FIRST 5 LA

SUMMARY MEETING NOTES
Program & Planning Committee
February 24, 2014

Approved: 3/27/2014

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Patricia Curry
Arturo Delgado
Duane Dennis (Chair)
Karla Pleitéz Howell
Christopher Thompson [Alternate] (Vice-Chair)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
Marvin Southard [EXCUSED]
Deanne Tilton[EXCUSED]

COMMSSIONERS PRESENT:
Suzanne Bostwick (Alternate)
Neal Kaufman

RECORDING SECRETARY:
Linda Vo, Executive Assistant

STAFF PRESENTERS:
Antoinette Andrews, Assistant Director,
Planning and Implementation,
Best Start Communities
Kim Belshé, Executive Director
Kelly Goods, Research Analyst
Research and Evaluation
Nelia Hoffman, Research Analyst
Research and Evaluation
Jessica Kaczmarek, Senior Program Officer
Community Investments
James Lau, Policy Director

EXTERNAL PRESENTERS:
Celia Ayala, President and CEO
LAUP
Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey, Co-Director
Children's Data Network
Dr. Emily Putnam-Hornstein, Co-Director
Children's Data Network

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**

    The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Thompson at 1:36 pm.

    Vice Chair Thompson went around the room and asked everyone to introduce themselves, including the public, and welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. **Review and Approval of Program & Planning Committee Meeting Notes from January 27, 2014:**

    ### THE ITEM WAS RECEIVED AND FILED

3. **Update on Children's Data Network (CDN) Rapid Response Projects (MCH project, Foster Care Study, Obesity) and Next Steps**

    Dr. McCroskey gives a presentation on Children's Data Network (CDN) Rapid Response Projects.

    She starts with a brief summary on its background.

Project Summary
This project seeks to develop a research repository to integrate child welfare and well-being data across state and local agencies, in addition to fostering ongoing collaboration among researchers, policy makers, agency administrators and community leaders to improve services for children and their families.

Project Description
Key aspects of the project include engaging in outreach to service providers, government agencies, and researchers to participate in collaborative research and data-sharing efforts. The goal of these efforts is to break down the long-standing walls between data creators and data consumers and to promote a data-driven culture that will help policy makers and program managers improve outcomes for young children and their families. The project will also advance data projects focused on identifying and producing actionable research in support of community planning and policy discussions on issues critical to the 0-5 population. Project investigators will develop and employ innovative strategies to engage a broader range of users to promote increased interaction with information about the health, education, and safety of young children. The project will also involve planning for the development of an information and research gateway for broad use by public and private organizations and community groups interested in young children and their families.

Dr. McCroskey goes over initial projects that are within in First 5 LA's goal areas:
1. Children are ready for kindergarten
   - Looked at what happened in specific neighborhoods. Developed website: Savemyseatsla.org To inform the Supervisors of what was happening within each of these areas
2. Babies are born healthy-
   - Level of funding available is correlated with healthy babies that are born healthy. Between 2000 and 2010, the inflation-adjusted Title V allocation to local maternal, child, and adolescent health (MCAH) programs in California decreased by 45%. Over the same period, the rate of low birth weight (LBW) in singleton births increased by 8%.
   - Lower funding of local MCAH programs explains 30% of the increase in the LBW rate among mothers with less than a high school education and 23% among mothers with a high school degree or GED
3. Children maintain a healthy weight
   - Evaluate the impact of obesity-related interventions and policies on early childhood obesity risk in communities throughout LA County
   - Six clusters of neighboring census tracts experiencing contrasting (increasing vs. decreasing) obesity trends, and the WIC clinics
   - These clusters provide an opportunity to conduct a qualitative investigation of what may account for the contrasting obesity trends in adjacent geographic areas (NIH funding)
4. Children are safe from abuse and neglect
   - The birth records of all children born in LA in 2006 & 2007 were linked to child protection records
   - Overall, 1 out of 7 children born in LA county was reported for possible abuse/neglect before age 5 (higher than previously reported)
   - Characteristics at birth allowed us to stratify children based on the likelihood of being maltreatment victims
   - Children in the highest risk decimal at birth (10%) made-up 45% of victims before age 5
5. Babies are born healthy, Children are safe from abuse & neglect

- Project done with the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation
- Overall, 41% of teens who give birth in LA County have been earlier reported as alleged victims of abuse/neglect
- Increased risk of low birth weight among children born to teen mothers who were victims of abuse/neglect, after adjusting for other factors
- Strong intergenerational dynamics – 40% of babies born to teen mothers who were victims of maltreatment were reported to CPS by age 5 (compared to 15% for teen mothers without any history)

Dr. Putnam-Hornstein now takes over the presentation.

