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CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

1. Mayor Michael Antonovich called the meeting to order at 1:43 pm. Quorum was present.

COMMISSION: (Items 2 – 15)


Commissioner Antronette Yancey submitted minor corrections to the minutes. The changes were not substantive.

M/S (Antronette Yancey / Michael Antonovich)
APPROVED AS AMENDED

Mayor Michael Antonovich briefly reminded the community what priorities he had been stating as wanting to accomplish—to improve the child safety and well-being through the successful public-private partnerships, very vital, along with inter-agency service delivery in a County-wide direct service provision that would prevent child abuse or neglect and/or prevent children from entering the County’s supervision.

Mayor Michael Antonovich emphasized quality early education care and proper physical, nutritional, dental, eye and mental health habits. Following the Commission’s approval last month of his motion directing a full financial audit to independently verify First 5 LA’s funds, on March 1st, the ad-hoc committee met with the staff of the Los Angeles County Office of Auditor-Controller and developed the audit scope of work. The Auditor-Controller has released the RFP to a limited number of firms on the County’s master agreement list. By April 1st, the contract award is expected to be made and then on April 11th, the audit will begin. The targeted purpose will be an independent verification of First 5 LA funds for the Governor’s budget proposal, which has now changed to a one-time re-direction of $1 billion from First 5 Commissions state-wide through a two-thirds vote of the Legislature. The decision would go to the floor of both Houses as part of the overall State budget package rather than to the voters through a ballot initiative. The Governor’s proposal is to also take 50 percent of future Proposition 10 revenues, but this is now off the table.

The current $1 billion proposal includes $950 million from the County’s First 5 Commissions, $50 million from the State First 5 Commission, representing 50 percent of each Commission fund balance as of June 30, 2010. If adopted, County Commissions would be required to return these funds to the State by June 30, 2012 to be used for Medi-Cal services for children under the age of five. The proposed re-direction of the reserves would impact First 5 LA’s strategic plan, a likeliness that the Commission would need to re-visit current and future funding commitments for both placed-based and County-wide investments. An independent verification of those fund balances would be necessary now, more than ever, because First 5 LA should be able to retain the money it has already, legitimately, voted and committed to spend. These reserve funds that have been already, legitimately, reserved for specific contracts, particularly meritorious ones with capable providers and have demonstrated exceptional performance serving the County’s students, children and families.

There are several key funding commitments that this Commission has made that will abruptly end on June 30th of this year, including Partnerships for Families, the Healthy Births Initiative, and the School Readiness Program. However, during the February Commission meeting, Commissioners learned that the contractors for these three programs located in the 14 communities would be allowed an additional six-month extension on their contracts to December, 2011. These three programs are County-wide initiatives; but a glaring flaw in that direction is that by June 30th, established, integrative County-wide networks of service delivery will be broken without plans of sustainability for the clients because not all of the SPAs include one of the 14 communities. For example, the Partnership for Families contract in SPA 5, providing critical child abuse prevention and intervention services, will not be extended until December, 2011. Rather, it will abruptly terminate in June for no other reason than SPA 5 does not include one of the 14 communities. As a result, this arbitrary action places a hole in the successful child abuse
prevention safety net established since 2005 that relieves the already overburden DCFS system.

Mayor Michael Antonovich cautioned against cutting services to the 80 percent of Los Angeles County’s children outside of the 14 communities. Rather than re-inventing the wheel, he urged the Commission to reconsider County-wide augmentation to continue funding, through meritorious contracts, those capable providers that have already proven themselves in this effort. He said that it is wiser to seamlessly transition the expertise gained from these partnerships into the planning for place-based communities and County-wide proposals while at the same time, continuing to provide uninterrupted services for vulnerable children and families who virtually depend on them; and employment security for the experienced staff who service these clients. Next month, Mayor Michael Antonovich stated that he planned to revisit the issue of the feasibility of contract extensions through December, 2011 for those currently contracted County-wide initiatives with proven track records of success. In preparation, he asked staff to compile materials that would inform Commissioners about the amount of funds available to use if the current conference committee proposal was approved. He asked the Operations Committee, which might be called the Executive Committee if the Commission approves the revised bylaws, to work with staff on recommendations for the necessary changes to the strategic plan by reviewing the scope and overall funding of place-based and County-wide initiatives.

Mayor Michael Antonovich commented that First 5 LA should fight for its funds but also make the Governor’s budget proposal the Commission’s opportunity to focus on innovative solutions to obligate First 5 LA’s existing and future resources to purposes that meet the needs of Los Angeles County children as efficiently as possible, in accordance with the First 5 LA goals and objectives.

Commissioner Harriette Williams commented that Mayor Michael Antonovich brought up some very important issues. She stated that she hoped to have more study groups as it has happened in the past between now and the next Commission Meeting, so that everyone understands all of the nuances because there are a lot of grantees that are coming up with sunset. The Commission needs to look at this very carefully if the intent is to change the direction. She formally requested that staff consider facilitating some study groups or interim meetings between now and the next Commission Meeting.

Commissioner Nancy Au asked that the request be formalized into a motion so that staff will have clear direction. She said that it was a good idea because the Commissioners need clarity as to what the true impact was going to be regarding the move towards place-based, in terms of the process by which this decision was made. Commissioner Nancy Au also said that Commissioners were clearly under the understanding that the impact was going to be much more significant given the history of what has been done historically. If there was a discrepancy in terms of the Commission’s understanding as it engaged in the planning process and the reality of it now, she would like clarity so that she could truly understand the impact. Commissioner Nancy Au stated that the Commission knew when the decision was made to go toward place-based that there were going to be providers or programs and projects that were not going to be continued because they did not fit into the Commission’s agreed upon priority nor the agreed upon framework of providing services. For clarity, she felt that the study group groups were needed for her to get a true understanding.
Commissioner Nancy Au formally made a motion to direct staff to convene a study group for the Commissioners, being an open meeting per the Brown Act, so that this candid conversation and assessment could take place, and then move forward.

**M/S (Nancy Au / Michael Antonovich)**  
**APPROVED AS PROPOSED**

Commissioner Marv Southard asked that a preliminary analysis of the proposed Governor’s budget be included as part of the workshop, if this was to happen. The investment pool, overall, may be much less than originally anticipated which may mean a necessary change in strategy.

CEO Evelyn V. Martinez commented that an analysis of the fund balance would be necessary to assess the impact of the $425 million take away by the Governor; the discussion on what the priorities will be for funding would then take place, given that the Commission has a number of programs that were not to be included in the strategic plan.

Notices will be sent out to all Commissioners asking for availability and the meeting will be scheduled based on when the majority of the Commissioners are available since calendars are very difficult to coordinate.

The Commissioners were in agreement with meeting on a day where the majority of the Commissioners were available. Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding also suggested having a couple of meetings, depending on the number of Commissioners available. He stressed the importance of having all the information laid out in front of them to understand the assumptions, parameters, and options since there are strategic issues as well as operational issues that need to be addressed.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that staff, in addition to having financial information available to Commissioners, should also compile information on the expected impact to be based on what has happened historically as well as what are the assumptions going forward because Commissioners will need to make decisions. Having this information will be important to help inform those decisions.

Commissioner Duane Dennis asked for clarification on those PFF providers who will not get a funding extension beyond June for those not in the target communities, and through December 31, 2011, for those PFF providers in the target communities. CEO Evelyn V. Martinez commented that funding for these providers was to end in February 2011 and the Commission took action to continue funding through June 30th of this year. CEO Evelyn V. Martinez also commented that she agreed with Commissioners in that this has been one of the most important initiatives that the Commission has funded. At the same time, it is important for newer Commissioners to also recall that everyone was aware of these decisions made by the Board since last year when the Board approved the strategic plan.

Commissioner Deanne Tilton commented that PFF was very important to her because she was among the small group of Commissioners who fought for five years in order to achieve it. Now it has been showing its effectiveness. It has been making a big difference. One of the things that Commissioners did not consider closely enough is that Best Start is not just a child abuse prevention program. It has shown that child abuse could be prevented and keeps families out of the system with this project; but it is not exactly the same as Best
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Start. Commissioners cannot assume that if it is incorporated into Best Start, it will be doing what it is doing so well right now. Commissioner Deanne Tilton expressed how glad she was that Mayor Michael Antonovich brought this issue and looked forward to being able to have further discussions and looking at the outcome of this program and project that she felt has saved children’s lives and has kept families together.

NOTE: Mayor Michael Antonovich combined Items 6 and 7 into one action item.

