the county-wide initiatives supported by the Board in the fall of 2010. These are multiyear initiatives and they are slated and assumed to come to an end consistent with decisions made by the Board.

The allocations for the current strategic plan are done on a zero-based budget. So it is like comparing apples and oranges a little bit to the extent there are allocations supporting some of the work historically; whereas the Board made a determination to support a zero-based budget with the Best Start and county-wide strategies going forward.

Executive Belshé said she did not know if she would characterize what staff endeavored to retain fidelity Board decisions around the strategic plan in zero-based budgeting. Staff had to make some assumptions—what those funds would be on an annual basis—but all the other grants below the line, if you will, in terms of support for the county-wide initiatives and the prior strategic plan investments came from Board decisions. The Board, obviously, can revisit all of those decisions but the presentation did not make those policy decisions.

Chair Ridley-Thomas commented he thought that was fair. In terms of the clarification that was being sought, as the Commission is in the process of assessing, reassessing, considering, and reconsidering a range of initiatives and efficacy of those programs, it seemed to him they are beholden to expect that the material, at least the projections, are for the Board's consideration.
Commissioner Au stated that she applauded the staff. Conversation has been taking place for a number of years about the declining revenue and wanting to be prudent about how the Commission goes about making decisions and how to allocate the dollars. The Commission had this vague money bag and full of unallocated dollars and there was a real temptation. When the state went through their budget crisis, it became a major attraction and temptation on the part of the state. So the Commission made some decisions and, unfortunately, did not have this kind of information that would have helped to inform when those kinds of decisions were made.

Commissioner Au further applaud the staff for giving Commissioners something that she felt confident about, getting her hands around it and seeing that the Commission truly needs to be very, very thoughtful and strategic as to how it goes about allocating and starting up new programs and projects; and even having to make some hard decisions about some very good initiatives that the Commission may not be able to sustain overtime.

Executive Director Belshé made a couple of final comments. She wanted to be clear about a couple of points. The five-year projection does assume that there will be an estimated remaining balance of $239 million and at one level that sounds like a lot of money. At the same time, the Commission will be ramping up significant new initiatives as a part of the family strengthening and community building through Best Start. There are resources in the short term but over the long term there are some very important lines that are crossing relative to revenue and expenditures.

Staff also estimates, but only experience will truly determine, the additional $65 million that have been committed may not be spent. It will only be through experience that staff can better refine those numbers. Working through those numbers and more refinement is something staff would want to work with the chair of the Budget & Finance Committee.

Secondly, staff has made a recommendation to the Commission that it should look at a policy governing the establishment of a fund balance reserve. The Commission has not had to worry about that to date; but this long-term projection makes clear that now is the time to think and come back with some reserve policy options to inform what is the reasonable and responsible balance to be retained.

WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, THE REPORT WAS RECEIVED AND FILED

9. Approval of FY 2013-14 Budget Calendar

CAO Bosch reported staff was requesting approval of the FY 2013-14 budget calendar. On June 14, the Commission approved policy and guidelines for adoption of the program and operating budgets. The policy accelerates budget approval from June to April and also requires rolling two-year budgets.

Staff discussed these new requirements with the Budget & Finance Committee last month; and, for a number of reasons including the appointment of the COO, the Q1 report, staff's commitment to improving overall efficiencies within the organization as mentioned by Executive Director Belshé through the L3 process, the committee
recommended that staff present a one year budget for FY 2013-14 at the June 13, 2013, meeting.

M/S  (Marv Southard / Sandra Figueroa-Villa)
WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

14. Public Comment

Commissioner Fielding recommended to everyone who has not been immunized against influenza that there was still time to get immunized. This year, the flu strain has been more aggressive.

Chair Ridley-Thomas announced there were flyers to an event on January 19. He invited everyone to be a guest at the 21st Annual Empowerment Conference at the University of Southern California.

Commissioner Au mentioned the horrendous occurrence in Connecticut at the Sandyhook Elementary School and the conversation that is occurring on a federal level regarding this violence. She was not sure what role California or Los Angeles County would have in that conversation. Commissioner Au said that was one of the most appalling ways for 2012 to come to an end.

Commissioner Tilton commented she has spent the last year on a federal task force that is led by the U.S. Attorney General on children exposed to violence. A report was released the day before the Newtown disaster tragedy. Many of the recommendations in the report are under consideration at the federal level. She said she would be willing to make copies for anyone who was interested in looking at the recommendations. Attorney General Eric Holder held a major press conference when the report was released and she was honored to be a part of that. Members of that commission were actually sent to Newtown because of the great emphasis on the impact of trauma to children. These children, the survivors, were exposed to trauma beyond anything that was imaginable. Executive Director Belshé commented that staff could help with making copies of the report and getting them to Commissioners.

Commissioner Southard commented that mental health services has had a great partnership with school districts and law enforcement to do preventative activities to look at people who are at risk of doing such things. There has been some very significant intervention both at high schools, junior colleges, and universities of incidents that may have turned out to be like the one in Newtown; but because of an intervention, it did not. He believed some of the resources that have been dedicated to preventive activities in Los Angeles have been fruitful.
ADJOURNMENT:

The Commission adjourned at 4:30 pm.

NEXT MEETING:

The next Commission meeting will take place on February 14, 2013 at 1:30 pm.

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

Meeting minutes were recorded by Maria Romero, Secretary to the Board of Commissioners.
Item 3

Approval of the Monthly Financial Statements

Month Ending December 31, 2012
FIRST 5 LA

SUBJECT:
Monthly Financial Reports

RECOMMENDATION:
Approval of the monthly financial statements for the month ending December 31, 2012.

BACKGROUND:
Staff has historically provided monthly financial reports for the Commission’s approval. In an effort to ensure transparency of the financial status of the Commission, detailed financial information is provided for the month ending December 31, 2012.

DISCUSSION:
A Balance Sheet provides a “snapshot” view of the Commission’s assets, liabilities and fund balance as of December 31, 2012. This statement is on a cash basis and does not account for any accruals for either revenues or expenditures. A detail of operating expenditures including budget to actual activities is also provided.

Additional statements provided include a report detailing programmatic expenditures against the FY 2012-13 Program Budget approved on June 14, 2012 (as amended by subsequent Board action) and a report detailing expenditures related to programs functioning as pass-through agreements. Detailed footnotes are also included anticipating the need for clarification on some line items.

These financial statements are reported as a “soft close” and are unaudited. All material transaction dollar amounts that staff is aware of are included.

UPDATE:
On December 20, 2012, First 5 LA staff discussed with members of the Budget and Finance Committee our interest in working with the Committee to consider how to streamline the monthly financial information with a focus on providing information that is clear, concise and relevant to understanding First 5 LA’s finances. The goal is to provide the essential financial information necessary for Board members to exercise their role as financial stewards of public funds. The following is an update on these ongoing efforts to revise the presentation of monthly financial information.

In an effort to streamline the presentation of financial information, the first step taken was to discontinue providing the check register as part of the monthly commission packet. The check register represents voluminous information that is difficult to analyze and assess in a meaningful way. Moreover, the check register reflects the time period between Commission meetings and does not match to the actual monthly financial activity. While this information will not be provided in the Commission book, it will continue to be available via the First 5 LA website.
Staff continues to look for opportunities to improve on its reporting and is currently reaching out to other First 5 Commissions and like organizations to explore best practices.

Staff will work with the Budget and Finance Committee to further define the essential information needed for the Commission to fulfill its fiduciary duty. Staff will also continue to engage other First 5 Commissions and similar organizations to learn how they approach the presentation of monthly financial information. We will continue to engage with the Budget and Finance Committee to discuss opportunities, lessons learned and best practices identified through the Listening, Learning and Leading (L3) process, as well as through our outreach efforts with similar organizations.
Los Angeles County Children and Families First -
Proposition 10 Commission
Statement of Net Assets
December 31, 2012, Unaudited

Assets

Current Assets:
Cash 3,928,851
Cash - Morlin Mgmt Corp 26,950
Investment:
  Operating and Allocated funds 732,410,526 (1)
  Operating Fund - SRI 4,487,770
  Advance - Families in Schools 850,000
  Advance - LA Care Health Plan 12,072,289
  Advance - LAUP 27,215,043
  Advance - UCLA Dental Home Project 9,189,409
Other Receivables 7,863,446
Total Current Assets 798,044,284

Fixed Assets:
Land 2,039,000
Building & Improvements 12,076,512
Furniture & Fixtures 627,671
Computer, Software & Accessories 1,592,852
Office Equipment 258,284
Accumulated Depreciation (3,816,559)
Total Fixed Assets 12,777,760

Total Assets 810,822,044

Liabilities and Net Assets

Current liabilities:
Other Liabilities 3,666,163 (2)
Total Current Liabilities 3,666,163

Net Assets:
Investment in capital assets 12,777,760
Restricted 794,378,120
Total Net Assets 807,155,880

Total Liabilities and Net Assets $810,822,044

NOTES:
(1) Operating and Allocated funds - Included within this investment account is approximately $5.8 million intended for operating expenses for the next 3 months.
(2) Other Liabilities include accrued expenses, accrued vacation, and other payroll related liabilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Related Expenses</th>
<th>DECEMBER ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE ACTUAL</th>
<th>ANNUAL BUDGET *</th>
<th>YTD VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>707,235</td>
<td>4,451,967</td>
<td>10,534,860</td>
<td>6,082,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>184,384</td>
<td>1,058,460</td>
<td>2,876,342</td>
<td>1,817,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>891,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,510,427</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,411,202</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,900,775</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP Payroll Charges</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>10,874</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>19,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(14,171)</td>
<td>113,025</td>
<td>127,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Insurance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,950</td>
<td>70,400</td>
<td>43,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage Expense</td>
<td>5,442</td>
<td>19,432</td>
<td>58,680</td>
<td>39,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephones &amp; Modems</td>
<td>8,994</td>
<td>32,017</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>38,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>8,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage &amp; Delivery</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>17,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>15,280</td>
<td>41,978</td>
<td>138,395</td>
<td>96,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions &amp; Publication</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>10,474</td>
<td>8,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay (Equipment Purchases)</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>33,053</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>186,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td>6,611</td>
<td>33,510</td>
<td>60,790</td>
<td>27,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance-Furniture &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>12,346</td>
<td>75,039</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>119,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance-Equipment</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents &amp; Lease - Offsite Storage</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>10,441</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Related Costs</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>8,367</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>15,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Overhead</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>80,900</td>
<td>75,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>19,179</td>
<td>135,800</td>
<td>116,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Other Supplies</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>43,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>13,310</td>
<td>53,239</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>106,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phones</td>
<td>5,764</td>
<td>17,673</td>
<td>52,680</td>
<td>35,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,656</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>124,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware &amp; Software Maintenance</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>40,091</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td>61,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>459,897</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,784,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,328,597</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit and Accounting Fees</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>51,859</td>
<td>70,443</td>
<td>18,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>56,333</td>
<td>134,205</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>15,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>19,535</td>
<td>85,501</td>
<td>65,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>8,225</td>
<td>77,400</td>
<td>69,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dues First 5 Association</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Recruitment</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9,936</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>3,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Stipends</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>13,350</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>16,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,974</strong></td>
<td><strong>287,110</strong></td>
<td><strong>476,344</strong></td>
<td><strong>189,234</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Fees</td>
<td>32,583</td>
<td>191,253</td>
<td>635,000</td>
<td>443,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Fees</td>
<td>20,955</td>
<td>129,202</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>62,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,538</strong></td>
<td><strong>320,455</strong></td>
<td><strong>827,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>506,545</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences - Travel &amp; Lodging</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>9,139</td>
<td>45,583</td>
<td>36,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference - Registration Fees</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>14,723</td>
<td>52,400</td>
<td>37,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>12,680</td>
<td>39,180</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>3,464</td>
<td>11,516</td>
<td>48,811</td>
<td>37,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5,968</td>
<td>32,126</td>
<td>26,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,007</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,026</strong></td>
<td><strong>218,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>164,074</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,020,032</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,631,914</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,721,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,089,226</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES - OPERATING & ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET UPDATE:

The administrative expenses are within the maximum authorized under the Board policy.