Lesson learned was that they were able to develop knowledge to further inform the other projects.

Administrative records would be linked across various systems so that this data would be available for other agencies to use.

She says that most of the date sharing that has already taken place has taken place within government.

She informs the committee of the data sharing agreements that could be executed.

- CDN enters into a direct data-sharing MOU with a given State or County agency (either a new MOU or by extending an existing MOU via partnership with the Child Welfare Indicator's Project at UC Berkeley); or
- CDN requests pre-approved data elements prepared for release to approved researchers

Dr. Putnam-Hornstein concludes with the following:
- Developing high-quality evidence for program and policy effectiveness is a strategy worth investing in for the long term.
- By making use of administrative records, the Children's Data Network can help us understand what makes our children, our families, and our communities healthier, safer, stronger.

Commissioner Bostwick comments on how she was in the room the first time this all came together at a meeting and she was surprised at how everyone in the room was very excited about what data was available and how it would all be incorporated; who will share the data, who will own the date. Nonetheless, Commissioner Bostwick is happy about the work that has been done so far and is hopeful for its future.

Vice Chair Thompson would like to know what County agencies does Dr. McCroskey envision to be a part of this project?

Dr. McCroskey responds by saying that the goal is to have all agencies that are around the First 5 LA table be involved with this program and then to also get additional funding from other sources like LACOE/ Superintendent Delgado.

Commissioner Kaufman comments that he imagines that there are other data that have already been collected that this team would want to have access to, so he asks that part of the advocacy component would be to garner these other orgs to collaborate with them.

He would also like to know how the decision is made of what a project is going to be? Is there will be a governance body over all the participants to make these decisions?

Dr. McCroskey says that she imagines that there will be a governance group of people whom have key interests in the program/data, including a scientific advisory committee, and then a core group of people that First 5 LA had brought together initially.

There is no further discussion on this item.

4. **Update on Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP)**
   a. **Strategic and Business Planning**

Dr. Ayala gives an update on the Strategic and Business planning process of LAUP.
She states that there are three phases to this process:
- Discovery (September – December 2013)
  - Review data and literature, conduct stakeholder interviews and a stakeholder survey.
  - Analyze data and develop a Discovery report.
- Design (December 2013 – March 2014)
  - Conduct strategic and business planning sessions.
  - Finalize Vision, Mission, Values, Goals, and Strategies.
  - Draft Strategic Plan and Business Plan.
- Delivery (March – June 2014)
  - Engage in an iterative review process resulting in final versions of the Strategic Plan and Business Plan.

As part of this process, LAUP has also revised its Vision and Mission:

<u>Vision:</u>
Educational Justice: Every child will succeed in school and life.

<u>Mission:</u>
Support the development of the whole child by improving the quality and capacity of early education programs, developing a qualified and diverse workforce, and strengthening family engagement. Create and sustain strategic partnerships and advocate for policies that promote access and program excellence.

Dr. Ayala then covers the Strategic planning areas and goals.
1. Early Education Quality and Excellence
   - Establish LAUP's model for capacity building and technical assistance as the county, state and national standard
   - Support Community implementation of high quality early education and development programs
   - Provide high-quality early education environments that demonstrate excellence and continuous quality improvement
   - Develop and sustain an outstanding early education workforce
2. Strategic Partnerships
   - Develop and sustain the strategic funding and programmatic partnership necessary for growing high-quality early education systems in Los Angeles, the region, state, and nation.
   - Partner with First 5 LA to bring to scale high-quality early education systems in LA County.