6. Approval toContinue Funding the LAUP Workforce Initiative up to $1.5 Million Over Five Years and Incorporate into the ECE Workforce Consortium Contract When Renewed on July 1, 2011

7. Approval of Early Care Education Workforce Development Initiative

Mayor Michael Antonovich commented the Commission approved funding for the LAUP Workforce Initiative to continue the funding and expand in July 2010. Item 7 is a motion by Commissioner Antronette Yancey regarding the Workforce Development Initiative. He asked the Commissioners to consider how they will both complement and inform each other and ultimately incorporate it into the ECE Workforce Consortium contract.

Before starting the discussion, during the February 22nd meeting of the Board of Supervisors, on a motion by Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas was introduced and passed unanimously urgently requesting that the First 5 LA Board of Commissioners maintain all current contracts with the Early Care Education Workforce Development initiative throughout December, 2014. Obviously, the Board of Supervisors can only represent a request, but again, all five Supervisors were in support of that initiative. Commissioner Antronette Yancey’s motion brings this action before the Commission for formal consideration.

Commissioner Antronette Yancey stated that the quality of the workforce was quite clearly in alignment with the mission of the First 5 LA Commission. The issue with this particular motion is just to clarify the difference between the $5 million that was allocated for this contract under consideration versus the Consortium contract. The contract being discussed, the $5 million contract, was a policy focus on early child education whereas the other contract was more programmatically focused. The Los Angeles County Office of Education subcontracted with those who were able to provide the best service, who had the best track record of experience in that policy development process, which can be a lengthy process. It was Commissioner Antronette Yancey’s understanding that the Board, in authorizing the $37 million project, was not stopping the $5 million investment.

Commissioner Nancy Au commented that she was having a personal difficulty in trying to track these two items. She asked if a conversation could take place on Item 6 first because it talks about the Consortium and then she would be able to clearly see how the two have potential to fit together. Commissioner Nancy Au asked for the staff to make its presentation.

CPO Antonio Gallardo commented that Item 6 and Item 7 are two items that are related to early care and education workforce development. These items pertain to four separate ECE workforce development projects. To avoid confusion and to make sure everybody is on the
same page, staff would like to take a couple of minutes, upfront, to briefly describe the four projects.

Director Randi Wolfe clarified that she although she is the Best Start Communities Director, she would be speaking on this issue because of her former position with LAUP and her work in these projects. First 5 LA has a commitment to workforce development and within that commitment to workforce development, it also has a commitment to policy change related to workforce development. There have been four projects that have been funded. The first project is the Workforce Initiative. The Workforce Initiative is the project that LAUP funded for three years and then First 5 LA began funding last July. It is the pipeline project that brings together seven community colleges, five universities and a number of feeder high schools to work on the institutional and systemic issues related to providing the services and supports so that people move through a system of higher education and actually obtain degrees without replicating course work. That project is now in its fourth year.

The second project is the East Los Angeles College family childcare higher education academy. This was one of the County-wide augmentation investments approved by the Commission in November as a pilot project specifically focused on providing the support and resources to monolingual family childcare providers. The pilot is taking place at East Los Angeles College with a group that has already been identified of about 200 family childcare providers. Based on assumed success, this program would then be replicated in other communities.

The third project is the Consortium. The Consortium was another County-wide augmentation investment project approved by the Commission in November. The idea with the Consortium was to bring together many of the key early care education service providers and people invested in workforce development into one coordinated effort including the CARES+ Program, the training of license exempt as well as licensed providers, the STEPS to Excellence Program, the LACOE Division for School Improvement training elementary school principals and teachers in pre-K to third grade who do not have a background in early childhood background, and TQP which was bringing together all of the community colleges and four-year university across the County to actually look at the systemic and policy issues toward development a Early Childhood Education Bachelor’s Degree program and early childhood certification. This was funded in November as the Consortium.

The fourth project is the Career Development Policy Project which at the moment stands separate. Part of what is being proposed, is that this project be included within the Consortium. The policy project was funded in 2005, there was a particular focus on policy. As things have unfolded, policy is embedded in many of the projects involved with the Consortium. Part of the challenge has been to figure out what is not being addressed by the Consortium so that the Career Development Policy Project can play a unique role and add value to the larger Consortium.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding asked what the Career Development Policy Project was providing that the others was not so that Commissioners could understand the complementary or redundancy.
CPO Antonio Gallardo commented that in the motion that Commissioner Antronette Yancey is making, the idea is to continue the contract with LACOE for the Career Development Policy Project. Following approval of the ECE Workforce Consortium back in November and to ensure operational efficiency, staff conducted an analysis of the relationship between the Career Development Policy and ECE Workforce Consortium and found that there was significant overlap between the two projects in the areas of the goals, strategies and outcomes. In addition, the participants of the Career Development Policy Project Workgroup were nearly all represented already by the Consortium membership, presenting inefficiencies with continuing the two groups independently. The foreseen inefficiencies and overlap in objectives of the two projects were significant enough for staff to recommend the termination of the contract at that time. CPO Antonio Gallardo also provided clarification in regard to the motion submitted by Commissioner Antronette Yancey, referencing page 74, section 2 of the Commission packet.

- The Early Care and Education Workforce Development Initiative as approved by the Commission in November 2005, not in 1994.
- The full contract amount is for $5.7 million, not $5 million.
- The contract with LACOE for the Career Development Policy Project was executed on May 7, 2009, not June 2010.
- The contract was originally planned to end in 2015, not 2014.

Following the request from Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding, and for staff to move forward with the Commission’s directive, staff need to seek some additional clarity on the motion introduced by Commissioner Antronette Yancey. Staff would like to know from the Commission, whether the direction is continue the contract as is with the current scope of work; or, is it the Commission’s interest that the contract is continued with full funding at originally contracted level but allow for revisions to integrate the Career Development Policy Project within the Consortium.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding asked staff if the original contract has been effective and whether the goals and objectives had been met. He asked staff whether the contractor had met its obligations. Staff responded that the contractor has been in compliance and had met all deliverables.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that if this was true, then why did the Commission approve something that was going to lead to the LACOE program being eliminated, if in fact, it was working and why the Commission was not alerted that if the many part contract (Consortium) was approved, in essence, the Commission was sun-setting something else that was already in place and working as opposed to starting new things.

Director Randi Wolfe said this was more an accident of history. Things evolved in ways that nobody was actually predicting. She reminded Commissioners that at the July 2010 Commission Meeting, when the proposal was made to the Commission asking for $7 million--$3 million for the Workforce Initiative, $4 million was to further develop the Teacher Quality Partnership Federal Grant Proposal—at that time, the Commission had said that it would fund the Workforce Initiative for one year and more information was requested on the Teacher Quality Partnership Federal Grant Proposal. In the ensuing four months two things happened—(1) the Workforce Consortium life was breathed into that notion and what was the Teacher Quality Partnership Federal Grant Proposal and actually greatly enhanced it and rounded it off because the constraints placed the requirements of a
federal grant proposal were eliminated. The relationships that had been formed in the County were formalized into the Consortium. This is what came back to the Commission in November. Simultaneously, the Child Development Policy Project, which had been engaged in a planning process for a year was just on the brink of kicking off in September to the wider community. This was a coincidental overlap. It was not an overlap by intention or with any foresight. At this point, the critical question was not whether to involve that project as the whole nature of the Consortium is that when a new need is identified, it is nimble enough that it can be adopted. This is how the East Los Angeles College project was brought into the Consortium when it was not originally part of that.

In answer to questions posed by Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding, staff has considered in trying to grapple with how to make sense of everything, that one area where the Consortium was not addressing was engaging the business community because that is a place where it is critical to engage the business community from a policy perspective and all issues related to workforce development. This might be an area that the Child Development Policy Project could uniquely tackle and add value to the Consortium by expanding its scope and breadth.

Director Randi Wolfe commented the funding structure was very different. In terms of the Consortium, when speaking about funding, the funding with the Consortium is like a pass through. The Consortium funding is being used to fund seven projects. It is not like the Consortium is one project. The Consortium represents seven projects that are all being funded with the $5 million. Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that he understood this but specifically asked which of those projects would be reduced and by how much to try to assure that what was already funded would be fully incorporated.

CPO Antonio Gallardo clarified that when staff refers to the performance of a contract, there are basically two areas—whether the contractor is in compliance with the regulations of the contract or whether the contract is moving at the established pace. In this case, the Workforce Consortium was moving at a faster pace and became a more comprehensive approach.

Commissioner Antronette Yancey stated she understood the need to be nimble but it struck her that $5 million was a fairly amount for staff to make a unilateral decision. She asked if there was something in the bylaws or procedurally that allows staff to make this type of decision without coming back to the Commission to actually make a recommendation. CEO Evelyn V. Martinez commented there was no procedure per se, and did agree that probably what should have been done was to go to the Operations Committee for feedback or direction as has been done with other contractors and grantees that have been defunded due to contract compliance issues. CEO Evelyn V. Martinez stated this was an operational decision and took full responsibility for that decision.