* The FY 2012-13 Operating Budget was approved by the Board of Commissioners on June 14, 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE/PROGRAM</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 BUDGET*</th>
<th>DECEMBER EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>BALANCE REMAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLACE-BASED INITIATIVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Start</td>
<td>31,119,349</td>
<td>377,348</td>
<td>1,682,506</td>
<td>29,436,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTYWIDE STRATEGIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Systems Integration</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,545</td>
<td>290,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Access (Healthy Kids)</td>
<td>7,032,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,011,924</td>
<td>5,511,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Resource &amp; Referral (211)</td>
<td>1,239,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102,714</td>
<td>736,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Advocacy Fund (PAF)</td>
<td>1,603,571</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149,951</td>
<td>402,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Agenda/Agency Advocacy</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Issue Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,257</td>
<td>1,304,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education - Conference Funding Grants</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization</td>
<td>742,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,570</td>
<td>717,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization - 50 Parks</td>
<td>1,025,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220,920</td>
<td>774,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization - Challenge Grants/Social Enterprise Grants</td>
<td>1,068,094</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,261</td>
<td>997,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization - Donors Choose</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization - ECE Recoverable Grant Fund</td>
<td>1,075,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization - LA PECHI/Baby Futures Fund</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,401</td>
<td>666,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization - Matching Grant Program</td>
<td>1,305,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104,289</td>
<td>1,200,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development - Care4Plus</td>
<td>2,579,076</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,119,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development - ECE Career Development Policy Project</td>
<td>1,062,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>129,814</td>
<td>732,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development - ECE Workforce Consortium</td>
<td>7,990,706</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,080,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development - FCC Higher Education Academy (ELAC)</td>
<td>612,499</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,577</td>
<td>584,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development - Kindergarten Readiness</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development - P-5 Core Competencies</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development - Public Education</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,314</td>
<td>474,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTYWIDE INITIATIVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Infant Health</td>
<td>1,296,986</td>
<td>211,350</td>
<td>231,126</td>
<td>1,065,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Dental Care</td>
<td>3,244,420</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,244,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Vision Care</td>
<td>376,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>376,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Risk and Perinatal Services</td>
<td>144,922</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,473</td>
<td>119,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Partnership with Funders</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>199,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Identification and Intervention of Autism and Developmental Delays</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food Access</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>76,360</td>
<td>651,586</td>
<td>748,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Safe Sleeping</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Safe Sleeping - Public Education</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>90,370</td>
<td>193,423</td>
<td>556,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Safe Surrender</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>6,713</td>
<td>493,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little by Little/One Step Ahead</td>
<td>1,151,159</td>
<td>47,676</td>
<td>170,652</td>
<td>980,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Child Interaction Therapy</td>
<td>3,432,638</td>
<td>22,309</td>
<td>22,309</td>
<td>3,410,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support Groups for Parents</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,532</td>
<td>106,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing</td>
<td>24,850,000</td>
<td>24,850,000</td>
<td>24,850,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Childhood Obesity</td>
<td>4,881,186</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,881,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Services</td>
<td>5,241,637</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,241,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Parks and Trails</td>
<td>3,695,517</td>
<td>81,355</td>
<td>317,927</td>
<td>3,377,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Assessment of Newborns</td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>389,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIOR STRATEGIC PLAN INITIATIVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Friendly Hospitals</td>
<td>3,713,258</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>155,246</td>
<td>3,558,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Opportunities Fund</td>
<td>2,080,831</td>
<td>313,702</td>
<td>615,305</td>
<td>1,465,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Friends and Neighbors (FFN)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>52,641</td>
<td>297,025</td>
<td>702,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Literacy</td>
<td>2,170,000</td>
<td>236,474</td>
<td>510,991</td>
<td>1,659,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Place Libraries</td>
<td>43,677</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Births</td>
<td>4,525,249</td>
<td>432,479</td>
<td>1,220,108</td>
<td>3,305,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUP</td>
<td>52,604,091</td>
<td>8,101,124</td>
<td>15,773,690</td>
<td>36,830,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Health &amp; Nutrition - Dental Home</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Health &amp; Nutrition - Safety Net Dental Care Infrastructure</td>
<td>2,799,657</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,799,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Health &amp; Nutrition (OHN)</td>
<td>2,680,020</td>
<td>795,616</td>
<td>1,128,370</td>
<td>1,551,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Health Community Development</td>
<td>4,250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>4,248,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3 Workforce Development Project</td>
<td>558,553</td>
<td>208,543</td>
<td>297,328</td>
<td>261,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships for Families</td>
<td>10,912,168</td>
<td>1,271,985</td>
<td>3,166,701</td>
<td>7,745,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Readiness Initiative</td>
<td>5,176,427</td>
<td>579,595</td>
<td>1,462,470</td>
<td>3,713,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Children's Council</td>
<td>1,460,000</td>
<td>119,954</td>
<td>234,524</td>
<td>1,225,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countwide Systems Improvement Evaluation</td>
<td>148,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Development</td>
<td>1,173,646</td>
<td>39,011</td>
<td>354,393</td>
<td>819,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Evaluation Department Consultant Pool</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>11,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Partnerships</td>
<td>392,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>386,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Dissemination</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>32,883</td>
<td>82,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Evaluation</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>13,633</td>
<td>317,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>211,695,407</td>
<td>39,998,014</td>
<td>61,127,287</td>
<td>150,568,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES - EXPENDITURES BY FY 2012-13 PROGRAM BUDGET:

* The FY 2012-13 Program Budget was approved by the Board of Commissioners on June 14, 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative/Program - Pass-Through</th>
<th>December Expenditures</th>
<th>Year To Date Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) - LA County Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) - Participation Payment</td>
<td>38,584</td>
<td>85,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power of Preschool (PoP)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,147</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 4

Approve Two Amendments and Authorize Staff to Complete Final Contract Execution Upon Approval from the Board
SUBJECT:
Consent Calendar items for approval

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve two amendments and authorize staff to complete final contract execution upon approval from the Board.

BACKGROUND:
First 5 LA's approved programmatic budget for FY 2012-13 totals $214,288,973. The programmatic budget included investments in five areas: Countywide Investments, Place-Based Investments, Prior Strategic Plan Investments, Research and Evaluation, and Administration. The Commission received work plans tied to planned financial activities for each investment area for FY 2012-13 programs and initiatives.

Staff is seeking to approve two amendments: One for Gary Resnick to increase his contract by $15,500 and extend the contract for an additional three months to expand the Accountability and Learning report to include activities from the Listening, Learning, and Leading project. Staff is also seeking to approve an amendment with UCLA (Regents of the University of California) to increase the contract by $24,999 to expand the use of the Early Development Instrument to additional elementary schools and train an additional 40 teachers.

DISCUSSION:
Staff seeks the Commission's approval of the amendments listed in the attachment. Additional information is included in the attached schedule. Additionally, Scopes of Work and Budgets for these agreements for approval are available for review on the First 5 LA website at http://www.first5la.org/files/ipad/index.html.
## AMENDMENTS

**INVESTMENT AREA: Research and Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>INITIATIVE/ PROJECT</th>
<th>CONTRACT INFORMATION</th>
<th>ORIGINAL BOARD APPROVAL DATE</th>
<th>PROCUREMENT METHOD</th>
<th>PROJECT LENGTH</th>
<th>ORIGINAL CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>AMENDED AMOUNT</th>
<th>NEW CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Accountability &amp; Learning Report</td>
<td>Gary Resnick (Contract #08324): Amendment to increase the contract by $15,500 to expand the Accountability and Learning report to include activities from the Listening, Learning, and Leading project and extend the contract through 6/30/2013.</td>
<td>6/14/2012*</td>
<td>Consultant Pool Solicitation</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;E</td>
<td>Early Development Instrument (EDI)</td>
<td>Regents of the University of California (Contract #08167): Amendment to increase the contract by $249,999 to expand the use of the Early Development Instrument to additional elementary schools. An additional 40 teachers will be trained.</td>
<td>9/8/2011</td>
<td>AB 109 Exemption</td>
<td>3 yrs 3 months</td>
<td>$249,998</td>
<td>$249,999</td>
<td>$274,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Executive Director Approval
Item 5

Remarks by the Commission Chair of the Board
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Executive Director’s Report
To: Board of Commissioners

From: Kim Belshé, Executive Director

Date: February 14, 2013

Subject: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Each month, the Executive Director's Report endeavors to provide the Board of Commissioners with a snapshot of First 5 LA’s many activities to advance our strategic goals that children are healthy, safe, and ready to learn. In the spirit of listening, learning, and experimenting, I intend to test different approaches to organizing and providing the Board with these monthly updates. Towards that end, below I endeavor to highlight a number of the activities that I have undertaken in recent weeks to provide a flavor of my external engagement activities. Second, in an effort to better frame the rich array of organization-wide activity undertaken over the past month, I have organized the information around the topical clusters used in the Annual Accountability & Learning Report for FY 2010-11.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXTERNAL ENGAGEMENT

Over the past month, I’ve had the opportunity to engage with a diversity of partners that are critical to advancing First 5 LA’s important efforts on behalf of Los Angeles County’s young children and their families. As I’ve emphasized with my First 5 LA colleagues, partnerships are essential to advancing the outcomes we seek. First 5 LA’s investments alone can’t guarantee the future achievement of our children – we are part of a larger eco system of support and our success depends as much or more on partnerships, than on our direct resources. The meetings have provided an opportunity for me to get to know the diverse array of stakeholders that share our aspirations for children 0-5 and have bearing on our work – as policymakers, funders, grantees and contractors, community leaders, and others.
In recent weeks, I’ve worked with staff colleagues to engage four principal groups of partners. First, John, Tessa, and I met with key elected leadership, Senator Carol Liu and Assembly member Holly Mitchell, to discuss the state policy and fiscal environment and prospects for progress on key First 5 LA priorities, including early childhood education and home visitation. Additional meetings with members of the LA delegation have been scheduled, with a particular emphasis on new Assembly members who have the opportunity to serve up to 12 years in their new roles, given the recent voter-approved change to term limits.

Second, I’ve had the opportunity to engage with different funders who are engaged in activities related to early childhood development. Through my participation on a recent panel at the Everychild Foundation’s “State of our Children” conference and LA Partnership for Early Childhood Investment, I’m getting to know many of First 5 LA’s key partners and collaborators who share our goals for the health, safety, and school readiness of young children. In addition, Teresa Nuno and I had the opportunity to meet with Leonard Auble, President and CEO of the Annenberg Foundation, regarding an exciting new county-wide initiative, “LA n Sync”, an emerging cross-sector platform designed to leverage the unique diversity of Los Angeles County and respond collectively to major funding and program opportunities that will position the region as a compelling destination for public and private investment. I believe this is an important undertaking which offers a multi-sectoral approach with a high potential for impact in improving the quality of life in Los Angeles.

Third, I have been pleased to have the opportunity to sit down and meet with a number of key grantees and partners. I appreciated the chance to attend the recent presentation by Best Start LA Metro of their work and to learn first-hand of the work underway to engage parents and residents and build community partnerships that are focused on addressing priority issues that affect the healthy development of young children. I also sat down with Celia Ayala, President and CEO of LAUP, to get to know her and her organization better and to lay the ground work for developing a collaborative approach to exploring the sustainability of LAUP activity.

Fourth, I have had the opportunity to engage with a number of collaborative partners that are critical to our policy and program work. Specifically, I participated in the recent meeting of the LA County Home Visitation Consortium, a group that shares First 5 LA’s interest in promoting quality, sustainable home visitation programs. In addition, I met with leadership with the LA County Chamber of Commerce to discuss the Chamber’s LA Compact and opportunities to bring a more explicit focus to school readiness as a critical component of the Compact’s education reform agenda. First 5 LA represents an important new signator to this education reform effort and I’m eager for the opportunity for First 5 LA to inform and broaden understanding of education reform to include early childhood education.

Finally, John and I have benefitted greatly from the learning afforded us through the breakfast roundtables that a number of the Commissioners have organized. It’s been a terrific introduction for us to meet many of First 5 LA’s key partners, grantees, and community members, to learn about their work on behalf of young children, and to hear their thoughts regarding how First 5 LA can build upon its current work to accelerate our influence and impact on the outcomes we seek.
ORGANIZATION-WIDE ACTIVITY

I. PERINATAL SUPPORT

Nothing to highlight this month.

II. PARENTING SUPPORT AND CHILD SAFETY

Access to Substance Abuse Services for High Risk Parents and Caregivers

The Access to Substance Abuse Services for High Risk Parents and Caregivers Project aims to increase access to and utilization of substance abuse prevention and treatment services for parents and caregivers of children prenatally to age five in cases where there is potential or risk for abuse or neglect due to substance abuse. As part of this project, parents of children ages 0-5 years old with opened cases and identified by the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) as having a need for substance abuse services are provided screening, brief intervention (information and education), referral and substance abuse treatment.

