

FIRST 5 LA

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES
Commission Meeting
March 8, 2012

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Commissioners:

Nancy Au
Jane Boeckmann
Jonathan Fielding [Vice Chair]
Neal Kaufman
Marv Southard

Ex-Officio Commissioners:

Patricia Curry
Deanne Tilton

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Commissioners:

Antronette Yancey [Excused]
Zev Yaroslavsky [Chair] [Excused]

Ex-Officio Commissioners:

Duane Dennis [Excused]

STAFF PRESENT:

Yolanda Bosch, Chief Administrative Officer
Antonio Gallardo, Chief Program Officer
Tracey Hause, Director of Finance
Armando Jimenez, Director of Research & Evaluation
Maria Romero, Executive Assistant

STAFF ABSENT:

Craig Steele, Interim Chief Executive Officer [Excused]

LEGAL COUNSEL:

Nancy Takade, Principal Deputy County Counsel

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

1. Vice Chair Fielding called the meeting to order at 1:45 pm. Quorum was present.

Vice Chair Fielding presented a plaque to Dr. William Arroyo in appreciation of his service to the Commission as an alternate Commissioner representing the LA County Department of Mental Health.

Vice Chair Fielding introduced Philip Browning to the Commission. Mr. Browning will be serving on the Commission as a voting member representing from the LA County Department of Child and Family Services.

Vice Chair Fielding introduced Dr. Arturo Delgado, LACOE Superintendent, who was in the audience. Vice Chair Fielding commented that he would be serving on the Commission pending a determination on conflict of interest because of the many responsibilities that he has in his position. Furthermore, Vice Chair commented that having Dr. Delgado present in the audience demonstrated his concern and commitment regarding the zero to five population.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 2 – 4)

2. Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes – Thursday, February 9, 2012

Commissioner Kaufman asked that the minutes be amended to accurately reflect him not being in attendance at the February Commission meeting.

**M/S (Marv Southard / Neal Kaufman)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED**

3. Approval of the Monthly Financial Statements for the Month Ending January 31, 2012

Director Hause presented the regular monthly financial statements for the Commission's review.

**M/S (Nancy Au / Marv Southard)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

4. Approve New Contracts and Proposed Amendments for Existing Contracts and Grant Agreements in Support of Initiatives Approved as Part of the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget for the Period of March 1, 2012 to March 31, 2012 and Authorize Staff to Complete Final Contract Execution Upon Approval from the Board

CPO Gallardo reported that as part of the monthly practice, a list has been provided with 13 new contracts for execution and 15 amendments for existing contracts and grants for this reporting period in support of initiatives approved as part of the FY 2011-12 programmatic budget. Information about all contracts and grant agreements, including scopes of work and budget are available on the website.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that he appreciated the breakdown of the new contracts versus continuing existent contracts. He found this information helpful and asked that this be continued as a matter of practice.

Regarding the new Best Start Communities vendor agreements, Vice Chair Fielding commented that the description provided stated that there were about 300 Best Start Community meetings that would be taking place. He asked if this information was correct and if this new group of vendors would support 300 community meetings for a total of \$115,000. This equated to about three meetings a day, seven days of week during the stipulated period of time. Vice Chair Fielding commented that it felt a bit strange.

CPO Gallardo commented that as First 5 LA was ramping up to the preparation of the community plans, each community could have as many as six meetings per month, which were about 72 meetings among the 13 communities per month. For a period of five months, the estimate was potentially 300 or so meetings.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Vice Chair Fielding commented that the Commission was being asked to support the communities but this was difficult without getting any reports on the progress to date. Specifically, Vice Chair Fielding asked what has happened to date, where does Best Start Communities fit, and where was the Commission in the process. Not having any of this information made it much more difficult to understand how Best Start Communities fits in terms of the context. In terms of the augmentation agreements, staff was requesting \$550,000 in augmentation for what essentially appeared to be meeting support for Best Start Community plan development. While components such as translation, childcare, transportation, catering are important, it seemed the Commission was paying out a lot of money without having had any results of the planning process to date.