CPO Antonio Gallardo commented that from a programs perspective, the only intention was to make the most efficient use of the dollars.

Mayor Michael Antonovich commented that the Operations Committee should be informed to make that decision as it was not a delegated decision to staff. Prior to this type of decision being made, at least the Chairman and members from each of the respective agencies that are on the Commission should be consulted.
Commissioner Angie Stockwell commented that in light of the fact that Commissioner Duane Dennis, Nancy Au and herself brought forth Item 6 with the intent to work in a way where the Commission would not be working in silos but more concentrated. This being said, the fact that the initiative did not get going in a timely manner as was stated, Commissioners need to be sensitive toward grantees. There were things happening in the field that sometimes Commissioner are not aware of. There was a work stoppage that nobody was supposed to be hired at LACOE. This also applied to not approving contracts. A lot of the reasons for some things being late are systemic because of the economic conditions. Nothing against LAUP but she believes that there is a long and good partnership relationship with LACOE. This can be seen by LACOE having two major pieces of the Consortium. The work that is done by LACOE can be trusted. They also have the most comprehensive infrastructure of anybody in the State of California.

LACOE is the largest regional agency in the nation and has the capability of networking, advocating and pulling in together legislatures, Board members, and the general public. The services provided by LACOE are comprehensive in that there is a whole section alone under educational services to prepare the community, early education 0-5. In one of the strategic goals that LACOE has talks directly to improving the achievement of children 0-5 and getting them ready for school which happens to be one of the Commission’s goals. So, the Commission has a lot of goals that are in tune with LACOE. The proposal on Item 7 talks a lot to focusing of policy and focusing on business relationships which the Commission is also doing through resource mobilization. These items are human intense that the Commission needs to leave it and let it continue as it has been doing and increase its focus on policy advocacy and business. This work would enhance the work of the total Consortium and will launch the Commission forward to a greater extent. LACOE works with over 80 school districts in the County. It serves five times more children in early childhood education than any organization, including LAUP. Commissioner Angie Stockwell urged the Commission to leave it as is and place performance objectives with a focus on policy and business and then come back and find a way where this work can be tied to the LACOE educational services so it is directly with them and not a direct responsibility of LAUP.

Commissioner Nancy Au commented that it was important for the Commission to retain this policy arm because in all of the Commission’s work, it is known that in order for the Commission to maintain and sustain the changes wanting to achieve, that it is a multi-prong approach. But her fear was that unless the Commission was able to pull in the policy work within the framework and the umbrella of the Consortium, then the Commission runs into danger of this policy arm suddenly working in isolation. Being that she comes from a background of being a community-based provider, when the funding is there and clearly comes with requirements, as a provider there is compliance because it is directly tied into the funding. This is why she would feel a level of assurance if the Commission could pull this policy piece into the Workforce Consortium, and maybe with some assurance, because it looks like LACOE already has a good working relationship within that Consortium in two specific projects. To add a third project in the policy arena should not be a major challenge for them. As a Commissioner, she would have a semblance of confidence that all the components are working together. There is a wealth in terms of the sharing that can occur because policy work is not just one entity. Her guess was that all of the folks within the Consortium in some ways are impacting policy. With the LACOE piece, there will be specific requirements in the area they need to target that energy. The Commission will then be able to have a level of confidence that it is not duplicating efforts, the projects are
not working in silos or against each other. All efforts will be coordinated with collaboration. She has no qualms about retaining the funding level because it shows that LACOE is doing good work but would like to tie the funding through the Consortium to have a level of assurance that everyone is working as a unit.

Commissioner Duane Dennis commented that Commissioner Antronette Yancey’s motion spoke to integrating a policy component into the Consortium. He does agree with this as policy determines practice. If the policy agenda is separated from the practice agenda, a disservice is done to the Consortium. To this end, he suggested incorporating the policy piece into the Consortium. Regarding Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding’s issue with regards to the bleak role of the new piece, this is yet to be determined. He would hope that the Commission would provide staff with time to determine what the policy will be. This is a new piece and obviously, a high budgetary to the Consortium. There would need to be time for staff to decipher what the role would be. To that end, the Consortium can be moving along with the Career Development Policy Project and then sometime in the future, there should be integration. A timeline as to when this integration should take place should be provided.

Regarding Item 6, CPO Antonio Gallardo commented that in July 2010, the Commission approved $3 million of funding for a fourth year of implementation of LAUP’s Workforce Initiative and requested that staff return with evaluation results in conjunction with consideration of funding additional years of implementation. The Commission additionally discussed funding of the Workforce Initiative in the context of the approval of the ECE Workforce Consortium in November. The Workforce Initiative is a critical component of the ECE Workforce Consortium but the funding for this component was not included due to the pending evaluation. In response to the Commission’s request, staff is pleased to have a presentation from Dr. Marcy Whitebrook and Fran Kipnis from the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, a national leader in ECE workforce research, housed at UC Berkeley. LAUP has contracted with the Center to do the evaluation of both their Workforce Initiative as well as the ECE Workforce Consortium.

LAUP CEO Celia Ayala asked the Commission to think about the number of children that are impacted by the teachers year after year. Basically, the Commission is not only changing the landscape today but for some many years to come in terms of quality, early care and education for 0-5. LAUP CEO Celia Ayala introduced Dr. Whitebrook as the guru of early care education nationally and internationally.

The evaluation findings were presented to the Commission by Dr. Whitebrook and Ms. Kipnis. Based on the evaluation report, the Study of Child Care Employment, LAUP’s Workforce Initiative has employed effective strategies including dedicated student academic counseling, cohorts and other peer supports, transition services between levels of education, and financial assistance to support the h

Mayor Michael Antonovich invited Dr. Jon Gundry, Interim LACOE Superintendent, to address the Commission. He commented that there was a very close and collegiate working relationship between LACOE and LAUP. A lot of common ground is found in both organizational missions. Although work in early childhood education is not mandated by the State, LACOE has a long and very deep commitment to early childhood education. LACOE is the largest HeadStart provider in the country. There is a very large childhood education structure within LACOE and have been engaged in policy work in this area
before ever receiving the grant for this policy project from First 5 LA. This type of work will continue beyond the point when the current project ends. LACOE will continue to advocate for early childhood education for all eligible children in Los Angeles County and throughout California. This will be part of the ongoing mission as an educational agency. LACOE is not only the largest intermediate educational agency in California but throughout the United States. With this particular policy project, by all accounts is a project that is on target, functioning well and working. The policy project also predated the Consortium. What may look true on paper is not necessarily the truth in reality. This policy project is specifically about developing policy, identifying barriers to workforce development in the area of early childhood education and finding possible solutions that may be recommended to providers around the State of California. To place this project under a larger Consortium would run the risk of diluting the work that is being done by making it a small part of something else when it is really something that stands on its own and complements the work of the Consortium. He advocated on behalf of allowing the policy project to continue in its current form.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that the stories are wonderful and the enthusiasm was great. It is exciting to hear about the individual success stories. However, he expressed concern about being introduced to the evaluation by saying basically the students have said it all. To him, this means there is a very limited perspective on evaluation. As a Commissioner concerned about evaluation, he expected to see more quantitative not just qualitative analysis. Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that he was quite disappointed with the evaluation as a basis for moving forward. When the next steps are to get better data, he questions why good data was not gathered to start with to not be in the current position.

In response, Dr. Whitebrook stated the data systems were decentralized and set up as a beginning program to look at their own process and quality control. Additionally, there were questions about funding the program. Given this, building a comprehensive data system was not placed at the forefront. However, there is a real commitment among the Workforce Development Initiative Projects to do this.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding continued to express his disappointment at the lack of evaluation data, regardless of the reasons. This makes it much harder for Commissioners to determine the return on investment in terms of educational attainment. Secondly, Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented this was a very expensive program. On average, the cost is $3,700 per student. He said that the Commission needs to look at the County-wide impact, in addition to the specific areas where there is clearly demonstrated high levels of need. Approximately $52 million is being spent between the Consortium and this project. Given what is expected going forward, only a total of $90 million or $80 million after administrative costs, if the Commission is going to be spending at least $10 million per year on these projects, this equates to about 12 to 15 percent of the total budget on workforce development on preschools. He expressed concerned if this was strategically the right amount. Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding expressed concern about approving a project for five years when the Commission is about to have the strategic conversation on how to invest going forward. He did say that this project should be on the table but does not think, at this point, that an approving for five years of funding be made.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding suggested that this project be approved for another year and hope that the Commission can look at this strategically and decide how much the
Commission wants to invest overall in workforce. Furthermore, Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding hoped that the Commission would have better results that would warrant the money spent on evaluation.