3. Advocacy and Public Will Building
   o Elevate the profile of early education in LA County and, subsequently, the state, and nation
   o Advocate in partnership with First 5 LA to create a policy and funding environment supporting high-quality early education systems in LA County

Dr. Ayala concludes with next steps for the strategic planning process:

- Finalize strategies and activities (Feb – March)
- Continue Business Planning (Feb – May)
- Approval of Strategic Plan by LAUP Board (April)   `
- Deliver Business Plan to First 5 LA (June)

b.   FY12-13 Universal Preschool Child Outcome Study (UPCOS) Findings

Ms. Goods goes over the Universal Preschool Child Outcomes Study. She informs the Committee that today she will cover three topics:

- What is UPCOS?
- UPCOS findings
- Future directions for UPCOS

Ms. Goods informs the Committee that UPCOS is the Universal Preschool Child Outcomes Study, in which direct child assessments are conducted every Fall and Spring with a sample of children attending LAUP. The assessments cover key areas of early child development – language and literacy, cognition, and social-emotional development. The same assessments have been used during all of the UPCOS phases. This data is used in part to provide information on the child outcome performance targets

She says that each year, additional research projects are conducted in partnership with Mathematica and LAUP. In years past, this has included projects assessing the physical activity and nutrition practices in LAUP, and evaluations of the Quality Support Coaching LAUP providers receive. These reports are posted on the First 5 LA Research & Evaluation website.

Ms. Goods now goes over the history of UPCOS. She says that UPCOS is currently in its 7th year. During all 7 phases, First 5 LA has partnered with Mathematica Policy Research, as well as LAUP's research. In addition, every year, the UPCOS team has regular calls to review data, relevant program information, and any changes in the field to guide the ongoing work.

She covers a table of the child outcome targets for 2012-2013, which were presented in a ED update. Ms. Goods notes that one area that continues to be a strength, and is an important component of the preschool experience, is social-emotional development.

Ms. Goods now goes over a graph that represents the average standard scores in fall, and average change in scores from Fall to Spring for English and Spanish assessments. She calls out that children are directly assessed to identify their primary language (English or Spanish), and then routed to assessments in that language. Also of note, is that the assessments are conceptually scored – they can give the right answer in English or Spanish and would be given credit.

She states that these scores demonstrate the overall performance of the LAUP sample relative to a national norm of 100, represented by the blue line.

Overall, the scores hover close to the national average of scores, either slightly above or below by the Spring assessments.

Ms. Goods goes onto the next slides that show the standard scores for the 3 core developmental areas (starting with Vocabulary) with a description of the performance over time. She highlights that there is a fairly consistent trend in English vocabulary, while Spanish vocabulary scores have been increasing slightly.

On the following slide, standard scores for spelling in English and in Spanish, display that the Fall and Spring change scores are consistent over time. She notes that there was a larger increase in scores during the 2010-2011 year that was not sustained in subsequent years.

Ms. Goods also cannot offer a direct causal explanation for the increase, but does inform the Committee that LAUP did participate in the Teacher Institute that year.

The final charts that Ms. Goods goes over are the ones on Math. She states that the data here is fairly consistent and that in the English scores, while we are not seeing a change, the fact that the scores continue to hover around 100 indicates that these children are keeping pace with the national average.

She also notes that in Spanish math assessments, there has been a slight decrease in the Fall scores, but the Spring scores are staying fairly consistent.

Ms. Goods concludes her presentation by covering the future directions for UPCOS. There will be two subgroup studies:

LAUP Subgroup: English Language Learners (ELL)
   o   Assess ELL children in English and Spanish in Fall and Spring
   o   Compare child progress in the different language versions

Longitudinal Outcome Study
   o   Link child progress in LAUP to 2nd and 3rd grade academic performance
   o   Compare academic performance between LAUP and non-LAUP students

Vice Chair Thompson now asks the Committee if there are any questions.

Commissioner Delgado would like to ask about the kids who primarily speak English, who are assessed during the Spring and Fall. Within this time frame, do they switch from their primary language, Spanish to English?

Ms. Goods clarifies that in the Spring, English is the primary language and in the Fall, primary language is Spanish.