CPO Gallardo responded that reporting has been done at the Program & Planning Committee on the progress of what is happening in the communities. Staff would be happy to bring to the April Commission a specific progress report.

Commissioner Au commented that as a newly appointed Liaison to Best Start Communities, structure was beginning to be put in place on how progress was to be reported to the rest of the Commissioners. She stated that Vice Chair Fielding's questions were very appropriate and asked that he be patient. Time is needed to get their act together. It is not that the work is not continuing; phenomenal work is being done in the communities. The question is how to go about doing the presentations because each community dynamic is very unique in itself. The information needs to be presented in such a way that it does not take four hours to report on 14 communities. Commissioner Au also stated that she has met with the leadership staff of the Best Start Communities Department and will be mapping out what needs to be done between now and June with one of the key components being a presentation of the work that has been accomplished.

Vice Chair Fielding said that he could be patient but as public stewards, it is important to have some clear objective measures of progress against goals and objectives.

Commissioner Kaufman asked for clarification on the information being presented in the spreadsheet columns. Referencing page 95 of the meeting packet, he asked that staff provide clarification on the difference between total award and approved programmatic budget. He stated that this information did not provide him with the detail that he needed such as total awards within a project, particularly when there were multiple contracts within one allocation.

Commissioner Kaufman stated that procedurally, for transparency, the Commission is approving all contracts. However, the approved programmatic budget column is not helpful other than to only know that the contract amount is not greater than what the allocation was. In the interest of time, Commissioner Kaufman said that he would have an offline discussion with staff.

**M/S (Nancy Au / Neal Kaufman)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

COMMISSION: (Items 5 – 11)

5. Announcements by the Commission Chair

None.

6. Interim Chief Executive Officer's Report

Interim CEO Steele was not in attendance. A written report was submitted to the Commission for review and consideration.

7. Approve the Revised GASB 54 Policy as a Result of Direction by the Board of Commissioners Through its January 12, 2012

Director Hause reported that staff was asking the Commission to approve the revised GASB 54 Policy as presented in the Board packet. There was both a red-lined version and a clean copy provided. As Commissioners recalled, there have been lengthy discussions on this issue with the Ad Hoc Executive Committee as well as the full Commission. There was no new information presented, only the incorporation of changes that have been discussed over the last few months.

**M/S (Nancy Au / Marv Southard)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

8. Approve the Revised Accountability and Learning Framework, the Development and Approval of Research & Evaluation Projects Policy, and the Outcomes-Driven Planning and Evaluation Policy

Director Jimenez reported that a staff recommendation was being brought forward to approve the revised accountability and learning framework and the accompanying policies. This revision and the policies that are part of the accountability framework are direct actions to implement a recommendation made in the Harvey M. Rose audit report. Staff strongly agreed with the Rose recommendations and feel that these efforts will enhance the Commission's ability to make the kinds of changes in lives of children and families in LA County real and visible.

Director Jimenez reported that the framework was specific in terms of what it is to accomplish. The two policies include the development and approval of the Research & Evaluation Projects Policy so that systematic and consistent input can be obtained from Commissioners in the development, design and implementation of evaluation work.

The second policy focuses on the outcomes-driven planning. This is a formal commitment that the Commission needs to make so that it can clearly define success prior to beginning the work that is being done at the Commission. It is critical that for the Commission to be accountable; and it needs to clearly state and define what accountability means in terms of the change prior to the Commission starting that work. This will be an incremental process and the objective is that in the future, the Commission will have clear objectives, measurable performance measures, and

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

milestones that relate to the projects and the expenditures so that at any given time, the Commission will know the progress being made by each project. The policy will help the Commission accomplish that objective.

As the Director of Research & Evaluation, Director Jimenez said that he wanted the work to be meaningful and to be an important tool for the Commission to make decisions.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that this was exactly what the Commission should be doing rather than deciding on outcomes after the project is in place.

Commissioner Browning asked if this framework had already been started and if there was a timeline.

Director Jimenez commented that the process would correspond to the fiscal budget year. The program budget approval will have defined measureable objectives, outcomes and milestones that the Commission may want to report against and be accountable for. The workplan in the budget will be effective in July. Per Director Hause, the intent is to bring the programmatic budget for discussion in May and adoption in June.