Commissioner Nancy Au commented that millions of dollars were spent over the last two Board sessions on projects that do not even have track records. These projects were funded for multiple years; whereas, in this situation, there is a project where we have heard encouraging and positive results over a relative short period of time. She said that she did not understand Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding’s discrepancy in his logic.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding clarified that he was not suggesting that any of the things that have been approved in the last few months should be off the table in terms of funding. Everything seems to be on the table in terms of funding. He was suggesting that this should be part of all the things the Commission has decided may have much more than can be afforded. The recent things that have been approved may have to be cut back as well. He said he was not suggesting that this project be cut back disproportionately or in lieu of others.

Commissioner Nancy Au stated that in order to be consistent, the Commission should move forward on the motion and vote to approve, knowing that all of the previous projects that have also been approved will be on the table on an equal basis.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding agreed as long as it was clear that this project would be funded for five years but rather for up to five years, depending on the results of further strategic planning efforts. In this sense, Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding did not have a problem with as long as this is explicit in terms of people’s understanding and in terms of any contracts.

Commissioner Harriette Williams commented that as far as she was concerned, there are few things that the Commission could fund that would be more value-based than what we do to help the young people move to a better level of education and a better level of preparation in order to be able to help children the Commission serves. If a conversation needs to happen in terms of value, in terms of workforce, this is a high priority. As an educator, she thinks it is important to educate the workforce. She also stated that she has no problem with holding off on funding multiple years but agrees with Commissioner Nancy Au that it ought to be along with other projects that can be looked at in the same. Regarding evaluation needing to be data driven, Commissioner Harriette Williams said some things cannot be gotten that way as the Commission is dealing with human beings, personalities and life. The wonderful success stories that were heard today cannot be discounted in terms the evaluation.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding fully agreed with Commissioner Harriette Williams and thought that the qualitative evaluation was part of the overall evaluation; but he has heard from the evaluators, themselves, that they did not have the data to do the quantitative analysis which is equally important. Without this information, the Commission does not know whether the stories heard, however enlightening and uplifting, are representative.

Commissioner Harriette Williams commented that she believes the stories because she chooses to believe that they are representative.
Dr. Whitebrook commented that the stories are important to illustrate success but also agreed that quantitative data was necessary and would be seeking this data going forward.

Mayor Michael Antonovich stated that a member of the Board of Supervisors, the Supervisors will be looking at all of their programs and having to downsize because it is not known what is coming out of Sacramento. Changes will need to be made. If commitment is being made for a long-term contract, the wrong message is being sent because no one knows the outcome of the budget, which is a direct impact on the Commission’s ability to fund. When there are people 600 miles away wanting to take the Commission’s budget for their problem, instead of solving their problem, and letting the Commission work on programs with the money given by an initiative for specific programs, they are really confiscating the Commission’s resources for their errors and this is wrong. Everyone will need to go back and re-evaluate allocation of funding as soon as Sacramento comes down with their proposition.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that as part of the evaluation, he would hope that information on the earning power would be gathered. In trying to reduce the economic disparities, being able to understand how this contributes, in essence, a living wage on the part of young people and how this compares to others who may not have the use of these additional benefits would be an important part of this education evaluation because this cannot be separated from the productivity and vitality as a County.

Commissioner Marv Southard suggested that it might be useful to set up, from what is already known, what might be worthwhile benchmarks of achievement for the providers because, from experience, unless there is a benchmark against to measure providers, the dissemination of best practices is harder. Whereas a provider knows that they need to adopt a practice in order to punch up their outcomes, they are much more likely to adopt that practice if they see it as necessary.

Commissioner Angie Stockwell suggested that LAUP may want to have the Consortium look at the business division at LACOE through the business advisory services. For the educational services, she suggested LAUP look at LACOE’s career and workforce development and bring pieces into the Consortium.

Commissioner Angie Stockwell asked for clarification on the motion of Item 7 where the initiative is to be continued and linked with the Early Care Education Workforce Consortium. In addition, it says that the Workforce Development Initiative should partner with First 5 LA and LAUP. This means that the Consortium will not take into it but will link and work with in partnership. She expressed her support for this. Commissioner Angie Stockwell said that the contract should be left as is, focusing on policy.

Commissioner Nancy Au commented that she saw the power of the Consortium and also knows that there are some unexpected benefits from these programs working in a formalized structure but said that she was not totally convinced that the policy piece should not be embedded within the Consortium. She did state that the Commission could ensure that there was no degrading of the funding if the funding will remain intact, that it will go totally LACOE in order for them to do this policy work but that the policy activity will be in coordination with the other components that are impacting systems as well as policies.
Commissioner Antronette Yancey commented that she did not think there was any problem with coordination. As a matter of fact, this is always a very appropriate goal. She further commented that LACOE was also a part of the Consortium; and the Consortium was only channeling funding to the different programs.

Commissioner Nancy Au commented that a similar argument was that LACOE already has a working relationship and a funding relationship with the Consortium; so, what would be the down side of them also having that similar relationship with the policy piece because it is working successfully with those other two components. She did not see the down side to adding a third component which they are already doing the work.

Commissioner Nancy Au clarified that she wanted LACOE to go under LAUP in the Consortium. LAUP is the lead agency for the Consortium work and are funding two components that LACOE has been contracted to implement. She would like the policy piece to the Consortium to bring everything under one umbrella. Commissioner Nancy Au also stressed that she wanted to ensure there would be no disruption or reduction of the resources that go to the policy piece within the context of the Consortium.

Commissioner Antronette Yancey commented that the policy piece should be left with the folks that are doing it and are doing it effectively.

Commissioner Nancy Au commented that LACOE would continue to do the policy piece but within the work of the Consortium. Commissioner Antronette Yancey suggested having a memo of understanding to this effect.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that there were progress issues that resulted in ending the contract. If the contract was to continue with LACOE, Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that a clear message be sent to LACOE that they have to be carefully monitored and held to the same standard as any other contract. Going forward, it should be very clear what the benchmarks will be and how LACOE will be monitored.

**WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION AND NO OBJECTION, ITEM 6 AND 7 WERE SO ORDERED BY MAYOR MICHAEL ANTONOVICH.**

CPO Antonio Gallardo asked if LACOE was to have a performance-based contract. Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding suggesting that staff look at LACOE as they would look at other contracts that they have with respect to workforce development in terms of the quality of the monitoring, the clarity of benchmarks; nothing more, nothing less. Everybody needs to be treated the same with the same quality of monitoring and oversight; no more, no less.

Commissioner Angie Stockwell commented that a performance-based contract yield better progress.

8. Approval of a Strategic Partnership with the Los Angeles Partnership for Early Childhood Investment to Implement the Countywide Augmentation Proposal for a Funders’ Partnership in an Amount Not to Exceed $1.5 Million

Director Teresa Nuno commented that staff was seeking approval to establish the strategic partnership with the Los Angeles Partnership for Early Childhood Investment to
implement the County-wide augmentation proposal for a Funders’ Partnership in an amount not to exceed $1.5 million.

As part of the County-wide augmentation approvals in November, the Commission approved this in concept. At that time, staff was asked in the Community Investments Department to research and identify partnerships. Though the amount was approved, staff is making a recommendation to the Commission for approval. This partnership is part of the exciting opportunities that the Community Investments Department is going to be working with.

Through an analysis of funders’ collaboratives in Los Angeles County, staff identified the Los Angeles Partnership for Early Childhood Investment for its unique focus on increasing awareness and investments to support the needs of children prenatal to five and their families in Los Angeles County. Founded in 2003, the LA Partnership for Early Childhood Investment is a philanthropic funding collaborative comprised of some of the country’s largest private foundations, impactful family foundations and public funders of early childhood development who have the resources, intention and interest in leveraged grantmaking in early childhood. In addition, the Partnership’s members fiscal resources and its ability to support the goals of the Commission’s Strategic Plan has the immediate capacity to expedite the creation a pooled fund that will leverage First 5 LA funds through a required match. First 5 LA has been a member of the Partnership since its inception and remains an active participant in the Partnership’s various workgroups and committees.

Staff recommended a four year contract that would be renewed annually, not-to-exceed the total amount of $1.5 million in order to support the development and operation of a Funders’ Partnership. One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars annually (totaling $500,000 over four years) will be to support program operations and the remaining $1 million will be used to create a pooled grant fund. The $1 million will only be awarded as the Partnership secures funds and will be distributed as each match is secured.