Commissioner Delgado also asks how is it determined that there is this switch in primary language in this amount of time?

Ms. Goods says that there is a game doe during this assessment like Simon says and then they are scored in English and in Spanish.

Commissioner Delgado would like to know how many times they take this exam? Ms. Goods responds by saying that the kids only take the exam once in the Fall and once in the Spring. In addition, she says that parents also complete a questionnaire about what they feel their child's primary language is.

Commissioner Delgado saw that the scores for Math is a little less for Spanish speaking kids, and would like to know if the same questions are being asked in Spanish as those asked in English or just numbers?

Ms. Goods responds by informing the Committee that there are a lot of word problems for the math questions. For instance, if a child is asked in English how many blocks he/she would have if there are currently two blocks and another block is added. This same question would be asked in Spanish.

Commissioner Kaufman just comments in the areas of Strategic Partnership since the heart of the budget is identifying preschools, etc. partners. He comments that there are different business models and would like to know which business model LAUP will be leaning towards because it is not explicit in the presentation that Dr. Ayala just gave. One model could be some kids would have vouchers and then some would receive free preschool or have a business model function the way LAUP is now.

Dr. Ayala says that the LAUP Board will be looking at the current slots that are funded by First 5 LA and will determine what partnerships need to occur in order for LAUP to sustain itself.

Commissioner Kaufman says that it is still not clear which business model LAUP is moving towards based on its current efforts. He wants to know what is the role of LAUP in its own vision going past 2016? What does it mean to have partnerships? Is LAUP going to be the funder, facilitator, evaluator, or trainer, since there are so many different kinds of partnerships. He doesn't expect an answer now, but would like to see more clarification on the role LAUP as it moves forward in its strategic planning process.

Commissioner Bostwick would like to know how LAUP and First 5 LA are working together on Policy issues to ensure that both are in alignment. She would also like to know what happens if there is a disagreement between the two organizations.

Dr. Ayala says that there are multiple meetings that occur on a regular basis where the LAUP policy agenda is shared with First 5 LA. She notes that there have not been any disagreements but that there have been cases where LAUP has decided that it can do things on its own and other cases where First 5 LA will get involved.

There is no further discussion on this item.

5.   **Draft Governance Guidelines**

Ms. Belshé gives an update on the governance guidelines and reminds the committee of how they have already been presented at the Commission in February and have also gone to the Executive and Budget and Finance Committees for their input and feedback.

The area that has received the most extensive revisions has been the Sustainability and leveraging sections.

Informed by Commission and Committee inputs, changes have been made accordingly to the last draft.

Ms. Belshé acknowledges that not all organizations are the same nor do they have the same capacity so leveraging and sustainability would not be applied the same across all borders. She also says that First 5 LA has also looked into what other First 5's are doing with their contractors and grantees with regards to leveraging and sustainability in order to inform the final draft of the governance guidelines.

Commissioner Curry would like to know if First 5 LA will

Some Commissioners had questions regarding why some guidelines go in certain policies and/or bylaws and Ms. Belshé informs the Committee that staff would work with Legal Counsel to finalize the proper placement.

There is no further discussion on this item.

6. **State Legislative Agenda**

Mr. Lau gives a presentation on First 5 LA's Legislative criteria, agenda and provides a Federal update for the Committee. He states the goal of this presentation will be to:
- Review legislative agenda process
- Share initial Legislative Agenda
- Update on federal policies
- Answer questions

He goes on to inform the Committee that there are three overarching policy and advocacy focus areas:
1. Traditional Policy Agenda Focused- State and Federal policies that align with First 5 LA policy agenda
2. Agency Focused- Affect First 5 LA directly: tobacco tax, legislation on Prop 10
3. Sustainability Focused- Supports sustainability of major investments, including BSFF

Mr. Lau informs the Committee that staff looks at 200-300 bills and then use its criteria to narrow it down to 10-30 bills that it will focus its efforts on getting approved. He says that the considerations into the Legislative Agenda process are as follows:

- Flexibility
- Bill amendments
- Ability to insert changes
- Behind the scenes role vs. up-front in legislative process
- Political considerations
- Relationships

He also covers the current Legislative agenda development process with the Committee. He says that Staff develops & applies Commission approved criteria with consultant feedback. The Commission then discusses and approves the Legislative agenda. With the approval of the Executive Director, staff and consultants implement advocacy and monthly updates are provided to the Commission.