As of October 1, 2012, all First 5 LA-funded personnel (30 Substance Abuse Navigators) have been hired for the project and are now out-stationed in all 19 DCFS regional offices. DPH staff and Navigators have delivered presentations in at least half of the DCFS offices (at general staff meetings) to help train DCFS staff on the program's inter-agency referral process, and to assist with the initial startup of the program. DCFS staff referred 60 clients for services and completed 50 client assessments. Hence, 83% of people referred by DCFS were screened, at least in 5 DCFS offices.

At least one full-time Substance Abuse (SA) Navigator (licensed behavioral health professional) is located at each DCFS Regional Office. The SA Navigators provide coverage Monday through Friday and are on site as resource specialists, typically providing needed substance abuse information and referrals. The SA Navigators also participate in DCFS' Team Decision Making (TDM) meetings to contribute to and learn from the case planning process, educate DCFS staff on Substance Abuse services, and collaborate with co-located Public Health Nurses, DMH staff and Service Linkage Specialists about families needing multiservice assistance.

During the first quarter of FY 2012-2013, almost all of the SA Navigators were trained in Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) methods, the use of the Alcohol, Smoking, and Substance Involvement Test (ASSIST) screening tool, the Addiction Severity Index assessment, and on data entry for the project using the UCLA Data Management Center website.

DPH staff and SA Navigators attended numerous meetings with DCFS Regional Administrators at individual DCFS regional offices and continued to give presentations about the project at the General Staff meetings of multiple DCFS regional offices. The meetings resulted in the release of a DCFS FYI memo to all DCFS line staff, which was the final requirement DCFS requested before co-location began.

Staff Contact: Bill Gould (bgould@first5la.org)
III. PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH

50 Parks Initiative

In February 2012, the Commission authorized staff to establish a strategic partnership with the Los Angeles Parks Foundation (LAPF) to develop, construct and maintain three neighborhood parks in the Broadway-Manchester and Pacoima Best Start Communities as part of the City of Los Angeles 50 Parks Initiative in the total amount of $1,050,000. This investment allowed the Commission to leverage an additional $1 million in public and private dollars to support this project, creating walkable parks designed specifically for young children and their families.

As a condition of securing the property donated by Los Angeles Housing Authority (HUD) where the parks are located, the L.A. Recreation and Parks Department (the Department) had to commit to completing construction on each of the donated sites by February 2013. To this end, LAPF and the Department have worked expeditiously to meet this deadline and all three parks are scheduled to open in February 2013. After HUD released the properties, the City assumed ownership and is committed to maintaining the sites by the Department in perpetuity.

Throughout this partnership, First 5 LA Staff has collaborated with LAPF and the L.A. Recreation and Parks Department staff to coordinate and support community engagement activities. We are now in the final phase of the project to plan each of the upcoming park dedication events (see table below), including specific outreach activities to engage Best Start Community Partnership members and other community stakeholders, First 5 LA Commissioners, city and county officials. Best Start staff is also in discussions with Community Partnership members around engaging local community members in activities to promote awareness and involvement in the neighborhood parks after the openings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Location</th>
<th>Best Start Community</th>
<th>Dedication Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>554 W. 97th Street LA, CA 90044</td>
<td>Broadway/Manchester</td>
<td>Monday, February 11, 2013 10:00a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609 W. 105th St. Los Angeles, CA 90044</td>
<td>Broadway/Manchester</td>
<td>Thursday, February 21, 2013 1:00p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13116 W. Kagel Canyon St. Pacoima, CA 91331</td>
<td>Pacoima</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff contact: Jennifer Cowan (jcowan@first5la.org) / Jennifer Webb (jwebb@first5la.org)

Tot Parks and Trails: Two Ground Breaking Events and One Grand Opening

Two Ground Breaking events and one Grand Opening for parks built or rebuilt specifically for children 5 years and younger and their families were held in December 2012 as part of the First 5 LA funded Tot Parks and Trails Project (TPT).

The Ground Breaking for the new Ritchie Valens Tot Park in the Pacoima Best Start Community took place on December 6. The design and construction for the park is spearheaded by First 5 LA contractor, Shane’s Inspiration, the Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks and the Exceptional Children’s Foundation with input from local families involved in the Best Start Pacoima leadership team. During her welcoming remarks, Kim Belshé, Executive
Director of First 5 LA, stressed that providing spaces where young children can take advantage of the benefits of physical activity is an important strategy in preventing childhood obesity. Other attendees at the event included Jon Kirk Mukri, General Manager of Recreation and Parks, Felipe Fuentes, former Assembly member, and staff representatives from Los Angeles City Council member Richard Alarcon, Assembly member Raul Bocanegra and Senator Alex Padilla's offices.

A Ground Breaking event for the development of an inclusive playground at the Jamie Beth Slavin Park was also held on December 6. This project was also led by TPT contractor Shane's Inspiration in partnership with the Department of Recreation and Parks and the Exceptional Children's Foundation. Mr. Mukri, the General Manager of Recreation and Parks, mentioned during the introductions that building new playgrounds not only enhances a facility's amenities, it creates opportunities for healthy lifestyles.

Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative completed the El Sereno Arroyo Playground. The Grand Opening, held on December 8, celebrated the realization of a long term community goal of 20 plus years and the commitment by various partners including the Concerned Neighbors of El Sereno, LA-32 Neighborhood Council, City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, California Department of Transportation, Trust for Public Land, and City of Los Angeles Councilmember José Huizar.

The three projects are among the first of approximately 30 such Tot Parks and Trails to be located throughout Los Angeles County to address First 5 LA’s strategic goal of Children Maintain a Healthy Weight.

Staff Contact: Karen Robertson-Fall (krobertson@first5la.org)

First 5 LA Dental Care Program - A 21st Century Dental Home Project

The 21st Century Dental Home Model, approved by the Commission on July 12, 2012, is a 3.5 year, $9,239,000 investment led by the Regents of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). The project supports direct preventative and restorative dental services via a dental home model in community health clinics and training and technical assistance to providers to enhance the clinical and administrative operations necessary to adequately serve children prenatal to age 5 and their parents. The primary goal of First 5 LA's investment is to increase access to dental care for young children by establishing a broad partnership with up to 12 federally qualified or federally qualified look-alike community-based primary healthcare clinics.

In early January 2013, the Regents of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) announced the selection of 9 community-based primary healthcare clinics with a total of 12 service sites to participate in the First 5 LA-funded 21st Century Dental Home Model project. These clinics are: 1) AltaMed Health Services Corporation (Bell and El Monte sites), 2) Antelope Valley Community Clinic (Palmdale and Lancaster sites), 3) Arroyo Vista Family Health Foundation (Highland Park and Lincoln Heights), 4) Clinica Monseñor Oscar A. Romero, 5) Community Health Alliance of Pasadena (Fair Oaks), 6) Comprehensive Community Health Centers (Glendale), 7) El Proyecto del Barrio, 8) Northeast Valley Health Corporation (San Fernando Health Center), and 9) St John's Well Child and Family Center (Kenneth Williams Health Center).
In the remaining months of FY 2012-2013, the UCLA team will be working with the selected clinics and project partners Safety Net Solutions and Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County to secure agreements, develop clinic enhancement plans related to quality improvement, conduct medical/dental provider training on oral health services for children ages 0-5, and begin providing clinical services. Additionally, Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles, another project partner will begin conducting train-the-trainer sessions to deliver oral health education to childcare providers and parents/caregivers.

Staff Contact: Reena John (rjohn@first5la.org)

**Healthy Families Transition**

On January 1, 2013, the Healthy Families transition commenced with the transfer of more than 197,000 children from Healthy Families to Medi-Cal. The first phase of the transition included eight counties, including Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange. Federal approval for the transition was granted by the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare less than a day before the scheduled transfer. Advocates are monitoring the transition to ensure no problems occur. Los Angeles County will begin transferring children from Healthy Families to Medi-Cal on April 1.

Staff Contact: Ruel Nolledo (rnolledo@first5la.org)

IV. **SCHOOL READINESS**

Nothing to highlight this month.

V. **BEST START**

*Central Long Beach, East Los Angeles, South El Monte / El Monte*

This past December, Linda Alexander, Program Officer for Best Start Central Long Beach, presented at the 18th Annual Maternal and Child Health Epidemiology Conference cohosted with the 2012 CityMatCH Urban MCH Leadership Conference in San Antonio, Texas. This year's conference, titled "Advancing Partnerships: Data, Practice, and Policy," recognized the critical role that partnerships play in achieving desired Material and Child Health outcomes. The presentation, Utilizing a Place Based Collaborative to Improve a Community's Health: Because Place Really Does Matter, was a joint effort between First 5 LA and the Long Beach Department of Health and Human Services, and focused on the development of the powerful collaborative partnership that had been built in Long Beach, and lessons learned over the previous 18 months. The presentation was well received and provided an opportunity to highlight the depth and breadth and commitment necessary to build true collaboration.

Staff Contact: Reuben De Leon (rdeleon@first5la.org)

*Metro LA Presentations to First 5 LA Staff*

There were two meetings where representatives from Metro LA Community Guidance Body, which included parent, resident and community organization leaders, presented their progress in implementing community partnerships, their accomplishments to date, and lessons learned to First 5 LA staff. The first meeting, on January 28th, was intended for First 5 LA to learn of "lessons from the field" associated with the implementation of Metro LA. Some of the items
discussed included governance structure, relationship building and outreach, decision-making, working with the lead agency, and the community projects. The second meeting, on February 11th, focused on Metro LA's experience in the implementation of Community Based Action Research (CBAR). In both meetings, First 5 LA staff had an opportunity not only to learn about implementation-related lessons, but also to engage with the Metro LA Community Guidance Body around items of specific interest, which could affect our future work.

Metro LA Parents Coordinate Cultural Community Event

As the pilot Best Start Community, Metro LA has had an opportunity to support parents and community residents develop their capacity to be community leaders. These leadership skills were put into action on January 6, 2013, when 1 of the 6 Metro LA parent groups, Richardson Park, implemented a cultural event that reached over 225 children and their parents.

The parents and residents planned and executed all aspects of the event with minimal support, which included tasks such as:

- Securing food donations and financial support from local businesses
- Gaining marketing support from a local radio station, which broadcasted from the event
- Securing the venue
- Recruiting and coordinating volunteers
- Developing processes for registration, food and gift distribution

While the event was a huge outreach success, members of the parents group noted that a critical lesson learned moving forward is that they need more time to plan and to get businesses onboard to support future community events.

Staff Contact: Leanne Negron (lnegron@first5la.org)

Community Partnerships and Communications

On January 7 an introductory letter from Executive Director Belshé was distributed to the Best Start communities sharing highlights of the L3 process and specifically addressing the work being done in the Best Start communities. The letter was provided via email, regular mail, in person at Community Partnership meetings, and posted to the Beststartla.org website. Questions have been received from 66 community members and approximately 300 people viewed the posting online. An FAQ is available online and will be shared via email, regular mail and in person at meetings.

- **Panorama City and Neighbors:** Upcoming projects discussed were a continuation of the Potter the Otter reading engagements, event attendance and the development of a new communications campaign. Workgroup members were also asked to prepare to lead parts of a planning discussion to take place at the community's upcoming leadership retreat on February 9. Additionally, the entire Panorama City Partnership received another communications training on January 27.

- **Northeast Valley Community:** In preparation for their upcoming Kit for New Parents “film clip screenings” titled “The First 5 Years Last Forever: Tools for Effective Parenting” -- the Northeast Valley workgroup met three times in January. Collective decisions, regarding flyer language and images, schedule of the day and partnership engagement and
participation, were made. Additionally, the entire partnership received training on Social Media in December 2012 and message development on January 24.

- **Lancaster:** Building from conversations and trainings with the partnership in November and December 2012, the Lancaster Communications Workgroup met on January 20 to develop a comprehensive marketing and communications plan focused on the Best Start goal “children are safe from abuse and neglect.” Plan activities identified were hosting a community theater designed to illustrate scenarios in which children may be exposed to neglect or abuse, and give positive examples of alternative ways to handle the situations. Meetings to approve the plan and begin implementation were held in January 2013.

- **Palmdale:** The Palmdale Guidance Body met in December and decided to organize their Best Start activities around the goal “children maintain a healthy weight.” On January 22 Guidance Body members received a messaging training focused on the power of framing a message and used health and fitness campaigns as examples. The Community’s Communications Workgroup met on January 31 to begin developing the details of their plan.