M/S (Marv Southard / Michael Antonovich)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

9. Approval of Contract with Vavrinek Trine, Day & Company, LLP (VTD) for Auditing Services for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2011 in an Amount Not to Exceed $66,399

Mayor Michael Antonovich stated that the audit that will be conducted pursuant to the California law requires that each County Commission conducts the audit, issues its report on its financial activities during the procedural fiscal year. This audit contracts with the independent ad-hoc audit being conducted in consultation with the County-Auditor Controller. There is a little overlap between the two but both include a review of the Commission’s reserves; but the ad-hoc committee audit is in depth, focusing on how the reserves were established and categorized. Although the annual financial audit is necessary for fulfilling First 5 LA’s financial reporting requirements, that report is not going to be available until the end of the year, in October. The ad-hoc audit provides the Commission with current reliable numbers on First 5 LA’s committed and available resources now. To assist in analyzing the potential impact of the State budget actions, Phase I of the ad-hoc audit addresses the allocation of resources among the Commission’s programs and the quality of financial information provided to the Commission. These results would be expected in early May. Phase II of the audit covers the effectiveness of the Commission’s programs as compared to other jurisdictions based upon the findings of Phase
I, it includes a review of contracting processes unless we analyze that path, then we are bound to repeat those failures in the future, if there were failures. The annual financial audit required by California law does not address either of these two factors.

Finance Director Tracey Hause commented that it is the time of year when staff begins to prepare for the audit of the financial activities ending June 30, 2011. In doing so, a contract renewal is being recommended for Vavrinek Trine, Day & Company, LLP. California law does require that an audit be conducted and issue a report on financial activities for the preceding fiscal years. The financial reports, at a minimum, must include a review of the process to track and monitor administrative costs, a review of policies needed to assess and communicate the financial condition of the Commission, and document the results of those expenditures.

First 5 LA has historically completed an independent audited comprehensive annual financial report and has received the GFOA Award of Excellence in financial reporting and proposes to continue this practice. On February 18, 2010, First 5 LA released a Request for Proposal for auditing services. The terms of the RFP included but were not limited to a certified annual audit performed in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and evaluation of the adequacy of internal controls. Based on a thorough review of all proposals, staff recommended that firm of Vavrinek Trine, Day & Company to complete First 5 LA’s financial audits for five years. The initial contract began on May 1, 2010 and continues through April 30, 2011. Vavrinek Trine, Day & Company completed the audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010, which was presented and approved by Board of Commissioners on October 14, 2010. In order to meet the deadline of the State required October 15th for completed audits, written reports and Board of Commissioners approval, auditors began their field work in May. In keeping with the intent of the RFP process, staff recommends the renewal of the contract for Year 2 for auditing services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011 in an amount not to exceed $66,399.

10. Approval of Community Investments Department Funding Plan

Director Teresa Nuno reported that the Funders’ Partnership just approved folds into the set of activities being presented as part of the resource mobilization strategy. The activities include a range of projects such as strategic partnerships and future opportunities related to collaboration and networks for the purpose of leveraging.

Last June, Commissioners approved First 5 LA’s FY 2009 – 2015 Strategic Plan Implementation Plan including an $11 million allocation for the resource mobilization strategy. At the October 14, 2010, Commission meeting the Community Investments Department provided information regarding the resource mobilization framework and potential activities. Since the October 14, 2010 Commission meeting, the Community Investments Department has established strategic partnerships and is in the process of releasing RFPs and RFQs to leverage both fiscal and non-fiscal resources. There are three major approaches that the Department is engaging into support First 5 LA sustainability efforts including grantmaking, relationship building and information sharing.
Community Investments Department is providing grants through a competitive grant process and has already identified a number of strategic partnerships to leverage resources.

The establishment of a strategic partnership with the LA Partnership for Early Childhood Investment (the Partnership), is to begin in late March. The goal of the partnership is to increase the number of investors actively engaged in early childhood development programs. Five hundred thousand dollars of the approved $1.5 million allocation will be to support operations. The remaining $1 million will be matched by the Partnership and used to create a pooled grant fund for activities aligned with the current strategic plan.

A second strategic partnership with DonorsChoose.org, an online charity, to leverage resources to fund early learning projects in preschool and transitional kindergarten settings in Los Angeles County public schools is being negotiated. The concept is for First 5 LA to provide DonorsChoose.org with a 1:1 matching grant, which would allow DonorsChoose.org to leverage additional funding from the general public for early childhood education classroom projects that serve the First 5 LA target population. This investment will increase the visibility of First 5 LA strategic goal areas due to Donor’s Choose extensive on-line audience and public relations outreach. The partnership will be established in late March.

The main competitive grant opportunities to support leveraging fiscal resources include a matching funds program (modeled after the success of First 5 LA’s ARRA Matching Funds program), challenge grants, and social enterprise grants. An RFP will be released for the matching funds program by the end of March 2011. For the remainder of the grants, staff has determined that the most effective method will be to develop an RFQ to find an intermediary to implement the program. First 5 LA will remain involved in program design and the review process while working with an intermediary during implementation.

The purpose of the Matching Funds Program is to provide matching funds for community organizations to improve their odds of a successful application for non-First 5 LA funding. Non-First 5 LA funds include those available from the federal government and private philanthropies. For selected grantees, First 5 LA would commit to providing a cash match upon receipt of a successful application. This grant would be available to organizations seeking to expand existing programs or create new programs.

The Challenge Grant Program is a competitive grant for those organizations seeking to enhance, expand or sustain existing programs. For selected grantees, First 5 LA would commit upfront to matching any new funds raised by the grantee at a 1:1 match rate, up to a specified amount during the challenge timeframe (i.e., contract period). First 5 LA would also work with grantees to assess their resource development capacity and provide consultants (in addition to the cash grant) to support grantees’ resource development efforts to meet the challenge requirement.

The long-term goal of the Social Enterprise Grant Program is to increase the number of community organizations that are financially sustainable. The program will encourage and support non-profits who seek to meet their mission using earned income strategies. To accomplish this goal, First 5 LA would provide Los Angeles County non-profits with the capital necessary to build, grow, and diversify their revenue stream by implementing strategies to increase their income and resources. Earned income strategies including fee for service and establishing a for-profit venture would facilitate long term sustainability for non-profits to meet their mission beyond First 5 LA’s investment. The investment First 5 LA makes in such a program would result in sustainable organizations by generating revenue to implement their mission.
SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Relationship building activities will require First 5 LA to utilize its influence, visibility and resources as a leader in early childhood development to make connections, and develop and strengthen new and existing networks to facilitate leveraging of fiscal and non-fiscal resources. Staff and the Commissioners will work as partners to lead and facilitate the development of such relationships.

Information sharing is particularly important to ensuring communities are working effectively and efficiently in order to maximize resources. Sharing information about best practices is essential in order to leverage resources. In addition to the LA Partnership for Early Childhood Investments, the Community Investments Department has funded an additional three groups that will potentially leverage resources for Los Angeles County through sharing information about best practices and developing critical relationships.

The LA Place Based Learning Group was provided with $25,000 to develop relationships and share best practices among funders interested in and implementing place-based strategies. First 5 LA has been an active participant in the learning group for three years and initiated its founding in 2008. This learning group has grown to include a diverse blend of funders such as a community foundation, large private foundations, a quasi-public funding agency, Los Angeles County government programs, and small family foundations. In 2011, the learning group will continue to meet with four convenings. These learning exchange sessions allow a range of groups in the community investment field an opportunity to learn about timely issues, share their knowledge and problem-solve with their peers.

In conjunction with The California Endowment, First 5 LA contributed $20,000 to maintain operations and support of the LA Neighborhoods Revitalization Workgroup. Formed in January 2010, the workgroup’s membership includes Los Angeles County’s major public systems whose combined budgets represent more than $42 billion in local public investment. This workgroup is tasked with integrating public and philanthropic investments and initiatives in select distressed neighborhoods. Initially developed as a public/private coordinating body, the workgroup focused on supporting Los Angeles County’s applicants for the federal Promise Neighborhoods initiative. The workgroup’s integrated support and aligned strategies were a significant contributing factor to two Los Angeles neighborhoods receiving highly competitive federal planning grants. In 2011, the workgroup intends to broaden its scope to encompass a more strategic framework of neighborhood revitalization. This change recognizes that federal place-based efforts are increasingly integrated and that corresponding integration at the local level is critical. The workgroup’s purpose will be to (1) coordinate the public funders sector response to neighborhood efforts; (2) accelerate neighborhood-based participation in a coordinated, inter-agency planning process; (3) leverage anticipated Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative investments as well as other federal, state and local funding on behalf of neighborhood-based efforts in Los Angeles County, and (4) ensure public/private collaboration in planning, funding, and accountability systems with the County’s philanthropic leaders.

Staff is considering providing $15,000 to Advancement Project (AP) to produce a knowledge building and advocacy report. Advancement Project will conduct data analysis, and develop and disseminate a brief that identifies disparities in contracting for state child care funding and to identify strategies for how to reconcile those disparities. Advancement Project is engaging in this advocacy project because the California Department of Education’s (CDE) budgetary challenges and other issues have made it difficult for California Department of Education’s to conduct this type of review internally to bring about change within the system. By funding this opportunity, First 5 LA would support specific information sharing activities that can lead to improvements in Los Angeles County’s ability to leverage significant public funding to support
child care providers and promote the equitable distribution of public funding for child care across the state.