Mr. Lau highlights the legislative agenda activities:
- First 5 LA leadership involvement

- Support from sustainability and advocacy consultant team
- Advocacy visits with policymakers
- Provide testimony at relevant hearings
- Increase awareness via MMR and other outlets
- Active coalition/collaboration with other advocates
- Letters of support

He says what was previously and currently used as the Legislative Criteria is as follows:
- Alignment: Alignment with Policy Agenda, Investments and Parent Supports
- Impact: Reach; Value
- Value-add of First 5 LA's contribution: First 5 LA support makes a strategic difference
- Feasibility: Likelihood/challenges of passage
- Timeliness: Increased opportunity due to window or deadline
- Prevention Approach: Return on Investment

The question is also whether or not weighting should be used for each of these criteria.

Mr. Lau informs the Committee that staff is proposing that the legislative criteria be aligned with the BSFF (protective factors). Accordingly, there would be a focus on strengthening families and connecting families to services and supports in times of need:
- Reducing barriers to services and programs
- Streamlining administrative processes
- Increasing access to concrete supports
- Building parental knowledge and capacities

Staff is also proposing the following bills, with this new legislative criteria being applied, be supported:
- AB 357 (Pan): Establishes a Children's Health Advisory Board empowered to set standards to improve child health systems
- AB 1174 (Bocanegra): Facilitates the Virtual Dental Home system of care by expanding scopes of work and authorizes Medi-Cal payments for teledentistry services
- AB 1454 (Calderon): Requires annual unannounced visits for community care facilities, including family child care homes, child care centers and children's residential facilities
- SB 593 (Lieu): Creates the Social Impact Partnership Pilot Program to provide alternative method for delivering state services
- SB 837 (Steinberg): Requires school districts and charter schools offering kindergarten to offer Transitional Kindergarten
- SB 909 (Pavley): Permits a social worker to authorize an initial medical, dental, and mental health screening of a child in temporary custody

Mr. Lau also states that he would like the Commission to consider the following 0-5 Legislative Package:
Transitional Kindergarten for All 4 Year Olds
SB 837, Steinberg
- 5 year phase in
- Improve quality and access
- Wrap around care for low income children
- Mixed provider model

- Workforce development

Strong Start for 0-3
Spot bill to be introduced, Liu
- Redirects $200 million in existing State Pre-K to 0-3
- Builds on Early Head Start evidence based approaches
- Doubles number of 0-3 year olds served

He then goes over the timeline of the Policy items that would be covered with the Commission/Committees.

- February P&P garner feedback on criteria and legislative agenda
- March Commission meeting present Legislative Agenda I
- March P&P share policy updates and present Legislative Agenda II
- April Commission meeting present Legislative Agenda II
- Regular updates provided on policy, budget and advocacy work

Mr. Lau now concludes his presentation with Federal Policy updates.

He gives a brief update on the Race to the Top Grants, which are preschool development grants.
- Departments of Education and Health and Human Services released a request for comments on the new Race to the Top program, also called Preschool Development Grants
- Invest $250 million on competitive grants to states to build the capacity within a State to develop, enhance, or expand high-quality preschool programs
- First 5 LA and a number of our partners will submit comments by the February 26 deadline that reflect our interest in expanding quality programming, such as workforce development and supportive services for families
- The administration is expected to release the RFP in the Spring of this year, and grant winners will be announced by December, 2014

He then gives a brief update on the Early Head Start program.

- The Administration for Children and Families has been given authorization to dedicate $500 million to improve child care quality by funding Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships
- The Administration has been conducting webinars and meeting with early education leaders to obtain input
- RFP is expected to be released in the Spring,
- Awardees announced by the end of December, 2014
- Funding based on share of low income young children
- The grants
  - Are Competitive
  - Flow directly to local education agencies
  - Allow for new or existing Early Head Start programs to partner with local child care centers and family child care providers serving low-income infants and toddlers
  - Help child care programs meet Early Head Start standards through training and technical assistance

Commissioner Delgado would like to know

7.   **Strategic Planning Update**

Ms. Kaczmarek gives a brief update on the strategic planning process. She gives a brief recap on what was presented at the February Commission meeting.