- **South LA:** The South LA Best Start communities attended event planning trainings to strengthen the skills needed to implement community outreach and community engagement events in support of their “Healthy Families Build Strong Communities” priority. In addition, Public Affairs staff is in the process of securing communications consultant support from the Program Directors vendor pool to coordinate the implementation of communications activities as well as enhancing staff resources to support the Watts-Willowbrook, West Athens, Broadway-Manchester and Compton communities.

Staff Contact: Melissa Franklin (mfranklin@first5la.org)

**21st Annual Empowerment Congress Summit**

On January 19, 2013, 15 members from the Best Start Metro LA and South LA Community Partnerships, along with First 5 LA Program Officers, attended the 21st Annual Empowerment Congress Summit. The Best Start South LA Community Partnerships include the Broadway-Manchester, Compton/East Compton, Watts/Willowbrook and West Athens communities. Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors for the County of Los Angeles, and current Chair of the First 5 LA Commission, founded the Empowerment Congress in 1992. In his opening letter to Summit participants, Supervisor Ridley-Thomas stated, “For more than two decades now, the Empowerment Congress has provided a model for community-based leadership based on collaboration and cooperation across traditional dividing lines, with a common goal of advancing social, economic and environmental justice.”

This year’s half-day Summit brought together key stakeholders such as neighborhood groups, residents, nonprofit organizations, businesses, religious institutions, and community leaders – to dialogue around issues that are most important to the diverse constituency in the Second Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County. This year’s theme, “Advocating for Change-Organizing for Empowerment,” framed the issues discussed in various workshops and provided a context for all community members to educate, engage and empower each other to help problem solve.
Sam Joo of Koreatown Youth and Community Center, and a member of the Best Start Metro LA Community Guidance Body, co-presented a workshop on Coalition Building with Brenda Aguilera, Director for Best Start Metro LA from Para Los Niños.

Staff Contact: Marvin Espinoza (mespinoza@first5la.org)

**White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative: Briefing And Dialogue**

On January 16, 2013, First 5 LA hosted a briefing and dialogue on participatory democracy in partnership with The California Endowment, Center for the Study of Social Policy, Southern California Grantmakers and the Los Angeles Mayor's Office of Strategic Partnerships. Ian Bautista, President of United Neighborhoods Center of America; Carolyne Abdullah, Director of Community Assistance for the Everyday Democracy; and Peter Pennekamp, Executive Director Emeritus for the Humboldt Area Foundation discussed the status of President Obama's Neighborhood Revitalization efforts and shared lessons from place-based work occurring in New York, New Mexico and Humboldt County. The panelists presented an overview of strategies communities may want to consider when building their capacity to engage in policy change. They also outlined possible consequences to communities should cuts to key federal programs supported by the Departments of Health and Human Services, Education, Justice, Housing and Urban Development, Agriculture and Labor occur through sequestration.

First 5 LA's participation in this session stems from our ongoing involvement in the LA Neighborhood Revitalization (LA NRI) Workgroup. This informal workgroup was created in 2010 to support Los Angeles County's applicants for the federal *Promise Neighborhoods* initiative. Through the CI Department, First 5 LA remains engaged with the public and private organizations that contributed to the workgroup. Staffs from CI, Best Start and R&E were on-hand to learn from these nationally recognized experts in community engagement.

Staff contact: Jessica Kaczmarek (jkaczmarek@first5la.org)

**VI. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT**

**ECE Career Development Policy Project Meeting**

On July 1, 2012, the First 5 LA Commission entered into a performance-based contract with the Los Angeles County Office of Education to implement the fourth year (out of six) of the Early Care and Education Career Development Policy project (ECE CDP Project). The goals of the project are to improve the compensation and retention of the ECE workforce, employing strategies to increase policymaker, business sector, and public support for ECE workforce issues. The ECE CDP Project launched ECE Works!, a multifaceted outreach campaign to engage and inform business, civic, and community leaders about the importance and impact of the ECE workforce on May 30, 2012.

A primary objective of the ECE CDP Project is to increase and maintain the public spotlight on ECE workforce compensation and workplace condition issues. Accordingly, the ECE CDP project team convened a meeting with key ECE stakeholders on January 16, 2013 to provide information about the ECE Works! campaign in an effort to align and coordinate with other ECE-focused advocacy efforts throughout Los Angeles County. The ECE Works! team shared project materials and advocacy tools including new on-line resources. The team sought feedback from attendees about the new campaign resources as well as ideas for next steps in the
campaign and opportunities for future coordination across projects. The approximately 50 attendees included Commissioner Duane Dennis and many current First 5 LA grantees whose programs impact the ECE field. First 5 LA staff and contractors will continue to engage with attendees and other stakeholders to work in partnership on advocacy efforts to support the ECE workforce in Los Angeles County.

Staff Contact: Aimee Loya Owens (aloya@first5la.org)

*Quality Early Care* Media Campaign

Countywide Marketing staff completed preparations for the Quality Early Care and Education Campaign that kicked-off the week of January 28. The campaign message is “Quality Care Lasts a Lifetime” and is made up of a media buy using online, print, outdoor, Transit TV, cable and Metro bus advertising channels. The effort is supporting the Commission’s ECE Workforce Consortium initiative. The campaign also provides tips, resources and a checklist for parents on the ReadySetGrowLA.org website. Staff is working with a variety of community partners to help spread the message.

Staff Contact: Violet Gonzalez (vgonzalez@first5la.org)

*High School Recruitment Pilot Program Evaluation*

The final evaluation report for the High School Recruitment (HSR) Pilot Program was released. The goal of the HSR Pilot Program, which ran from 2008-2012, was to encourage more young people to consider Early Care and Education (ECE) as a career, by providing high school students with information, resources, and internship opportunities in the ECE field. HSR Pilot Programs implemented a “tiered activity” program design by starting with general outreach activities and progressing to academic coursework and internships.

First 5 LA hired the Evaluation and Training Institute to analyze the work of our five grantees, in order to learn what strategies were effective for achieving the goals of the HSR program. The evaluation found that students increased their knowledge of child development and of the ECE field as a result of participating in the program, while also improving their overall academic achievement in school. Most of the participating students have only recently left high school or have not yet graduated, so their long-term career choices are not known. The evaluation also identified the following best practices:

- Design a program that is engaging for students with experiential learning, hands-on activities and opportunities to interact directly with children.
- Include parents in the recruitment/orientation process to increase their buy-in and support.
- Involve key high school staff—make them aware of the program so they can recruit students who are/may be interested in this field.

Staff Contact: Sharon Murphy (smurphy@first5la.org)
Research and Evaluation Consultant Pool Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Released

The Research and Evaluation department will be releasing an RFQ this month on the First 5 LA Funding Center to seek additional consultants to be added to support First 5 LA’s Research and Evaluation work. Interested consultants should visit the Funding Center or contact the First 5 LA Research and Evaluation department contact below.

Staff contact: Heather Slavens-Breen (hslavens@first5la.org)

VII. COUNTYWIDE SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT

Technical Assistance Institute Pilot Program Evaluation

The Research and Evaluation Department released an evaluation of the First 5 LA Technical Assistance (TA) Institute, a pilot program established by First 5 LA to strengthen nonprofit organizations serving young children and their families. Between 2008 and 2012, First 5 LA invested in a series of TA Institute programs designed to increase the capacity of select current and former grantees in three key areas: fund development, financial management and strategic communications. These programs were carried out by organizations that are experts in each of these three fields. The TA Institute was made up of three programs: Customized Consulting, Social Enterprise Academy, and an Organizational Leadership Development Program.

The evaluation, conducted by Research and Evaluation staff, found that participants believed their organizational capacity had been improved as a result of the training and technical assistance they received. They valued the opportunity for professional development, as well as the specific skills and knowledge gained. Two organizations reported that their fundraising increased as soon as they started practicing what they’d learned in the training.

Staff in the Community Investments Department is using what was learned from the TA Institute evaluation to improve its capacity building programs. First 5 LA is continuing its investment in organizational capacity building with the recently launched Social Enterprise Grants Program and the Challenge Grants Program.

Staff contact: Bronwyn Mauldin (bmauldin@first5la.org)

VIII. INTERNAL INITIATIVES

Brand Awareness and Perception Research Project

The Public Affairs Department has begun work to establish a baseline of data regarding stakeholder awareness, perceptions and understanding of the importance of the first five years of life, the Commission’s role in the arena of early childhood issues and the three brands associated with the Commission — First 5 LA, Best Start and Ready, Set, Grow! (the agency’s parenting resource website). The objective of the research effort is to collect data from multiple stakeholder audiences, analyze the responses and use the information to inform future social marketing and public education efforts.

The effort is being led by the Commission’s consultant marketing and communications firm, Edelman PR, in consultation with the First 5 LA Research & Evaluation Department. Research
is being conducted via one-on-one interviews, group interviews for First 5 LA staff, focus groups and surveys. Research is being conducted with internal stakeholders, external stakeholders (current grantees, potential partners, and major L.A. County community leaders/organization) general public, parents of children 0-5, and the media.

As of January 24, 2012, research has been conducted with the following:

- Nine Commissioners
- Three Supervisor deputies
- Interviews with five groups of First 5 LA staff members as well as a survey sent to all staff
- Four focus groups with groups of parents of children 0-5
- Surveys with approximately 300 WIC participants at three centers

All research is estimated to be completed by the mid-to-late February, with results by the end of March. This effort is fully coordinated with our Listening, Learning and Leading initiative.

Staff Contact: Francisco Oaxaca (foaxaca@first5la.org)

**State Policy and Sustainability RFQ**

The policy department posted an RFQ for a State Policy and Sustainability consultant to further focus the First 5 LA Policy Agenda as it relates to state policy opportunities, and advocate for First 5 LA’s priorities in state policies and regulations. This support may include a range of diverse tasks from relationship building with key decision-makers, policy strategy assistance, policy communications strategies and other relevant tasks. 15 applications were received, 2013 and a finalist should be named later in the month, with submission to the Commission for approval at the March 2013 meeting.

Policy Grantee Quarterly Meeting: On January 30, 2013 the Policy department held its quarterly meeting with grantees. The agenda included a discussion of important budget issues related to the 0-5 population, grantee plans to support various bills and a segment focusing on evaluation of policy/advocacy initiatives.

Staff Contact: Stacy Lee, Policy Manager (slee@first5la.org)

IX. PUBLIC POLICY, ADVOCACY, COLLABORATION

**State Budget Update**

Governor Jerry Brown’s proposed 2013-14 budget, for the first time in years, does not include extensive cuts to health and human services programs. The budget plan calls for $97 billion general fund spending with a $1 billion reserve. Over $4 billion is earmarked for debt reduction.

While the budget falls short of restoring cuts to the many health and human services programs targeted during the recession (child care, which was arguably one of the hardest hit, does not experience any restoration), the Governor does call for increasing funds to K-12 and higher education. In addition, the Governor commits to expanding Medi-Cal as part of the state’s implementation of the Affordable Care Act.
The Governor's Medi-Cal expansion plan, which would cover childless adults who earn less than 138 percent of the federal poverty level, includes two implementation options: The first option would require counties to administer the expansion by building upon their Low Income Health Programs. A number of county administrators have raised concerns about pursuing this option, in part because not all counties have the requisite infrastructure and they fear funding would be inadequate. The second option is a state-based expansion of the existing Medi-Cal program. Under this option, the Governor has indicated that if the state takes on responsibility for an expanded Medi-Cal program, the counties will need to help offset new state costs by assuming responsibility for other state programs, including child care. While not identified specifically as “realignment”, this proposal may mirror in some ways last year’s child care realignment proposal, which the legislature ultimately rejected.

Also important to note, this budget proposal does not rely on First 5 California dollars to cover Early Start or Medi-Cal. Last year’s budget included an $80 million request to fund these programs.

Staff Contact: Tessa Charnofsky (tcharnofsky@first5la.org)

Meetings with Elected Officials

Policy staff regularly meets with elected officials, their staff, and candidates running for office to introduce them to First 5 LA, update them on projects, or address budget related issues.

In recent weeks, meetings were held with Senator Carol Liu (D-Pasadena) and her staff as well as Assembly member Holly Mitchell (D-Culver City) and her staff to discuss the early education landscape and opportunities to strengthen early learning systems in California. First 5 LA is issuing an RFQ for an advocate who will identify policy opportunities, including funding prospects that address the agency’s priorities, including early education.