Staff is also exploring ways in which the Commission can support program related investments and strengthen existing collaborations and systems organized around efforts to leverage state, federal and private investments in communities. Opportunities such as the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative, which includes Promise Neighborhoods, Choice Neighborhoods and the Byrne Criminal Justice Program, can lead to increased funds for the County through the draw-down of federal funds should communities be successful in these efforts. Additionally, these community activities have generated cross-sector and cross-system collaborations as well as interest from private funders. Staff is exploring how First 5 LA can continue to support this work and increase the prominence of issues related to children 0-5 and their families.

Beyond the $11 million resource mobilization allocation, the Community Investments Department is also overseeing a portion of the Oral Health and Nutrition Project (OHN) and the Community Gardens Initiative (a countywide augmentation approval). Furthermore, the staff is coordinating with departments across First 5 LA to support sustainability of several projects. Per the Board's request, staff will report back to the Commissioners regarding lessons learned in June.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that he thought all things being proposed were meritorious. He commended staff for their work. However, Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that there is much less money and the Commission cannot do all things. He stated that these types of activities were wide open in terms of the type of entities that could be funded. Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding stressed that the criteria was very broad. In his view, the criteria needed to be narrowed. Furthermore, he stated this was a category that needed to be carefully observed over the next month, particularly those areas that are very strong. For instance, the challenge of the Matching Grant Program and the Collaboration Network Building, the Commission needs to be very clear on what are the priorities and that these activities directly related to them.

Director Teresa Nuno commented that Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding’s point was extremely well taken. There is much excitement about the type of opportunity that these funding approaches can also present. There is a strong sense that although resources may be limited, this kind of revenue generating approach is an opportunity for those that do have relationships with philanthropy, the corporate sector and the government. The proposed activities will provide an opportunity to leverage their assets.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman commented that the criterion is not having the ability to find a match. The criterion was that there be a program or an outcome that the Commission cares about and has the capacity to get a match. He cautioned staff to be very concrete on what kinds of programs or activities the Commission would want to match, and then find the best match for it.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman said that he had the privilege of attending the annual meeting of Grantmakers in Health. He said one of the workshops he attended focused on Program Related Investment and Mission Related Investment. The Program Related Investment says what type of investment to get a double bottom line—outcomes and revenue generation. Mission Related Investments are similar but an endowment is used and has less risk.
Commissioner Neal Kaufman further commented that $500,000 for the Social Enterprise Program compared to other activities is not the right amount. He would prefer to see a way to help stimulate the non-profit organizations that meet the criteria to help them become self-sufficient through revenue streams. Whether it is helping them to write the business plan or whether it is the Commission actually funding the business relationship as working capital for them as a company, this needs further expansion.

He asked that staff periodically provide the Commission with a report card—who was funded, what was the match, what was leveraged. Commissioner Neal Kaufman asked for actual numbers to be presented rather than percentages.

Commissioner Angie Stockwell commended staff on their work. She was pleased with the proposed activities.

M/S (Nancy Au / Michael Antonovich)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED WITHOUT OBJECTION

11. Approval of Contract for Richards, Watson & Gershon to Continue Providing Legal Services in an Amount Not to Exceed $75,000

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED WITHOUT OBJECTION

12. Approval of Bylaw Revisions

Mayor Michael Antonovich thanked Legal Counsel Craig Steele for the preparation of the changes to the bylaws and incorporation comments from the various Commissioners. Before starting the discussion, Mayor Antonovich introduced an amendment to Page 104 of the packet, which reads, the Chair or Chief Executive Officer may cancel or continue a meeting in case of a lack of a quorum or lack of business to be transacted, and asked that this be amended to read, the Chair may cancel or continue a meeting in case of a lack of a quorum or lack of business to be transacted.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele reported that the Commission was required by County ordinance to have bylaws by which the Commission operates. A lot of the document before the Commissioners represents his intent to clean up the document to reflect current practices of the Commission. The Commission has progressed from having two meetings a month in a system where one meeting was of the Commission of the Whole. The administrative provisions of the bylaws have been updated with these changes being self-explanatory. Each of the changes is shown in strikeout or underline type throughout the document.

The genesis of this project was the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance. In discussions that were held last year regarding committee structure of the Commission. The committee structure has evolved over a period of time. Under the Brown Act, there are two types of committees that a body, such as the Commission, can have; both consisting of less than a quorum of the body. A standing committee is one that is created by official action of the full body, has a regular meeting schedule, an unlimited term, and meets in compliance with the Brown Act with agenda being posted and meetings open to the public. Even
though it is a subcommittee of the larger body, other members of the Commission, in this case, would be permitted to attend, although not participate in the meetings of a standing committee.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman asked for clarification regarding Commissioners being permitted to attend a standing committee but not participate in such meeting. Legal Counsel Steele clarified that Commissioners could listen but not vote or try to influence the decision.

The other type of committee is an ad hoc committee. This is a committee that is appointed not by formal action of the Commission but rather by the Chair for a limited purpose and a limited time. In the case of the Operations Committee, over the years, the Commission has always treated that committee as an ad hoc committee because it always appointed not by the Commission but by the Chair. Members of that committee were always appointed by the Chair and had a limited term because each time the Commission changed Chairs, once a year, the new Chair would appoint new members of the Operations Committee. The function of the Operations Committee was always to give feedback and advice, make recommendations to the full Commission but never to make binding decisions on the part of the Commission.

Commissioner Angie Stockwell commented that in the written report, reference was made to the Attorney General’s Office adoption of a rule of thumb of limited duration. Does rule of thumb provide for flexibility.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele said there was some level of flexibility. There is no statute that says limited duration means a specific amount of time. Over the years since that type of committee was introduced, more and more attorneys who practice in this area are looking at a six-month window for an ad hoc committee. Anything longer than six-months starts to resemble more of a standing committee. However, there was no specific law regarding duration of the life of a committee but six-months is modern practice.

The Operations Committee is treated as an ad hoc committee. Over the last couple of years, the ad hoc committee has not met regularly. It has had more of a sporadic meeting schedule, once a couple of months. The committee comes together for a specific purpose over a limited period of time. However, there was discussion in the process of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee as they were looking at these issues and ways to promote participation with a sharing of information among all Commissioners and to try to find a way to get more information what happens or is discussed at the Operations Committee.

With regard to the Operations Committee, options include an Executive Committee which is what the Ad Hoc Governance Committee suggests as the name of the committee that would be either a standing committee that complies with the Brown Act (i.e., posted agenda, public meetings) or a truly ad hoc committee appointed by the Chair of the Commission every time there is a need for a meeting. In the suggested structure, the Vice Chair of the Commission would Chair the Executive Committee and two other Commissioners, voting members, would be asked to meet as the Executive Committee, whenever the Executive Committee needed to meet. The committee would not have a regular meeting schedule. The Executive Committee could meet on the audit and the evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer. During the course of the year, different Commissioners could serve on the Executive Committee, depending on who the Chair
The other option is to have a standing committee, appointed by the Chair, with a regular meeting schedule, the agendas are posted, and any Commissioner or member of the public could attend these meetings. This type of committee would still be entitled to hold Closed Sessions on issues such as employment matters, compliance issues, and litigation to protect confidentiality. In terms of evaluating the options, if the Commission believes it is more important to have the structure and the formality and the ability for Commissioners to attend but not participate in the Executive Committee meetings, then the Commission should favor a standing committee. If the Commission favors the efficiency and nimbleness of an ad hoc committee in a more private setting, then the Commission should favor ad hoc Executive Committee. In either case, language has been put into the proposal that would limit the jurisdiction of the Executive Committee and there is specific language about the Committee’s charge. The Executive Committee cannot make decisions on behalf of the Commission.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that he favored an ad hoc committee structure because it is more flexible and the meetings can be convened on short notice, if needed, on issues such as the state budget.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman asked if the Executive Committee was to be an ad hoc committee, would the minutes from those meetings be public or private if shared with all Commissioners. Legal Counsel Craig Steele commented that once minutes are shared with all Commissioners, they would become a public document, like any other document that provided to Commissioners.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman further inquired if it would be legal for detailed minutes to be provided to the Executive Committee and the rest of Commissioners with a summary of meeting highlights. Legal Counsel Craig Steele responded this was not a fair way of conducting business as there would be two sets of information. As of right now, the Operations Committee uses action minutes and not a transcript.