Commissioner Browning asked if the current contracts had an evaluation procedure currently in place. Director Jimenez responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Kaufman said this was very exciting and it had gone through quite an extensive set of presentations. To him, the reason why this was important really stemmed from the role of First 5 LA which is to create and help others sustain what it helps to create. Commissioner Kaufman stated that he personally believed that the Commission needed to define what was the long-term outcome not just one or three years; but, perhaps five and ten years. The agents of sustainability should also be sustained, such as the County, LACOE and communities, to figure out what the Commission could do to make it happen. In order to accomplish, outcomes need to be defined, policy and decisions relevant to data analysis should be developed; so that at the end of a specific time period, the information for the agents of sustainability is available to make those decisions.

Commissioner Kaufman said that the Commission had been doing this in some form as all projects and initiatives have an evaluation component. This now formalizes it and codifies it, and makes it a requirement. The Commission needs to define what is important, what will it try to do, and include a sense of those of who will be agents of sustainability as part of the presentation. He said this process was exciting, was evolutionary and built upon the work that the Commission and the Research & Evaluation team has done. For this, he applauded everyone.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Vice Chair Fielding stated that the Commission had two purposes: (1) to evaluate what the Commission has done and add this to the literature disseminated; and, (2) for the Commission to take those pieces of the agenda that it has acted upon and for which there is good evidence works, and become a strong advocate, not necessarily by continuing to provide funding, but more so being an advocate for others to sustain these programs and policies.

**M/S (Nancy Au / Marv Southard)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

9. Receive and File the Staff Report Regarding Phase One of an Online Change Dashboard to Provide Information to the Public About Change and Progress in First 5 LA's Outcome Areas

Director Jimenez reported that as part of the accountability and learning framework and the Commission's need to be transparent about the progress being made, one of the elements or key pieces was the development of a dashboard.

The Commissioners were presented with a visual snapshot of the online dashboard. This was step one of a multi-phased dashboard roll out that is taking place throughout 2012. The change dashboard is one tool that is being used and developed to show how the Commission is using its funds and how children and families benefit.

The initial online dashboard phase will present simple and straight forward facts about First 5 LA. The idea is to provide basic information for the casual website user. The next phase will include clickable items that will provide additional information in pop-up boxes. In future years, new data will be uploaded as it becomes available and programs mature.

The online dashboard will not be static. It will be a tool that will be continuously updated and improved. This tool will evolve as First 5 LA and the needs for communication also evolve.

There are three principles that are being applied to the development and evolution of this tool: (1) transparency, (2) responsiveness and (3) adaptability. Community input will be obtained and this information will be used to inform the development and adaptation of the change dashboard as its roll out continues.

Commissioner Southard commented that he was supportive of this tool and expressed that the Commission should be focused on what it can do rather than on what the ideal ought to be. He asked if the dashboard might be the place to look at one of the big deal issues—third grade reading scores—that the Commission wanted to take a look at from the very beginning. Commissioner Southard asked if this was something that could be tracked over time.

Vice Chair Fielding said that the context in which the information is presented was very important. He agreed with staff that the trends, independent of First 5 LA's work, were important to know. In looking at the information being presented during

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

phase one of the online dashboard rollout, serving 109,000 children out of 750,000 was a small number. He said that staff should be sensitive to how this information is to be presented and should also include percentages.

Commissioner Au commented that what keeps her grounded in terms of First 5 LA's work is that there are many kinds of influences and impacts. She said this will be very difficult for the Commission to truly track as a result of the Commission's investments, specifically in the public health arena, since the Commission has entered into a number of project partnerships with the public health folks. Commissioner Au further stated that the work that is done by the public health folks is oftentimes imbedded in a larger initiative for projects and programs. Hence, it would not be quite right for the Commission to take total credit for the impact that the public health folks are doing; but, because the Commission has entered into a partnership, the Commission's ability has been enhanced to make that kind of impact. She asked how the dashboard would capture this information.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that the Commission needed to look at some gross measures of whether it was reaching the overall goals.