Staff is in the midst of reaching out to newly elected legislators to set up meetings to provide background on First 5 LA, investments in the members’ districts, and to discuss mutual policy goals.

Staff Contact: Tessa Charnofsky (tcharnofsky@first5la.org)

Stakeholder Engagement And Collaborative Activities

Policy staff participated in meetings and events that advance the agency’s policy goals. During the months of January, staff attended the following meetings:

- January 4: LA Chamber Health Committee featured Senator Ed Hernández (D-West Covina) who spoke about the roll-out of the Affordable Care Act in California, concerns about whether Governor Brown would fully fund Medicaid expansion and Special Session priorities.

- January 9: Policy Roundtable for Child Care, staffed by the County Office of Child Care and chaired by USC social work professor Jacquelyn McCroskey. The meeting included predictions regarding the Governor's budget, which was due to be released the following day, including how child care might fare. First 5 LA’s new Executive Director, Kim Belshé, attended the February meeting.
January 11: Los Angeles Chamber’s Education Committee addressed how California’s educational system will fare post Prop 30. Facilitating the discussion was former legislator and Community College Chancellor Jack Scott, and the panel included representatives from the Legislative Analyst’s Office, California School Boards Association and Capitol Advisors Group, LLC. Speakers addressed the Governor’s financing proposal, formally called “weighted student formula,” as well as the plan to give districts local control, making categorical funding for certain projects optional.

January 16: LAPAI Meeting – The Los Angeles Pre-School Advocacy Initiative, an effort coordinated by the California Community Foundation. In the meeting the group discussed Governor Brown’s 2013-14 budget, including the potential for a child care realignment. In addition, they introduced Dr. Linda Perry, a Los Angeles representative to the California State Advisory Committee on Early Education.

January 18: Infant Toddler Advocacy Workgroup Webinar - Budget Debrief and Advocacy: The webinar was dedicated to information-sharing on the state budget and the potential impact on infants and toddlers as well as advocacy opportunities. Major topics included funding for child care, child welfare realignment and the health care budget.

January 24: Emerging Considerations in Maternal Mental Health: Experts from throughout the country discussed emerging considerations for improving maternal mental health screening and treatment.

January 22: LA Chamber LA Compact Joint Advocacy call focused on building a legislative agenda, what the new K-12 “local control” proposal means for LAUSD, including how districts might or might not invest in pre-school with increased revenue from a “weighted student formula”.

January 22: L.A. Access to Health Care meeting examined Healthy Families transition, Covered California updates, Medi-Cal Expansion and the state budget.

January 22: LA County Home Visitation Consortium, policy subcommittee. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the implementation of the consortium and subcommittee, outline the framework, and steps to set and accomplish goals. Staff will attend both the Consortium meeting and Policy Subcommittee. The LA Best Baby’s Network staffs the Consortium and is funded by a First 5 LA Policy Advocacy Fund (cycle I) grant to supports its policy work.

January 24: Perinatal Mental Health Taskforce meeting. Monthly meeting of this taskforce to update the members on activities (this group is a PAF grantee).

January 24: LA Partnership for Early Childhood Investment, annual meeting. First 5 LA’s Executive Director was a featured guest and participated in a discussion with members to learn about the Partnership work and our goals, discuss our collaborations and projects, and engage in a discussion with the members around areas of common interest.

January 28: Joint Committee on Legislation, a committee of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care, is compiling their annual legislative agenda and examining the implications of the Governor’s proposal to devolve child care responsibility down to the Counties in exchange for the state administering the Medicaid expansion.
- January 28: Breastfeeding Policy Roundtable is planning a summit and preparing their legislative agenda.

- January 29: Maternal Child and Adolescent Health Department staff and Alternate Commissioner Suzanne Bostwick met with Policy team to share updates and identify mutual policy goals. The teams meet quarterly.

- January 31: Child Care and Development State Budget Policy Workshop: The Child Development Policy Institute, On the Capitol Doorstep and the Children’s Defense Fund. Staff attended the budget workshops to hear agencies’ updates on the Governor’s fiscal year budget.

Staff Contact: Tessa Charnofsky (tcharnofsky@first5la.org)
Item 7

Approval of Strategic Partnership and Contract with the University of Southern California School of Social Work to Conduct a Rapid Response Data Project as Part of the LA Children’s Data Network
FIRST 5 LA

SUBJECT:
Strategic Partnership with USC - Cumulative Risk of Child Protective Service Involvement: A Population-Based Examination from Birth through Age 5

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Commission enter into a strategic partnership and execute a contract with The University of Southern California (USC) to study the cumulative prevalence of children 0-5 in Los Angeles County who are involved in the child welfare system.

BACKGROUND:
At the October 2010 meeting, the Board of Commissioners approved an allocation of $5 million over five years to establish The Data Partnership for Funders as a countywide effort designed to establish an interagency partnership among experts in the field of data and technology related to children and families. The Data Partnership for Funders is now known as the LA Children’s Data Network (LACDN). Participating members of the LACDN have selected and approved this project. Please see attached memo for further detail.

DISCUSSION:
It is currently known how many children ages 0-5 enter the child welfare system annually, but it is not known how many children cumulatively will have been involved in child protective services by the age of five. Dr. Putnam-Hornstein will expand on prior state-level analyses to examine the cumulative prevalence of children ages 0-5 in the child welfare system in LA County by SPA. This analysis will provide the Commission and LA County Policymakers a more accurate understanding of the risk posed by maltreatment.

NEXT STEPS:
Upon the Commission’s approval, First 5 LA will seek to establish a Strategic Partnership contract with USC to examine the cumulative prevalence of children in Los Angeles County who are reported for maltreatment, substantiated as victims and enter foster care by age five.

For Office Use

Board Action Taken:

Approved: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Further Discussion

Referred to Committee/Work Group: ____________________________
To: Chairman of the Board
From: Kim Belshé, Executive Director
Date: February 14, 2013
Subject: RECOMMENDATION TO ESTABLISH A STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP WITH UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA - SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

RECOMMENDATION:
This is a request for approval to establish a strategic partnership with The University of Southern California (USC) to examine the cumulative prevalence of children in Los Angeles County who are reported for maltreatment, substantiated as victims and enter foster care by age five. This project will leverage prior investment by the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation and expand on data analysis conducted by Emily Putnam-Hornstein, PhD, Assistant Professor, USC School of Social Work. The total budget is $73,542. Funds for this project are available in the current programmatic budget.

BACKGROUND:
At the October 2010 meeting, the Board of Commissioners approved The Data Partnership for Funders as a countywide effort which forms an interagency partnership among experts in child and family research. The Data Partnership (1) establishes the Data Rapid Response Team (DRRT) to identify and prioritize research questions, (2) engages current and potential data consumers in order to identify their needs and train them to navigate existing data effectively, and (3) will develop an online clearinghouse to act as a single “place” where all data and research projects related to 0-5 issues in the region can be accessed efficiently. Data Partnership members must be committed to working collaboratively to minimize duplication and find ways to leverage First 5 LA’s $5 million investment. Over the past two years staff has convened a group of stakeholders to form a working group now known as the LA Children’s Data Network (LACDN). Staff has engaged the LACDN working group to explore infrastructure, address priorities and conduct pilot Data Rapid Response projects.

Currently Data Rapid Response Projects for the LA Children’s Data Network are selected by LACDN participants. Criteria considered include whether or not the objective will be relevant to policy-makers and other data consumers, is relevant to children ages 0-5, and will have a clear benefit beyond First 5 LA.

In this case, a proposal was submitted by USC to the LACDN. After discussion, LACDN members concluded that the project met the criteria and approved moving forward.
SUMMARY OF PROJECT
The LACDN will collaborate with USC to expand on data analysis being conducted by Dr. Putnam-Hornstein to study the cumulative risk of maltreatment of children ages 0-5.

Objective: Dr. Putnam-Hornstein will examine the cumulative prevalence of children in Los Angeles County who are reported for maltreatment, substantiated as victims and enter foster care by age five. It is currently known how many children in LA County enter foster care annually. However, no study has estimated prospectively how many children will cumulatively experience these events by the age of five.

Methods: This analysis will expand prior state-level analyses through newly developed linkages between the 2006 birth cohort and child welfare data from 2006-2012 to examine the cumulative prevalence of children born in Los Angeles County who enter the foster care system and will include an examination and modeling of demographic variations by child maternal characteristics, as well as geographic variations between counties in California, as well as within Los Angeles County by SPA.

Results: Point-in-time estimates give the impression that only a small share of children are maltreated in the foster care system, whereas cumulative risk estimates demonstrate the true severity of the risks and the resulting public health burden. Because there is limited information on how many children are involved in the child welfare system during the first five years of life, there has been an underinvestment of resources, with more visible but less prevalent and consequential public health threats targeted for increasingly scarce funding. The results of this study will not only serve to highlight the public health threat posed by maltreatment, which is understated by annual risk estimates, but will also inform policies targeting resources to children, families and communities at high risk of child welfare involvement.

JUSTIFICATION
This strategic partnership meets the following criteria below:

☑ The proposed Strategic Partner can provide specific resources needed by First 5 LA to implement an approved program or initiative in a manner or on a scale that makes the strategic partnership more cost-effective than resources that would be obtained through a competitive solicitation; or

☑ The proposed Strategic Partner can implement an approved program or initiative more expeditiously than resources that would be obtained through a competitive solicitation; or

☑ The proposed Strategic Partner can provide a demonstrated level of ability or expertise that is only available in the community through the proposed strategic partnership; or

☐ That working with the Strategic Partner provides significant and unique opportunities to leverage First 5 LA funds to produce additional funding for the program or service.

AND

☑ The proposed strategic partnership is consistent with the adopted Strategic Plan.
1. The proposed strategic partnership leverages data, infrastructure, and data agreements which have already been obtained by USC which will make the proposed partnership more cost-effective than resources that would be obtained through a competitive solicitation.

2. The proposed strategic partnership leverages the principal investigator's prior work which will allow this project to be completed in a few months. Contracting with another entity would require duplication of Dr. Putnam-Hornstein's work, which would cause a significant delay to the project.

3. Because this project expands on Dr. Putnam-Hornstein's prior work, she is uniquely qualified to do the proposed data analysis. In addition, Dr. Putnam-Hornstein's research appointment at UC Berkeley allows her access to child welfare data necessary to complete the project.

4. By entering into this partnership the Commission will gain valuable information toward helping children in Los Angeles County remain safe from abuse and neglect.

* Please see attached memo for further information regarding the proposed partnership.

CONCLUSION

Approved by the Board of Commissioners at the February 14, 2013 Commission Meeting.

☐ Approved
☐ Denied

______________________________    _______________________
Kim Belshé, Executive Director           Date
Memorandum

To: First 5 LA
From: Emily Putnam-Hornstein, PhD
Date: 1/30/2013
Re: Proposed Rapid Response Project
Attachment: Examples of Prior State-Level Studies

Please find below additional information concerning the proposed Rapid Response Project - Cumulative Risk of Child Protective Service Involvement: A Population-Based Examination from Birth through Age 5. This project has been strategically developed to leverage earlier investments in data, infrastructure, data agreements, and the principal investigator’s prior experience working with these data sources.

Data:

- Child welfare records arise from the state’s CWS/CMS system and are available to a small number of researchers affiliated with California Child Welfare Performance Indicators Project at UC Berkeley. The principal investigator of the proposed Rapid Response project (Dr. Putnam-Hornstein) maintains a research appointment at UC Berkeley and therefore has unique access to these data. The child welfare data that will be used for this project have been configured longitudinally and formatted for analysis through ongoing funding available from the California Department of Social Services and the Stuart Foundation.
- Vital birth records have been previously purchased and are currently maintained within the California Child Welfare Performance Indicators Project. Funding to purchase these records was provided by a combination of unrestricted project funds and funding the PI received from the HF Guggenheim Foundation. These data have been formatted and prepared for other data linkages through funding from the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation. However, there has not been any funding available to link more recent birth cohorts with child welfare data. As such, First 5 funding will support new linkages at a low cost given earlier data investments.

Committee for the Protection of Human Subject Approvals:

- These data are available to the principal investigator under a longstanding MOU with the California Department of Social Services and existing IRB approvals which allow for the linkage of child welfare data with vital birth records. As such, this project is also able to leverage existing data agreements and human subjects’ approvals to enable the rapid linkage and analysis of data.