Commissioner Duane Dennis commented that Commissioners have previously received minutes from the Operations Committee. CEO Evelyn Martinez clarified that minutes were, at one time, provided to Commissioners in their FYI folders. Commissioner Neal Kaufman requested that this past practice continue.

Commissioner Marv Southard expressed his support for an ad hoc committee structure because of the flexibility that is needed at this time by the Commission.

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard) APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED WITHOUT OBJECTION

The second option is with regard to the Planning and Public Affairs Committee. He suggested that the Planning Committee be treated as a standing committee of the Commission with posted meeting agenda. Under this structure, any member of the Commission could attend and participate in a meeting of the Planning Committee. The advantage of this option is to continue to operate with current practice. This creates the opportunity for the Commission to take action on pressing issues between regularly scheduled Commission Meetings. This provides flexibility for staff in the rare occasion that a decision needs to be made.
The Planning Committee could also be an ad hoc committee but it is a bit harder since the committee has a continuing subject matter function, needing continuity and formality. The proposal of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee was to combine the Planning and Public Affairs Committees. This option is also provided. A suggestion is that the Planning Committee would be separate with Public Affairs Liaisons. The Liaisons, voting and/or non-voting Commissioners, would serve in a Public Affairs Liaison role rather than a full broader Commission. Making the Planning Committee a standing committee would be consistent with current practices.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman commented why the Planning Committee could not be a Committee of the Whole. It seems strange to have four members appointed, who are the voting members, and the other Commissioners could attend meetings but not participate. Legal Counsel Craig Steele stated that the concern was when there were two Committee of the Whole meetings, frequently a quorum could not be established at the second meeting. The intent was to make the quorum smaller.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman clarified that the role of the Planning Committee was not to take votes that are binding for the Commission, except for the extraordinary extra meeting. The Planning Committee meetings are geared more toward providing staff with guidance. Commissioner Neal Kaufman commented that he did not have a problem with the Planning Committee being a public meeting in accordance with the Brown Act. He asked why the issue of a quorum was important if this committee had not been delegated with the authority to make binding decisions on behalf of the Commission.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele said that basic Robert Rules of Order requires a quorum at a committee meeting. In practical terms, the agendas for the committee would read Planning Committee and Commission Meeting. This would be in effect a meeting of the Commission, if quorum was present; with no quorum, it would not matter as it would be a committee meeting.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman asked why the Planning Committee did not have the word “program” as part of the title. This implies or states that a meeting is convened to discuss only what is going to happen in the future rather than evaluate what is happening presently or has happened in the past. It seemed to Commissioner Neal Kaufman that this committee should be called the Program & Planning Committee, with the Chair deciding what was to be discussed at this committee meeting.

Commissioner Duane Dennis expressed his support for the committee name change and also agreed that Public Affairs component be separated out of the Planning Committee.

Commissioner Nancy Au asked if the Planning Committee was a standing committee, would there be appointed Commissioners as well as non-appointed Commissioners who would choose to attend the meeting but not be allowed to speak or engage in voting or decision-making.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele responded that non-appointed Commissioners to the Planning Committee would be allowed to attend, to speak but would not be allowed to vote as a member of the Planning Committee on certain items. As a practical matter, if some big decision was being brought forward, then the meeting would be noticed as a meeting of the Commission and a meeting of Planning Committee so that a vote could be taken. Other
Commissioners, not members of the Planning Committee, would not be allowed to vote on Planning Committee items.

Commissioners Duane Dennis commented that decisions of the Planning Committee would still require full Commission approval as the committee would not be independent decision on behalf of the full Commission.

Commissioner Harriette Williams commented that the Public Affairs Committee currently provides technical assistance to staff. Given this, she saw the Public Affairs Committee having more an ad hoc committee structure.

Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding asked if having Public Affairs Liaisons should be considered. These Liaisons would be appointed by the Chair as serve as liaisons to Public Affairs activities as opposed to have another committee.

Commissioner Marv Southard suggested having a Public Affairs Committee as an ad hoc committee because liaisons, in the history of the Commission, have meant various things. Rather than confuse what the meaning is of liaisons, a committee should be formed like in any other organization.

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard) APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AS AMENDED

After the vote, Commissioner Neal Kaufman referenced Page 95 of the meeting packet, under Section II, Intent, and stated that “0” was not prenatal. He asked that the word “prenatal” be inserted in lieu of the “0” and the words “health and” be inserted before development.

Commissioner Antronette Yancey referenced Page 102 of the meeting packet, under Section I, Administration and stated that more clarity was needed for Subsection A as it was too vague.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman commented that there are working policies that give CEO Evelyn V. Martinez guidance and authority.

Commissioner Deanne Tilton commented that insofar as the ex-officio members are excluded from several roles in the bylaws, she was interested in knowing how much of this was required by the State law, how much was Commission policy, how much was interpretation, and would like to know what other membership rights ex-officio members have aside from not being able to vote.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele commented that ex-officio membership was not provided by Proposition 10. The proposition did not create any ex-officio membership. He also stated that he was not aware of any public entity in California other than First 5 LA that has ex-officio members in his 20 years of experience.

When the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors adopted the ordinance, they adopted a section of the ordinance that said the Commission shall request of certain organizations to send a representative to have ex-officio status on the Commission to lend their expertise in appropriate matters. This is only law that Legal Counsel Craig Steele is aware of.
Commissioner Deanne Tilton commented that she understood that ex-officio members had the same membership rights voting members but wanted clarification on quorum and voting privileges. She further asked if this was the law or policy.

Commissioner Neal Kaufman stated that ex-officio members cannot vote because the law states that the Commission is comprised of nine members. By practice, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission cannot be ex-officio members. Commissioner Neal Kaufman inquired if it was appropriate for ex-officio members to Chair the Programs & Planning Committee. He asked that it be clear as to what ex-officio members can and cannot do.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele referenced Page 97 of the meeting packet, under Section II, Ex-Officio Representative and stated this was a repeat of what the County ordinate states.

Commissioner Deanne Tilton commented that she did not understand why ex-officio members could not serve as Committee Chairs. She felt that ex-officio members of the Commission work just as hard as voting members and wanted to have the playing field as evenly as possible within the law.

Commissioner Duane Dennis commented that the “Policy Roundtable for Child Care” was the correct name of the entity he represents and not the “Policy Roundtable for Child Care Advisory Board. He asked that a correction be made.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele reiterated that ex-officio members had the same membership rights of voting members with the exception of serving as Committee Chairs. This was dictated by State law.

Commissioner Deanne Tilton disagreed with this opinion and stated that she did not believe that State law or the County Ordinance prohibited ex-officio members from serving as Committee Chairs.

CEO Evelyn V. Martinez commented that the Commission has set a precedent by having a former ex-officio Commission member serve as Chair of the Planning Committee.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele commented that based on the discussion, he would remove language from the proposed bylaw changes that stated that ex-officio members could not serve Chair of the Planning Committee; with this change, any member of the Commission could serve as Chair of the Program & Planning Committee.

Mayor Michael Antonovich called for a vote the Commission on the proposed bylaw changes, as amended during discussion, as a package.

M/S (Nancy Au / Michael Antonovich) APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AS AMENDED WITH NO OBJECTIONS

NOTE: Mayor Michael Antonovich combined Items 13 and 14 into one item.

13. UPDATE: Oral Health Community Development (OHCD) Project

14. UPDATE: Oral Health and Nutrition Project
Oral Health & Nutrition

Mayor Michael Antonovich commented that he had requested both presentations as part of the February 10th motion that he introduced before the Commission on oral health and nutrition.

Director Teresa Nuno commented that staff would be presenting the plan for the remaining balance of Oral Health & Nutrition Project which totals $12.8 million. The balance includes $5.9 million remaining from the original $10 million allocation to oral health. The update being provided was in response to the request made in February.

The Oral Health and Nutrition Expansion and Enhancement Project was approved by the Commission in October 2006, with an allocation of $10 million for the purpose of promoting good oral health and nutrition for young children and their families in L.A. County. To date, through this project, the Commission has funded initiatives that have expanded or will expand services to approximately 88,000 children 0-5 and/or their parents across Los Angeles County. The Commission also funded a first-time research project that identified and established a baseline on the oral health needs of children 0-5 and the barriers to care.

We also funded the Pediatric Oral Health Access Program, which is a free training program that provides a sustainable increase in access to dental care by providing general dentists with increased skills and comfort level needed to treat young children, including children with physical and/or developmental disabilities. The Commission also funded a pilot project as part of a statewide partnership with Sesame Street to examine the efficacy of the healthy habits toolkit for non-exempt childcare providers.