Ms. Kaczmarek reminds the Committee that Strategic planning will be organized into three phases beginning in 2014 and running through June of 2015 in order to address implementation implications for the new strategic plan.

She informs the Committee that these phases will help prepare the Board and staff representatives from across the organization for the analysis, decision-making and internal alignment necessary for effective implementation of the strategic plan. While it is expected that one or two day long retreats involving the full Commission will be required over the course of 2014, staff will work with the Program & Planning (P&P) Committee to provide oversight of the strategic planning process on an ongoing basis.

She also goes on to inform the Committee that staff plan on providing monthly updates to the P&P Committee and will work with those members to resolve important strategic decisions. Additionally, staff will explore timely methods and opportunities to engage external stakeholders in the process. The full Board will receive progress updates at the following month's Commission meeting. The plan will be approved by the Board in November 2014.

She then goes on to explain to the Committee how the following three strands of First 5 LA activity that will support the decision making:

- Long-Term Financial Projection
- Governance Guidelines
- Strategic Plan for 2015-20

In developing the next strategic plan, staff will create the following blueprint:
- Create organizational clarity, direction, and shared ownership for the next five years by:
    - articulating the measurable impact First 5 LA aspires to contribute to;
    - bringing greater focus to the organization's strategic direction; and
    - defining the role(s) First 5 LA will play in affecting the lives of young children and their families
- Promote transparency in decision-making and accountability in the context of declining resources
- Build upon foundational learning from 2013
- Commission approval by November 2014

Ms. Kaczmarek informs the Committee that First 5 LA staff and a consultant team with strong strategic planning expertise will facilitate the process with ongoing Board oversight.

She then goes on to provide the Commission with the following updates:

- Final selection of the consultant was made in mid-February; recommendation to Commission via consent in March
- Program and Planning Committee will provide oversight and feedback
- Monthly updates will be provided at Board of Commissioners meetings

- Additional opportunities for Board engagement may include special meetings (e.g. Board Retreat)
- Staff from across the organization and external stakeholders will be included in the process

Ms. Kaczmarek concludes her presentation by going over the following timeline for the strategic planning process, noting that is pending input from its consultant partner.

Activities	Estimated Timeline
Phase I: Alignment and Pre-planning	
Board approval of consultant team via consent calendar	March 2014 Commission meeting
Develop process and timeline for strategic planning	March-April 2014
Abbreviated SP consultant synthesis of 2013 baseline info; identify critical strategic issues for Board, P&P Committee and staff discussion	March-April 2014
Review proposed strategic planning process with P&P Committee	April-May 2014
Phase II: Analysis and Decision-making	
Engage P&P Committee in threshold conversations	May 2014
Engage P&P Committee in strategic option/impact scenario conversations	June 2014
Accelerated and focused external engagement	July-August 2014
Proposed Board retreat	September 2014
Draft strategic plan	October 2014
Board approves strategic plan	November 2014
Phase III: Implementation	
Accelerated implementation planning	December 2014 – April 2015
Board approval of implementation recommendations	May/June 2015

8. **Best Start Update: Developmental Evaluation**

Mr. Gonzalez introduces himself and says a few words about his background. He then goes on to inform the Committee members of all the work that has been done thus far and what is in the pipeline.
- Roll out meetings introducing our approach of Learning by Doing, resident engagement, and developmental evaluation are being completed within each community
- Staff has participated in a variety of trainings to build capacity to effectively manage the Learning by Doing process and build relationships that can be leveraged to support the work of the community partnerships.
- Staff has also been involved in several meetings and training to ground themselves in how to assess our progress and build a learning system internally and externally so that we are able to capture, share, and guide the ongoing development of Best Start.
- There have also been opportunities to engage the Board and staff in conversations with national experts like Bob Sege and Jack Shonkoff, who are doing similar work in terms of building protective factors in families and communities.