University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90089
Expertise

- To date, the PI has successfully linked the birth records of more than 2 million children born between 1999 and 2002 to child welfare records through each child's fifth birthday. These data have been used to develop preliminary predictive risk models, establish the first ever cumulative risk estimates of child welfare involvement between birth and age 5, and will allow this Rapid Response project to be conducted quickly and expertly – generating significant new knowledge and data within a short 6-month time frame.

Emily Putnam-Hornstein, PhD

Date 1/30/13
## Exhibit A – Scope of Work

**Agency Name:** Emily Putnam-Hornstein, PhD  
University of Southern California  
**Project Name:** LACDN DRRT: Cumulative Risk of Child Protective Service Involvement  
**Project Length:** 6 months  

**Contract Number:**  
**Contract Period:** 2/15/13-6/30/13  
**Revision Date:**  
**Report Period:**  
**Submission Date:** (Office Use Only)

### Project Goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities and Subtasks</th>
<th>Staff Assignment</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include who, what, when, where, how and how much for each objective</td>
<td>Indicate the activities and subtasks leading to the fulfillment of the objective. Include benchmarks or milestones in chronological order. Include the appropriate quantity or frequency of the associated activities or subtasks.</td>
<td>Indicate staff, consultants or subcontractors responsible for the respective activity or subtask.</td>
<td>Indicate start and end period.</td>
<td>Indicate Date Due.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Aquire and link 2006 birth record data and CPS data through each child’s 5th birthday | Contractor | 2/15/13-3/15/13 | Memo emailed to First 5 LA staff  
Due: 3/15/13 |
| 2. Create data tables of children reported for maltreatment, substantiated as victims, and entering foster care by county, SPA, and LA hospital of birth | Contractor | 3/15/13-4/15/13 | Table emailed to First 5 LA staff  
Due: 4/15/13 |
| 3. Presentation to LACDN members summarizing finalized descriptive data and preliminary multivariable predictive risk models for CPS involvement | Contractor | 4/15/13-5/15/13 | Draft Power Point delivered to First 5 LA staff  
Due: 5/15/13 |
## Exhibit A – Scope of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities and Subtasks</th>
<th>Staff Assignment</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include who, what, when, where, how and how much for each objective.</td>
<td>Indicate the activities and subtasks leading to the fulfillment of the objective. Include benchmarks or milestones in chronological order. Include the appropriate quantity or frequency of the associated activities or subtasks.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>4/15/13-5/31/13</td>
<td>Draft Report Delivered to First 5 LA staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Draft Report summarizing descriptive and multivariable models for CPS involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due: 5/31/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Create Final Report and power point materials for dissemination</td>
<td>5.1 Present summary and draft report to LACDN members</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>5/31/13-6/30/13</td>
<td>Revised report and power point delivered to First 5 LA staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Participate in LACDN discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due: 6/30/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Incorporate LACDN input into final report and dissemination materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 18, 2013

Sponsor: First 5 LA

Proposal entitled: “Cumulative Risk of Child Protective Service Involvement: A Population-Based Examination from Birth through Age 5”

Principal Investigator: Emily Putnam-Hornstein
Time Period: 2/1/2013 – 6/30/2013
Total Cost: $73,542.00

On behalf of the University of Southern California (USC), I am pleased to submit the proposal above referenced. This proposal has been approved by the department of Contracts and Grants on behalf of the administration of the University.

The USC proposal contemplates a project as laid out in the proposal at an approximately estimated cost of $73,542. In the event that an award is made, USC anticipates participating in the project under an agreement that is subject to mutually agreeable terms and conditions and beneficial to both institutions. Please note, per our previous conversations despite the budget containing hours as required by First5LA USC does not record hours for faculty and exempt staff and instead uses a percentage of effort certification process. In the event an award is made please be aware that USC will be unable to provide hourly back-up for all exempt staff on this award.

Should you have any questions of a business or fiscal matters please contact us at rountree@usc.edu or by phone at (213)740-1894, our fax number is (213)740-6070.

Katie Rountree
Sr. Contract and Grant Officer
## Deliverables Based Budget Exhibit B

### Cumulative Risk of Child Protective Service Involvement: A Population-Based Examination from Birth through Age 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor Cost Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>25% Accrual/25% Support</td>
<td>40% Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$36,866.00</td>
<td>$5,046.87</td>
<td>$5,046.87</td>
<td>$5,046.87</td>
<td>$5,046.87</td>
<td>$4,872.34</td>
<td>$4,872.34</td>
<td>$4,872.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support</td>
<td>15% CAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$10,425.00</td>
<td>$2,041.00</td>
<td>$2,041.00</td>
<td>$2,041.00</td>
<td>$2,041.00</td>
<td>$1,985.10</td>
<td>$1,985.10</td>
<td>$1,985.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$8,166.00</td>
<td>$1,733.20</td>
<td>$1,733.20</td>
<td>$1,733.20</td>
<td>$1,733.20</td>
<td>$1,652.40</td>
<td>$1,652.40</td>
<td>$1,652.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$16,750.00</td>
<td>$3,230.00</td>
<td>$3,230.00</td>
<td>$3,230.00</td>
<td>$3,230.00</td>
<td>$3,023.00</td>
<td>$3,023.00</td>
<td>$3,023.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Hours</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Labor Dollars</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HOURS</strong></td>
<td>640</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LABOR DOLLARS</strong></td>
<td>$79,150.00</td>
<td>$13,014.39</td>
<td>$12,682.39</td>
<td>$9,385.32</td>
<td>$9,385.32</td>
<td>$9,107.44</td>
<td>$9,107.44</td>
<td>$9,107.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL HOURS AS NECESSARY

| Labor Cost Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Communications  | $136.00 | $19.43 | $19.43 | $19.43 | $19.43 | $19.43 | $19.43 | $19.43 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Office Space    | $756.00 | $108.00 | $108.00 | $108.00 | $108.00 | $108.00 | $108.00 | $108.00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lab Operations  | $2,096.00 | $281.71 | $281.71 | $281.71 | $281.71 | $281.71 | $281.71 | $281.71 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Materials/Supplies | $500.00 | $71.43 | $71.43 | $71.43 | $71.43 | $71.43 | $71.43 | $71.43 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| **TASK TOTAL** | $73,342.00 | $12,499.31 | $12,166.56 | $9,849.90 | $9,849.90 | $9,522.12 | $9,522.12 | $9,522.12 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

### TOTAL COST

| Labor Cost Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| **RETURN TO COST** | $12,342.00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

### COMPOSITE RATE

| Labor Cost Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| **RETURN TO COST** | $115 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

---

**Note:** Additional supporting documents may be requested.

---

**Fiscal Contact Person:**
Date: 1/18/13

**Program Officer:**
Date: 1/18/13

**Finance:**

---

**Agency Authorized Signature:**
Date: 1/18/13

**Agreement:**
Contract #:
Agency Authorized Signature:
Date: 1/18/13

---

[First 5 LA]
Agency: University of Southern California
Project Name: Cumulative Risk of Child Protective Service Involvement: A Population-Based Examination from Birth through Age 5

---
Item 8

Approve
Resolution 2013-02 Increasing the Research Partnerships Research and Evaluation Project Line Item FY 2012-13 Program Budget by a Total Amount of $404,837
SUBJECT:
Approval of an amendment to the FY 2012-13 Program Budget

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve Resolution 2013-02 increasing the Research Partnerships Research and Evaluation Project line item FY 2012-13 Program Budget by a total amount of $404,837.

BACKGROUND:
The FY 2012-13 Program Budget was approved via Resolution by the Board of Commissioners on June 14, 2012. Any changes to allocations or amendments to the Program Budget must be submitted to the Board of Commissioners for formal approval via Resolution.

DISCUSSION:
$1 million of contract authority was approved for the Family Survey Data Collection project within the Research Partnerships Research and Evaluation Project line item in the FY 2012-13 Program Budget; no funds were included in the Budget as estimated fiscal year expenditures were unknown at the time of budget development. The Family Survey Data Collection Project will generate representative data on key indicators of well-being for children zero to five and their families in each of the Best Start Communities. A contract was approved and executed in November 2012 for this project with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) following an RFP process to complete the Family Survey design, collect and analyze the survey data, and disseminate findings.

The contract with NORC was executed in the amount of $719,027 for the contract period of December 1, 2012 through November 30, 2013. At the time of contract execution an accurate estimate was not available for how much was anticipated to be spent against this contract amount in the current fiscal year. However, based on further analysis, it was determined that an estimated $404,837 will be spent against the contract prior to June 30, 2013. As such, this amendment serves to move funds into the FY 2012-13 Program Budget to account for these expected fiscal year expenditures. As a result of this amendment, the updated FY 2012-13 Program Budget total for Research Partnerships will go from $392,000 to $796,837, a difference of $404,837. This line item is budgeted on a zero-based platform and will reduce the First 5 LA Uncommitted Fund Balance by $404,837.

Attachments:
1. Resolution No. 2013-02
2. Research Partnerships – Request for Amendment to FY 2012-13 Program Budget
RESOLUTION NO. 2013-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CHILDREN
AND FAMILIES FIRST PROPOSITION 10 COMMISSION
APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2012-13 PROGRAM BUDGET

The Board of Commissioners of Los Angeles County Children and Families First Proposition 10 Commission ("the Commission") hereby finds and resolves as follows:

Whereas, the Los Angeles County Children and Families First Proposition 10 Commission is authorized by statute and Los Angeles County ordinance to adopt an annual budget for operations & programs; and

Whereas, the Commission is further authorized by statute and Los Angeles County ordinance to formally amend the annual budget as needed during the fiscal year.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. An amendment to the FY 2012-13 Program Budget adopted on June 14, 2012 is approved, increasing the Research Partnerships Research and Evaluation Project line item by $404,837, resulting in a new fiscal year budget of $796,837; and

2. The executed copy of this Resolution shall be retained on file as evidence of the Commission's actions herein.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 14TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2013, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners ____________________________________________
NOES: Commissioners ____________________________________________
ABSTAIN: Commissioners __________________________________________

__________________________________________
Mark Ridley-Thomas
Chair, First 5 LA

__________________________________________
Kim Belshé
Executive Director
Commission Meeting Date: 02/14/2013

Program: Research Partnerships

☐ New Allocation  Amount: _________________________

☐ Allocation Amendment  Amount: _________________________

☒ FY 12-13 Budget Amendment
   ☒ Program  Amount: $404,837.40
   ☐ Operating  Amount: _________________________

Explanation and Relevant Additional Information:

The Family Survey Data Collection Project was approved by the Commission on June 14, 2012. The project will generate representative data on key indicators of well-being for children zero to five and their families in each of the Best Start Communities. We have contracted with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) following an RFP process to complete the Family Survey design, collect and analyze the survey data, and disseminate findings. We would like to amend the FY12-13 programmatic budget to include monies for this project for work that will be completed through the end of the fiscal year.

(For Finance Use Only)

Finance Comments/Notes:

This amendment is moving funds from the approved contract authority into the FY 12-13 Budget to account for anticipated expenditures prior to June 30, 2013. The new Budget total for Research Partnerships will be $794,837.

Requested By:  

Reviewed By:  

Approved By:  

Acknowledged By:  

Department Director - Signature & Date  

Finance Staff - Signature & Date  

Finance Manager/Director – Signature & Date  

Executive Director – Signature & Date
Item 9

Approve
Mid-Year Amendments to the FY 2012-13 Operating Budget
**SUBJECT:**
Approval of adjustments to the FY 2012-13 Operating Budget

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Approve mid-year line-item adjustments to the FY 2012-13 Operating Budget.

**BACKGROUND:**
The FY 2012-13 Operating Budget was approved via Resolution by the Board of Commissioners on June 14, 2012. Any adjustments above $25,000 to individual budget line items must be submitted to the Board of Commissioners for formal approval. Formal approval via Resolution is not necessary if no increase is requested to the FY 2012-13 Operating Budget; as such this action has no effect on the Commission’s overall Fund Balance.

**DISCUSSION:**
Per the adopted policy of the Board of Commissioners, the Executive Director has the authority to approve budget adjustments to the Operating Budget between line items in an amount not to exceed $25,000. Adjustments totaling $25,000 and over require approval by the Board of Commissioners. In an effort to ensure that all adjustments are transparent, staff has provided detail on all proposed adjustments, including adjustments under $25,000.