Commissioner Au commented that she hoped the research and evaluation folks would grapple with this piece because it speaks to Commissioner Southard's comment of impact and outcome.

Director Jimenez commented that one of the things to do was to create bridges between the work of the Commission and the work that is partnered with large entities such as the County and WIC. Director Jimenez further commented that staff has been working for years to build and help support data development in those areas. For example, the Commission has partnered with the LA Health Survey for several years and there are significant amounts of data on conditions of children and families in LA County. Although the Commission was not directly investing in those conditions, the Commission can be a strong advocate for changes in those areas. One of the things that will be happening in the evolution of the dashboard will be for the Commission to link to those circumstances so that type of information can be presented, although the Commission is not directly responsible.

Commissioner Kaufman said the dashboard was a communication tool and asked, (1) who was the target audience of the communication and (2) depending on that target, different information is presented in different ways. He also said that how things get expressed also represents what stakeholders might want to know. Part of the therapeutic use of creating a communications structure is to bring people in to talk about, understand it, and to hear from them.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Commissioner Kaufman asked if this was the kind of thing that would come to the Planning & Program Committee for further discussion. Specifically, was the target population of the communication and the kinds of communication going to be presented to that committee. He felt that codifying this at the Program & Planning Committee would be, in his view, the next step. Commissioner Kaufman asked when this would happen and asked staff to drive when it made sense to present this information to the Program & Planning Committee.

WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION, THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY RECEIVED AND FILED

10. UPDATE: Program & Planning Committee

Commissioner Kaufman reported that the meeting notes from the January Program & Planning Committee were in the FYI folder for Commissioners to review.

He also announced that there would be no meeting in March. The next meeting will be in April. The agenda items include a report from Mathematica Policy Research about the Universal Preschool Child Outcome Study.

Vice Chair Fielding suggested that the Program & Planning Committee think about how to prioritize funding from the Community Investments Department. He commented that a prior approval had been done for the neighborhood parks in the Broadway-Manchester and Pacoima areas. This was a great win because it was totally in line with what was already being approved by the Commission. To him, this made a lot of sense. For some of the other things that the Commission has approved for the Community Investments Department, there has not been this type of clarity.

Vice Chair Fielding asked Commissioner Kaufman, as Chair of the Program & Planning Committee, to take up this issue; specifically, what types of leveraging and matching investments the Commission would like to see and at what level. It is more important for the Commission to be strategic rather than just making sure that money is spent as there are plenty of opportunities for matching but those opportunities do not necessarily align with the goals of the Commission.

Commissioner Kaufman suggested that at the next meeting, or whenever it was convenient, for criteria to be brought forward that described the criterion under which the Community Investments Department made its decisions. Commissioner Kaufman stated that the Commission would like to give the Community Investment Department flexibility, the incentive to be creative, and nimble; but, at the same time, putting in specific criteria that described the kinds of things to be funded. Depending on the agenda items, this issue can be placed at either the April or May agenda.

CPO Gallardo commented that he would be happy to work directly with the Community Investments Department to bring this issue to the Program & Planning Committee first and then eventually to the full Commission.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Vice Chair Fielding said this would be helpful in forming the planning discussion for the new budget in May.

11. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Kim Barker, Wilsona Family Literacy Program
Jim Chacon, Westside Community Adult School
Diane Gaspard, Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute, UCLA
Barbara Hill, Shenandoah Family Literacy Program
Amani Khair, Shenandoah Family Literacy Program
Jeni Kuida, LTSC
Roberta Lanterman, Long Beach Unified School District
Delmi Martinez, Parent
Rick Overdorf, Wilsona Family Literacy Program
Ivette Pineda, North Valley Caring Services

ADJOURNMENT:

With the conclusion of the agenda, Vice Chair Fielding adjourned the meeting.

The Commission adjourned at 2:56 pm.

NEXT MEETING:

The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be on:

April 12, 2012 at 1:30 pm
First 5 LA
Multi-Purpose Room
750 N. Alameda Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

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