Of the original OHN allocation from 2006, approximately $4.1 million is expended, contracted or encumbered to date. These dollars have leveraged an additional $4.3 million in funding from other public and private foundations including the California Wellness Foundation, L.A. Care Health Plan, Annenberg Foundation, Kaiser Permanente Community Benefits, as well as Health Research and Services Administration (HRSA) funding. In total, the OHN project has leveraged a 1:1 cash match on funding as well as increased the level of collaboration and partnerships across various networks of oral health providers and funders serving children 0-5. In June 2010, an additional $6.9 million dollars from the Oral Health and Community Development (OHCD) initiative were re-directed to the OHN project.

In the Fall of 2010, staff assessed both the accomplishments and challenges from the OHN project and began to identify ways to expedite the distribution of funds associated with this project. The economic downturn and cuts to funding for oral health-related projects also forced staff to re-evaluate its strategy. Staff drafted a plan that incorporates lessons learned from First 5 LA's oral health partners. This plan also allows the Commission to be responsive to the oral health needs of children and families while identifying ways to capitalize on timely opportunities available through the new federal health care legislation.

Based on lessons learned from the past five years, staff has prepared a revised solicitation without a matching requirement with emphasis on direct preventative and restorative dental services, which have been identified by pediatric dental providers.

The primary goal of this $4.4 million funding opportunity is to expand access to dental care for children 0-5 by establishing dental homes in community clinics and providing training and technical assistance to providers in order to enhance their clinical and administrative
operations necessary to adequately serve children 0-5 and their parents. First 5 LA’s funding opportunity to establish dental homes will support: (1) Early Intervention for children to receive their first dental visit by age one; (2) Risk Assessment that target Primary Care Providers, Pediatricians, and Family Practitioners to assess children’s oral health and refer children to dentists to establish “dental homes” for young children and their parents; (3) Anticipatory Guidance to educate parents and caregivers about the importance of good nutrition and oral hygiene; and (4) Individualized Prevention and Disease Management to deliver comprehensive oral care to young children.

Funding for provider training and technical assistance will focus on strategies to: (1) create oral health service partnerships to address or reduce systemic barriers that prevent infants and young children to access and receive pediatric dental care services, (2) increase cross-referrals between medical and dental professionals; (3) raise parents’ knowledge about the transmission of dental caries; (4) expand the number of general dentists that treat children aged 0-5; (5) increase the number of children 0-5 with access to comprehensive oral care; and (6) strengthen programmatic and administrative functions such as targeted outreach and education to families with young children, billing and accounting procedures, and customer service, which are important for long-term sustainability. (Revised solicitation and linkage to full-service pilots)

In response to the board’s decision to allocate $2.8 million toward capital improvements staff is preparing a Request for Proposals to address the issues faced by providers which pose barriers to increasing access to early dental care services. The goal of the capital improvement fund is to strengthen and expand the capacity of the health and dental care safety net overall for children and their families.

Per the Chair’s request staff is moving forward to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to advise on the implementation of the OHN project. Staff is currently engaging in conversations with many stakeholders and experts in the field focused on delivering dental care services to children 0-5. They are positioned to advise on the implementation of OHN Project activities because these groups are adopting many of these proposed strategies and implementing them into their practice. Examples of stakeholders staff has connected with include but are not limited to the Oral Health Access Council (OHAC), California Healthcare Foundation, the Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County, L.A. Care Health Plan, the LA Health Collaborative and the Los Angeles County School Health Center Policy Roundtable.

Staff is currently in negotiation with four partners that will enable the Commission to leverage its overall investment in oral health. These partnerships involve community clinics, a dental university as well as L.A. Care Health Plan. These efforts will expand and enhance access to services for children 0-5. They are estimated to expend nearly up to $2.6 million dollars over a three year period. Staff expects contracts to be executed before June 2011.

In addressing the Commission’s request for full-service partnership pilots and strategically develop full-service partnership sustainability, staff is in the process of reviewing the oral health provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The objective of these efforts is to identify timely opportunities that will strengthen the dental safety net in L.A. County and prepare to enhance and expand the capacity of oral health providers to service children 0-5. Strategies that are being explored include utilizing emerging technologies such as tele-dentistry, mobile dentistry, and innovative workforce strategies such as the use of dental school residents and registered dental assistants. Staff is also exploring ways to support the oral health component of full-service partnerships with an emphasis on reaching children in community settings such as schools, school-based health centers, Head Start/Early Head Start sites, early care and education sites, WIC centers and others. These efforts will capitalize on
Staff has also identified the importance of advocating for policy change related to oral health at the state and federal level, as well as of ensuring that there is adequate funding support in this area. First 5 LA’s policy agenda supports children’s oral health issues through its policy goal to promote affordable, comprehensive health insurance for all. Staff is in contact with stakeholders across the county and state such as OHAC, California Healthcare Foundation, and the Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County in an effort to promote awareness about the oral health needs of children in LA County. These activities are ongoing and will support the effort to identify sustainable oral health funding and partnerships.

Finally, staff will continue to include oral health and nutrition messages as part of its ongoing public education campaigns with the remaining balance of the OHN marketing allocation. Each February, First 5 LA supports National Children’s Dental Health Month, and in 2012 First 5 LA will ask its partners to share their accomplishments and lessons learned in order to build a countywide effort at sustaining the progress of these various oral health activities and ultimately increase funding sources.

**Oral Health Community Development**

In September 2007, the Commission approved the $20 million Oral Health Community Development (OHCD) Project aimed at preventing dental decay in children through community water fluoridation and related public education and advocacy activities. The primary focus of the OHCD Project is to fund water fluoridation infrastructure and related public education activities to improve the oral health of children in LA County from the prenatal stage through age five. The OHCD Project funding included a one-time cost based on a competitive, first-come-first-serve strategy over a three-year period (2008-2010). An OHCD Workgroup was established to advise the process.

Since 2008, extensive work was conducted by the workgroup, staff, technical experts and community leaders. Some of the lesson learned include the extent of effort required to obtain the necessary city council resolutions, assess and advocate the public will to fluoridate, and the need to take into consideration individual water companies and internal processes including the capacities to support labor and maintenance cost which remain outside the scope of First 5 LA’s RFP.

Director Elizabeth Iida provided a summary of the financial history of the allocation for OHCD from January, 2009 through March, 2011 totaling $15,569,605. Additionally, the four water agencies that have received funding are collectively serving approximately 622,000 residents, of which over 31,000 are children ages 0-5.

Going forward, First 5 LA will continue to promote OHCD through the RFP which remains posted on the First 5 LA website to inform all municipalities and water agencies, including those that have not previously expressed interest, that the opportunity for funding to implement fluoridation systems is still available.

Mayor Michael Antonovich thanked the staff for an excellent report. He stated that despite the extended solicitation there are still $5 million available.
Mayor Michael Antonovich introduced a motion to move the remaining $5 million from the Oral Health Community Development Fund Project to the Oral Health & Nutrition Project, subject to the directives of Oral Health & Nutrition Motion approved at the February Commission Meeting. This will accelerate additional direct dental health services to the under age five and pregnant women populations throughout the County of Los Angeles who are in need of such oral hygienic services.

M/S (Michael Antonovich / Jonathan Fielding)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED WITH NO OBJECTIONS

Commissioner Angie Stockwell commended and thanked CEO Evelyn V. Martinez for the work she did in the re-organization to align the work of the Commission with the new strategic plan. Commissioner Angie Stockwell also thanked Directors Armando Jimenez, Carol Baker and Teresa Nuno for their work prior to the new re-organization, especially for their timely responses to requests for information and assistance in bringing clarity to issues that needed more understanding by Commissioners. Furthermore, she also acknowledged these Directors for the institutional memory they continue to maintain on Commission projects and issues.

15. Public Comment

SP Andrade, Lennox School District
Julie Benavides, East Los Angeles College
Kathleen Bimber, Los Angeles City College
Ryan Bonillas, CPPEER
Jeffrey Caperton, People Coordinated Services
David Crippens, Unite LA
Cathy Ellis, Bright Horizons
Bonnie Freeman, National Center for Family Literacy
Amy Grodzienski
Jon Gundry, LACOE
Roberta Lanterman, Long Beach Family Literacy
Frank Lozano, Student
Renee Martinez, East Los Angeles College
Alex Morales, Children’s Bureau
Alondra Murcia, Pierce College
Ana Najera, Drew CDC
Donna Rafanello, Long Beach City College
Larry Reed, WIFI Project
Katherine Reuter, Saint John’s Child & Family Development Center
Jennifer Romero, Cal State L.A.
Carol Salazar, HP-Bell CAS-Family Literacy
Virginia Santos, Bienvenidos-East Los Angeles
ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:47 pm.

The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be on:

April 14, 2011 at 1:30 pm
Multi-Purpose Room
750 N. Alameda Street
Los Angeles, CA  90012

Meeting minutes were recorded by Maria Romero.