Staff is presenting recommended adjustments to the FY 2012-13 Operating Budget based on analysis of expenditures through December 2012, as well as analysis of expenditures anticipated through June 2013. Based on this analysis, staff is proposing reductions in some areas to account for additional resources needed in other areas.

Expected areas of significant savings include:

- Personnel Services – Savings in personnel line items are expected due to position vacancies and other various staffing changes during the year. A number of positions across the organization took longer than expected to fill, leading to savings in line items related to both salaries and benefits.
- Consultant Services – Based on the rate of expenditure through December, significant savings are expected in the area of Consultant Fees. However, there are several internal projects that will require consultant support before June 2013 for which cost estimates were not available at the time of preparation of the mid-year Operating Budget adjustments. These include consultants that will be required to support implementation of outstanding recommendations from the Harvey Rose report, including a compensation study and staff morale survey.

The following are highlights of the recommended adjustments:

- Savings in the area of salaries and benefits were moved from the Finance, Best Start Communities and Policy Departments to account for the addition of the Chief Operating Officer position within the Executive Department. The net effect of these adjustments is zero.
• Funds were transferred into Equipment Rental to cover the monthly cost of the new Xerox machines now being utilized by the organization. This adjustment is covered by savings identified within other areas of the Facilities Management Department budget, primarily within the Other Supplies and Miscellaneous/Contingency line items.

• Legal fees were high for the first six months of the year due to fees associated with the Interim Chief Executive Officer. Staff is recommending that some funds be transferred into this line item to account for potential increases in general monthly fees going forward. This adjustment is covered by savings within the Miscellaneous/Contingency line item in the Executive Department budget.

• The primary reason for the increase necessary in the Other Professional Fees line item is due to the outsourcing of building management duties. During the preparation of the original FY 2012-13 Operating Budget, the amounts estimated for building management services provided by Morlin Asset Management were lower because they did not incorporate estimates for complete outsourcing and continuous on-site support. Subsequent to the budget preparation and approval, all building management duties were outsourced to Morlin for FY 2012-13, including the cost of three full-time staff providing continuous on-site support for the building. The Operating Budget adjustment accounts for the increased monthly fees as a result of this outsourcing. Funds for this are covered by savings in other areas of the Facilities Management Department budget, primarily the Capital Improvements and Miscellaneous/Contingency line items.

Attachments:
1. Budget Summary – FY 2012-13

For Office Use

Board Action Taken:
Approved: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Further Discussion

Referred to Committee/Work Group: ________________________________
# Budget Summary FY 2012-13

Recommended Mid-Year Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Services</th>
<th>Approved FY 2012-13</th>
<th>Estimated FY 2012-13 Expenditures</th>
<th>Projected Savings/Shortfalls</th>
<th>Recommended Mid-Year Adjustments</th>
<th>Revised FY 2012-13 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Salaries</td>
<td>10,534,860</td>
<td>9,142,054</td>
<td>1,392,806</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,534,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employee Benefits</td>
<td>2,876,342</td>
<td>2,488,399</td>
<td>387,543</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,876,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel Services</td>
<td>13,411,201</td>
<td>11,630,453</td>
<td>1,786,749</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,411,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Operating Expenses

| 6131 ADP Payroll Charges | 30,000          | 21,748                            | 8,252                       | -                               | 30,000                    |
| 6132 Workers' Compensation Insurance | 113,025          | 108,542                           | 81,267                      | 0                               | 113,025                   |
| 602 Utilities            | 160,000          | 108,479                           | 51,522                      | -                               | 160,000                   |
| 603 Corporate Insurance  | 70,400           | 53,900                            | 16,500                      | -                               | 70,400                    |
| 605 Mileage and Parking | 56,880           | 38,264                            | 18,616                      | (1,200)                         | 57,480                    |
| 606 Telephones and Moderns | 71,000           | 64,034                            | 6,966                       | (6,000)                         | 65,000                    |
| 607 Cell Phones and Mobile Devices | 56,680           | 35,146                            | 21,534                      | -                               | 59,680                    |
| 608 Outside Printing     | 11,750           | 6,486                             | 5,264                       | 200                             | 11,950                    |
| 609 Other Supplies       | 45,000           | 2,458                             | 42,542                      | (26,650)                        | 18,350                    |
| 610 Postage and Delivery | 20,700           | 5,564                             | 15,136                      | (5,450)                         | 15,250                    |
| 611 Educational Supplies | 3,000            | 90                                | 2,910                       | -                               | 3,000                     |
| 612 Office Supplies      | 138,395          | 81,142                            | 57,253                      | 1,450                           | 139,845                   |
| 614 Subscriptions and Publications | 10,474          | 4,880                             | 5,594                       | 900                             | 11,374                    |
| 615 Equipment Rental     | 60,700           | 91,010                            | (30,320)                    | 32,000                          | 92,700                    |
| 616 Building Repairs and Maintenance | 195,000          | 150,078                           | 44,922                      | -                               | 199,000                   |
| 617 Equipment Repairs and Maintenance | 25,000          | 23,400                            | 1,600                       | -                               | 25,000                    |
| 618 Office Storage       | 10,800           | 12,225                            | (1,425)                     | 4,500                           | 15,300                    |
| 619 Hardware and Software Maintenance | 101,500          | 80,182                            | 21,318                      | (1,500)                         | 100,000                   |
| 620 Miscellaneous Service Charges | 80,300           | 70,016                            | 10,284                      | (500)                           | 80,800                    |
| 621 Miscellaneous/Contingency | 133,800          | 36,106                            | 97,694                      | (51,650)                        | 84,150                    |
| Total General Operating Expenses | 1,394,994        | 795,115                           | 599,779                     | (63,999)                        | 1,340,994                 |

Professional Services

| 6502 Audit            | 70,448           | 70,448                            | -                           | 70,448                          |
| 6504 Legal            | 150,000          | 125,000                           | (25,000)                    | 25,000                          | 175,000                   |
| 6507 Professional Dues | 85,501           | 38,860                            | 46,641                      | (8,650)                         | 78,851                    |
| 6508 Professional Dues - First 5 Association | 50,000          | 50,000                            | -                           | 50,000                          |
| 6509 Professional Development | 77,400          | 14,358                            | 63,042                      | 9,650                           | 87,050                    |
| 6512 Staff Recruitment | 15,000           | 13,000                            | 2,000                       | -                               | 15,000                    |
| 6514 Commission Stipends | 30,000           | 26,700                            | 3,300                       | -                               | 30,000                    |
| 6506 Human Resources Related Costs | 25,600          | 16,734                            | 8,866                       | -                               | 23,600                    |
| Total Professional Services | 499,944          | 404,855                           | 95,049                      | 30,859                          | 530,744                   |

Consultant Services

| 6601 Consultant Fees | 655,000          | 354,317                           | 300,683                     | (7,050)                         | 677,550                   |
| 6602 Other Professional Fees | 192,000          | 248,570                           | (56,570)                    | 70,000                          | 264,000                   |
| 6603 External Reviewers | 4,883            | (4,883)                           | -                           | 4,883                           | 4,883                     |
| Total Consultant Services | 827,000          | 517,770                           | 309,230                     | 69,859                          | 896,859                   |

Travel and Meeting Expenses

| 6701 Airfare      | 45,583           | 18,149                            | 27,434                      | 3,450                           | 49,033                    |
| 6703 Lodging      | 48,811           | 20,791                            | 28,020                      | 3,300                           | 51,811                    |
| 6704 Conference Registration | 55,400          | 31,636                            | 23,764                      | 4,650                           | 58,070                    |
| 6706 Local Meetings | 30,180           | 24,394                            | 5,786                       | 4,450                           | 40,630                    |
| 6707 Per Diem     | 32,126           | 11,776                            | 20,350                      | (2,300)                         | 29,056                    |
| Total Travel and Meeting Expenses | 219,099         | 106,643                           | 112,456                     | 13,359                          | 232,449                   |

Capital Improvements

| 6316 Capital Outlay | 220,000          | 186,106                           | 33,894                      | 220,000                         |
| 6302 Capital Improvements | 150,000          | 51,312                            | 98,688                      | (60,000)                        | 90,000                    |
| Total Capital Improvements | 370,000          | 237,418                           | 132,582                     | (60,000)                        | 310,000                   |

Item 10

Strategic Plan
Implementation Profile—Best Start:
Implementation Update and Key
Board Considerations
Item 11

Harvey Rose Audit Implementation Profile—Human Resources: Compensation & Benefits Study Implementation Update
Item 11
Harvey M. Rose Audit (HRA) Implementation
Outstanding Issues/Recommendations

FIRST 5
LA
Champions For Our Children
www.First5LA.org
Overview

Background: Harvey Rose Audit (2011)
- Outstanding items mainly in Human Resources
- Compensation Study
  - Solicitation
  - Timeframe
# Outstanding Items in H.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRA Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Management to prepare a staff allocation analysis of staffing associated with each Department and submit annually as part of proposed budget.</td>
<td>Staff allocation analysis will be informed by the Listening, Learning, Leading (L3) initiative and compensation study (below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Management assessment of staff allocation analysis identifying duplication of services provided by contracts and recommend efficiencies in policies and procedures; 2.4 management to realign staffing as needed.</td>
<td>Internal time study, underway as part of the L3 initiative to examine comprehensive solicitation process, will inform next steps. Ongoing assessments of staff allocations as natural attritions occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outstanding Items in H.R., cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRA Recommendation:</th>
<th>Status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Management directed to develop clear staffing plan for the Best Start Communities and Grants Management departments given anticipated changes in workload for each department.</td>
<td>Alignment of staffing resources to anticipated workload pending given status of Best Start; alignment of grants management and other functions informed by L3 and internal efforts to evaluate efficiencies and procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outstanding Items in H.R., cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Management to annually report on HR management performance indicators including: (a) turnover, (b) reasons for turnover, (c) grievances, (d) performance evaluations and frequency, (e) results of independent staff morale and satisfaction survey with appropriate plans of action.</td>
<td>(a) Turnover analysis report produced with 2007-12 data by department; (b) Exit survey designed and implemented 2012; (c) Confidential staff complaint report to E.D. Jan., 2013; (d) Performance evaluation completion report to E.D. Jan., 2013; (e) Independent solicitation forthcoming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outstanding Items in H.R., cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Update compensation policy based on survey covering salaries and benefits, updating classification scale and compensation ranges.</td>
<td>Underway, described below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Management to develop an agency-wide training curriculum addressing both technical and managerial skills. Participation in courses, conferences, seminars should be tracked.</td>
<td>Training curriculum development to be informed by staff surveys (L3 and morale/satisfaction survey); course and conference participation survey developed and implemented 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compensation Study

- Recommendation of Rose Audit, suggestion to do every 5 years
- Last approved compensation study 2001
- Solicitation
  - Review wages and benefits internally to ensure areas of responsibility and functions appropriate to classification
  - Review current staff classification to assess appropriateness of current system
  - Review internal wages and benefits compared to external wages and benefits for comparable functions and classifications
  - Present options on above and make recommendations
Compensation Study, cont.

- **Timeline**
  - Feb. release of Solicitation
  - Board update Feb. 14
  - Board Action (approve contract) April/May
    - 2 months to develop options/recommendations
    - 2 months to present options/recommendations to
      Budget & Finance and Operations committees
  - Options/Recommendations to be brought back to Board
Item 12

Policy & Advocacy Update:  
Sustainability Plan for Universal  
Assessment / Home Visitation
Family Strengthening Sustainability
Resource Mobilization and Policy Change
Update
February 14, 2013

First 5 LA's Community Investment, Program Development (PD), Policy, Finance, and Research & Evaluation (R&E) Departments continue to work in partnership to identify and explore strategies to leverage public and private resources to support the implementation and sustainability of First 5 LA's Family Strengthening Strategies across the county. Highlights on progress to date are summarized below.

Medicaid Funding
First 5LA staff is exploring the potential for using Medicaid financing mechanisms to fund home visitation (HV) programs and services. Specifically, staff has examined how Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) and Targeted Case Management (TCM) can be leveraged to support Welcome Baby and universal assessment.

As presented to the Commission on November 11, 2011, First 5 LA convened Maternal Child Health Access (MCHA) staff—contractor for Welcome Baby in the Best Start Metro L.A. Community—in order to complete a time study and cost survey of the Welcome Baby program for the purpose of determining the cost benefit to participating in MAA and/or TCM. Consultants from HealthReach assisted MCHA staff in the completion of the time studies and cost surveys and performed an analysis of the data.