He now hands over the presentation to Ms. Andrews, whom is the new Assistant Director of Planning & Implementation of Best Start Communities. Ms. Andrews reminds the Committee that in November 2013, the Board approved the Learning & Accountability Plan for the

Building Stronger Families Framework. The plan provides an overview of our approach to assessing progress towards achieving the core results for families and communities. Today, we will provide an update on our learning and accountability activities to date with a deeper dive into Developmental Evaluation, which is an emerging approach in the evaluation field as funders and programs seek to use data and information to make informed decisions about the ongoing development of their efforts.

She notes that it is important to remember that in order for developmental evaluation (DE) to be successful, organizations must have a culture that supports learning and innovation, which involves some level of risk. Accordingly, Ms. Andrews states that there has to be organizational readiness for successful DE application and that she and the team will discuss this further later in the presentation. She mentions that they will also articulate how DE is applied in the context of Best Start and discuss next steps related to the overall Learning & Accountability Plan.

Ms. Andrews reminds the Committee how the Building Stronger Families Framework (BSFF) is applied with the Learning and Accountability Framework and centers around four key questions:

1. How will we know we are making a difference?
    Indicators of Success
2. How do we best understand the evolution of Best Start?
    Evaluation for Learning – Developmental Evaluation
3. How do we demonstrate that we are making progress?
    Learning for Accountability
4. How do we achieve the scope and scale required to generate positive community-level change that can be sustained over time?
    Learning for Scope, Scale & Sustainability

Ms. Andrews informs the Committee that today's presentation will focus on the second question: How do we best understand the evolution of Best Start? Essentially, she states that we are asserting that we are not interested in being passive observers of Best Start's evolution. And she does acknowledge that we are still in the midst of making critical decisions about the right mix of resources, partners, and approaches and that we want to use the data and information emerging form the early implementation of the BSFF in order to help us make those decisions. Ms. Andrews reveals that this is what sparked our interest in DE and what drives our application of DE to the BSFF.

With the approval of the BSFF and Implementation plan back in November 2013, Ms. Andrews informs the Committee that First 5 LA is investing in a community change approach which asserts that if families are strong and communities support families to succeed, then children will be healthy, safe and ready for school.

She also reminds the Committee that given the reality of our declining revenue and what we know about promoting and sustaining community change, we understand the need to invest in a community infrastructure that brings multiple stakeholders together, sustains resident engagement, and mobilizes resources around a common agenda to strengthen families and ensure that communities support families to succeed. She says that if we are to succeed in this effort, we need an evaluation approach that supports real-time learning, critical reflection, evaluative thinking and decision-making grounded in the results we seek for families and communities. Staff feels that DE holds promise to do just this.

Ms. Andrews now hands the presentation over to Ms. Hoffman.

Ms. Hoffman goes over the BSFF Theory of Change (ToC). Based on the PowerPoint slide, she states that staff is attempting to address highly dynamic and complex issues that impact children and families in the communities where they live. She says that these issues require "thinking outside of the box"- which require innovation and alternative approaches that have the potential to be more effective, efficient and sustainable on a large scale. However, she notes that innovation does present a challenge for evaluators. The dominant approach to evaluation assumes that the problem and solution are well defined and that there is a clear path to success. And because it is difficult to evaluate a complex problem where there is no one pre-defined program model that will work the same in such diverse settings as the 14 Best Start communities, a different evaluation tool had to be developed- DE.

DE is an approach to evaluation that is grounded in systems thinking and supports innovation by collecting and analyzing real-time data in ways that lead to informed and ongoing decision-making as part of the design, development, and implementation process.

Ms. Hoffman goes on to explain the differences between traditional and developmental evaluation. In traditional contexts, the program is typically planned, there is action and then those actions are evaluated. This all happens in a consecutive fashion. In the developmental context, however, planning, acting and evaluating are all happening at the same time. Findings from the evaluation are used to inform continuous learning in real time. The learning is used to refine, adapt and change the innovation as needed.

Ms. Hoffman notes that DE is not a method and then goes on to cover what types of methods are used in DE. She states that DE is just as rigorous as traditional evaluation and uses the same methods. Data collection and use of information, however, typically happens much faster in DE as opposed to traditional evaluation. Rather than wait for a report at the end of the year, DE attempts to feed back information in real time.

She also informs the Committee that another important distinction between Developmental and Traditional Evaluation is the role of the Evaluator. In traditional evaluation, the evaluator is positioned as an external, independent and objective observer. The Developmental Evaluator, however, is more of a strategic learning partner and facilitator. The Developmental Evaluator is a member of the team and actually participates in discussions to infuse evaluative questions to facilitate systematic data-based reflection and decision making.

Ms. Hoffman states that DE is not always appropriate for all settings or programs. And states that it is appropriate in the following conditions:

- Complex, changing conditions
- No widely accepted, evidence-based model
- Approach is still being refined
- Data are needed to make informed decisions and changes in real time
- Innovation and learning are valued and promoted by the Board and staff

Ms. Hoffman states that given the given the kind of learning and adaptation that is inherent in Learning by Doing, staff sought an evaluation approach that would bring evaluative thinking into the Learning by Doing process, provide feedback supported by data and delivered in an interactive way to help the Partnerships fine-tune what they are doing, consider and adapt to uncertainty, and inform decisions.

In addition, she says that staff sought an evaluation approach that would encourage partnership between the evaluators and the other members of the team and be nimble and responsive to the ongoing data and information requests from the community partnerships.

Ms. Hoffman further informs the Committee that staff wanted to use the DE approach so that it would give them insight on the following:
- Learning, innovation, and adaptation are inherent in Learning by Doing.
- DE encourages a strategic partnership between community members, evaluators, contractors, and First 5 LA staff.
- Community Partnerships have requested ongoing data and information to help them make informed decisions.
- DE can provide insight into how to manage, support and develop complex place-based, community change efforts.

Ms. Hoffman informs the Committee who the BSFF Developmental Evaluators are:

- Harder+Company Community Research (Harder) and Special Services for Groups (SSG) serve as the developmental evaluators.
- Harder/SSG have assigned a developmental evaluator to each Best Start community.
- The evaluators support the work of the Community Partnerships throughout the LBD process.
- The evaluators will promote learning within the Community Partnerships and across the 14 communities.

She then goes on to cover what the evaluators will do.
- Provide data to the Community Partnerships as they choose their core result and work through the Learning by Doing process
- Work with Community Partnerships to assess their progress
- Facilitate learning and provide evaluative thinking throughout the process
- Work with Community Partnerships and First 5 LA staff and contractors in the ongoing development and implementation of the BSFF
- Collect data to document how Best Start is evolving

Ms. Hoffman now hands the presentation back over to Ms. Andrews.

Ms. Andrews states that DE requires that we work differently. If we truly want to do this work well, learning cannot be limited to just the evaluators. Others must be involved in promoting learning and contributing to the ongoing development of Best Start. As part of the November approval, the Board commissioned resources to assist the Community Partnerships in being results-focused. These individuals make up the learning Team. Again, Ms. Andrews states that this is about building a community infrastructure that can sustain results over time. She also says that the Learning Team is a critical input into this work.

Ms. Andrews now goes over the key takeaways from DE. They are as follows:

- Community Partnerships, contractors, and First 5 LA staff are embracing the idea of evaluators as strategic partners in this work.
- Developmental Evaluation encourages learning, innovation and ongoing development of an initiative.
- The Developmental Evaluation will focus on shared vision and collective action during the initial phase of BSFF implementation.

- The Developmental Evaluators are part of a Learning Team to support the work of the Community Partnerships.

She then concludes her presentation with next steps:

<u>Data support for Learning by Doing</u>
- Indicators
- Community Based Action Research (CBAR)
- Data from resident engagement work with SBCC
- Community capacity assessments

<u>Six-month Outcomes</u>
- Operationalization
- Internal & external systems for tracking progress

9.   Public Comment

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 pm.

NEXT MEETING:

The next scheduled meeting will be taking place as follows:

March 27, 2014
12:00 pm – 5:00 pm

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

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