HealthReach considered several scenarios—in which some Welcome Baby staff participates in MAA and others participate in TCM—to maximize revenue projections for participation in either or both programs. Based on this analysis, HealthReach estimated that participation in MAA would yield the greater net return than TCM, with MAA net revenue representing 4% of the total Welcome Baby program budget.

Following this presentation, staff initiated steps to establish a claim plan for California Hospital Medical Center (CHMC)—fiscal agent for MCHA—in order to draw down MAA funds for Welcome Baby. First 5 LA has submitted a claim plan for CHMC and is awaiting approval from California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS). At this time, First 5 LA is not able to submit invoices for Welcome Baby due to delays at the state and federal level, regarding updating reporting guidelines and procedures. First 5 LA and HealthReach are closely tracking the release of the state's updated procedures. And, once First 5 LA is able to submit invoices for Welcome Baby, staff will examine actual billable MAA expenses and can report on actual net revenue earned.

At this time, staff was asked by the Commission to explore the option of contracting directly with the state rather than the SIB in order to negotiate a client-specific MAA rate which is likely higher than the county rate. HealthReach will continue to explore the future possibility of this contracting option and prepare a proposal to the state after the new guidelines are released.
Staff also continued working with HealthReach to identify MAA eligible reimbursement activities within the newly designed First 5 LA universal assessment program protocols. After estimating potential MAA revenue for the universal assessment program, HealthReach did not expect net returns or cost-benefit for participating in MAA. First 5 LA and HealthReach will revisit this scenario once the universal assessment program is fully implemented and a time study and cost survey can be completed by direct service staff. Similarly, as each of the intensive home visitation programs are implemented to fidelity, First 5 LA and HealthReach may have providers complete time studies and cost surveys for MAA and TCM.

While Medicaid programs, such as MAA or TCM, may provide modest revenue to offset some program expenditures, this funding stream cannot solely sustain First 5 LA’s Family Strengthening Strategies. It is also worth noting that participation in Medicaid is highly administrative, payments are reimbursed months after services are rendered, and there is a moderate to high level of risk of administrative audits to providers. Staff will continue to investigate how other counties and states are using the various Medicaid financing mechanisms to fund HV.

**Federal Home Visiting Funds**

First 5 LA staff is consulting with Dr. Deborah Daro and the L.A. County Department of Public Health (DPH)—who receives federal home visitation funds via the state—to track the Home Visiting Program allocations which are part of the federal Affordable Care Act. There are two funding streams for federal HV funds: formula and competitive grants. Formula grants are provided to each state annually based on the number of children in the state, and competitive grants are awarded to selected states based on a competitive process. The competitive grants are in two categories: expansion grants for states with developed HV systems and development grants for states with very limited experience in delivering HV services.

During the first year of implementation (FY11-12), California was allocated $9.05 million in formula and competitive grants, of which $886K was awarded to L.A. County. In FY 12-13, California received grants totaling $18.68 million, $2.87 million for L.A. County. Within this allocation, L.A. County received a formula grant of $1.04 million to be used for the expansion of DPH’s Nurse Family Partnership (NFP) program within Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The county was also awarded competitive grants totaling $1.83 million for the implementation of NFP in L.A. County Service Planning Areas: 2, 3, 7 and Healthy Families America (HFA) in the Antelope Valley.

As the county was able to secure resources for NFP, First 5 LA determined that NFP will not be implemented by Best Start Community contractors. Rather, First 5 LA will leverage these federal funds by establishing a system to refer eligible Welcome Baby families to the NFP programs in the county.

Staff is tracking HV allocation for FY13-14 and how these funds will be awarded in L.A. County. We will also monitor the expanding list of approved evidence-based HV models.

**Los Angeles County Home Visitation Consortium**

First 5 LA staff participated in the L.A. County Perinatal HV Advisory Committee, convened by DPH to foster collaboration among the multiple agencies providing HV and to
guide the federal HV application process. Since federal funds have been awarded, the HV Advisory Committee has been incorporated into a new L.A. County Perinatal and Early Childhood HV Consortium. Also initiated by DPH, the HV Consortium is intended to establish a coordinated system among HV stakeholders to improve access, quality and data collection and to establish and advocate for policies that will help sustain HV services within L.A. County. The HV Consortium includes policy and operational subcommittees. Consortium members within the subcommittees represent a variety of HV programs/agencies, advocates for family strengthening, and individuals who have received previous in-home supportive services.

L.A. Best Babies Network (LABBN), with funding from First 5 LA’s Policy Advocacy Fund grant, is playing a lead role in the convening a HV Guiding Coalition which inform the framework for the HV Consortium. LABBN staff will also guide the development of a policy and advocacy agenda for the HV Consortium policy subcommittee. An interdepartmental team from First 5 LA is actively participating in the HV Guiding Coalition as well as the HV Consortium and subcommittees to ensure coordination and alignment with First 5 LA’s Family Strengthening Strategies.

National Home Visitation Program Models
The PD and Best Start Community Departments worked in collaboration to facilitate the Best Start Communities’ assessments of existing resources, community strengths and needs in order to identify the more intensive, Commission-approved select HV program models for implementation in their communities: HFA, Parents As Teachers (PAT), Triple P, and SafeCare. The Best Start Communities have finalized their selection of intensive HV program models, and First 5 LA has begun to formalize relationships with the national offices of the selected models: HFA, PAT and Triple P. First 5 LA staff will engage representatives from each of selected HV national offices to further discuss current and future funding streams that support their specific HV activities.

Insurance Companies
First 5 LA staff has initiated outreach to insurance companies to discuss possible partnerships to support countywide universal screening and Welcome Baby. Initial outreach has been made to insurance providers Kaiser Permanente and L.A Care as potential partners based on their previous commitment to preventative care and their significant client base in LA County. Preliminary findings from Welcome Baby pilot administrative data have been shared with L.A. Care which, in turn, has identified an array of information of interest to the plan. Follow-up conversations have been scheduled to explore potential areas for collaboration.

As part of the Family Strengthening Strategies evaluation, R&E staff will be developing a sustainability sub study that will initially implement the cost effectiveness analysis recommendations from the economic feasibility study of Welcome Baby completed in 2010. The sustainability sub study will also identify additional research activities and data to be collected in order to demonstrate to insurance providers the ongoing cost effectiveness of First 5 LA’s Family Strengthening approach. R&E staff will work with Urban Institute (UI), the evaluation contractor engaged for the pilot community, to implement the initial cost effectiveness analysis and will leverage the expertise of both UI and members of the First 5 LA Research Advisory Committee. In terms of providing robust data for evaluation
efforts, R&E recently executed a contract with Net Chemistry and is anticipating the launch of the Welcome Baby database in early FY13-14.

**Philanthropy**
First 5 LA remains an active member in the LA Partnership for Early Childhood Investment’s (the Partnership), a collaborative of private and public-sector funders interested in leveraging fiscal resources to support early childhood in L.A. County. In January 2013, The Partnership made its inaugural grant award via their recently established Baby Futures Fund to Children Now—the local lead agency for the Pew HV Campaign.

The Pew HV Campaign aims to create new policy champions for HV, direct county funds toward HV programs with a strong evidence base, and embed HV within the early childhood system. Children Now will work with advocates, agency staff, providers and other key allies to educate policymakers in L.A. County about the benefits of investing in evidence-based HV programs and the importance of rigorously monitoring such programs for effectiveness. Children Now will work in coordination with the county’s HV Consortium to help determine and shape policy recommendations to be included in a report for wide dissemination. Children Now will also engage in policy maker and community leader education and advocacy to demonstrate the importance of quality HV and build support for these policy recommendations. They will work with Pew’s national partners, including law enforcement officials and business leaders, to strengthen the case for quality home visiting in Los Angeles County.

In addition to being a lead investor in the Baby Futures Fund, F5LA participates in the Partnership’s policy committee which is responsible for advancing public policy that promotes investment in early childhood such as HV.

As philanthropy is targeted as a source for HV funding, it is worth noting that based on data collected by the Foundation Center, private foundations and public charities made grants totaling $56,275,110 for prenatal, maternal and pediatric projects in L.A. County over a 5-year period (2006-2010).\(^1\) This funding data illuminates the fact that while foundations make considerable investments in L.A. County each year, these resources are limited and are not sizable enough to sustain First 5 LA’s countywide Family Strengthening Strategy. Nonetheless, there is great potential among the philanthropic and business sectors to advocate and influence public policy—where the greatest amount of resources for HV can be leveraged and sustained.

**First 5 Association and Other County Commissions**
The First 5 Association is in the process of updating their HV matrix which tracks all HV program models being implemented across the state. In addition to program model elements, the Association is tracking each county commission’s investment for each program model and any other funding sources being leveraged. First 5 LA will be reaching out to First 5 colleagues across the state to discuss successful strategies for leveraging resources. As other Commissions are facing similar challenges with continued financing of HV programs, there is an opportunity for First 5 LA to join forces with other Commissions, through the leadership of the Association, in a united advocacy campaign.

---

\(^1\) Data from FoundationSearch, 2012.
Previously, First 5 LA consulted with the Children & Families Commission of Orange County (OC) about their experiences with TCM reimbursement for their Bridges for Newborns program. The Bridges for Newborns program screens new mothers in OC birthing hospitals to identify family support needs in order to ensure access to parent education, health and other services to assist in caring for their newborn. The OC Commission has successfully billed $9 million since they began participating in TCM in 2001. However, they stressed the intense administrative demands of TCM and the need for staff (or consultants) with expertise in TCM to successfully design and rollout the program.

In Alameda County, the First 5 Commission currently funds 5 of the 10 major HV programs in the county and coordinates the network of HV providers to promote efficiencies. First 5 Alameda plans to transfer all HV contracts and funding to the Alameda County Public Health Department (PHD) in July 2013 at a 25% reduction over what the programs received in previous years. Following this transition, PHD will be holding all HV contracts while First 5 Alameda continues to support the training, data collection and evaluation support for the system of HV programs. In FY 12-13, Alameda County received funding from the Social Security Act Title IV-E waiver savings to fill the gap of First 5 funding reductions for one year. However, it is unclear if that funding will be available next year and what additional funds PHD can invest into HV. First 5 Alameda reduced funding level is committed for 4 years, during which staff will be working with the county to help secure additional and sustainable funding for HV.

State Policy
The First 5 LA Policy Department has been in conversation with policymakers and advocates about potential legislation related to HV at the state level. In addition, the department released a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in January 2013 for a consultant who will assist the department in developing a state strategy to advocate for sustainability of First 5 LA’s HV investments, among other policy areas.

Federal Policy
The First 5 LA Policy Department is working with its federal advocate to monitor and identify opportunities to advocate for funding and expansion of HV programs. In December 2013, First 5 LA submitted public comment to the federal Department of Health and Human Services regarding proposed Essential Health Benefits. The comment included reference to supporting home visiting programs as an effective mechanism to addressing the health needs of children. Staff continues to monitor Affordable Care Act implementation and other opportunities to provide comments in support of funding and expansion of HV.

First 5 LA Policy Grants
The Policy Department manages a handful of grantees whose work will provide additional opportunities to advocate on behalf of HV programs. Some related projects are focused on the state health benefits exchange, Affordable Care Act and other publicly funded programs with HV components.
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RECOMMENDATION:
This memo is for informational purposes only. Recommendations will be made at the March 14, 2013 Commission meeting.

BACKGROUND:
At the May, 2012 Commission meeting, the Commission made a number of funding decisions related to First 5 LA investments that were slated to expire at the end of the 2011-12 fiscal year. The Commission approved continuation of funding for these programs (e.g., Family Literacy, Healthy Births, and School Readiness) for one year or until the Best Start Communities, Welcome Baby, and select home visitation programs are established through contractual agreements with First 5 LA. In June 2013, several of these investments are scheduled to end, as are a number of other contracts. Staff will return in March with a full analysis and recommendations for each investment for the Commission to consider.

DISCUSSION:
The purpose of this informational item is to inform the Commission that several of the Commission’s investments are scheduled to end in June 2013. They fall primarily in three categories:

- One time expenditures, such as the Matching Grant Program.
- Investments attached to a sustainability plan that has been delayed, such as Partnership for Families (PFF).
- Investments that are related to Best Start, such as Healthy Births.

Over the next few weeks, staff will meet with the Program and Planning Committee to discuss the framework that will be used to analyze the existing grants and inform future funding decisions, and with the Budget and Finance Committee to discuss the fiscal consequences of different options. Informed by the input received from both committees, staff will return to the Commission with recommendations.
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