

FIRST 5 LA

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES
Commission Meeting
April 12, 2012

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Commissioners:

Jane Boeckmann
Philip Browning
Cynthia "Cindy" Harding (Alternate)
Neal Kaufman
Antronette Yancey
Zev Yaroslavsky (Chair)

Ex-Officio Commissioners:

Patricia Curry
Arturo Delgado
Duane Dennis
Deanne Tilton

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Commissioners:

Nancy Au [Excused]
Jonathan Fielding (Vice Chair) [Excused]
Marv Southard [Excused]

STAFF PRESENT:

Craig Steele, Interim Chief Executive Officer
Yolanda Bosch, Chief Administrative Officer
Antonio Gallardo, Chief Program Officer
Armando Jimenez, Director of Research & Evaluation
Raoul Ortega, Interim Finance Director
Maggie Martinez, Director of Human Resources
Francisco Oaxaca, Director of Public Affairs
Maria Romero, Executive Assistant

LEGAL COUNSEL:

None

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

1. Chair Yaroslavsky called the meeting to order at 1:36 pm. Quorum was present.

The Commission met in a closed session prior to the regularly scheduled Commission meeting. There was no reportable action taken.

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 2 – 4)

2. Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes – Thursday, March 8, 2012

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

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

3. Approval of the Monthly Financial Statements for the Month Ending February 29, 2012

Interim Director Ortega presented the regular monthly financial statements for the Commission's review. Staff has historically provided monthly financial reports for the Commission's approval. In an effort to ensure transparency of the financial status of the Commission, more detailed financial information was provided for the month ending February 29, 2012 on pages 16 through 87 of the meeting packet. Interim Director Ortega noted that because the final judgment on AB 99 was made in March, the balance sheet on page 16 would continue to reflect the liability since reporting was being made for the month of February.

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

4. Approve New Contracts and Proposed Amendments for Existing Contracts and Grant Agreements in Support of Initiatives Approved as Part of the FY 2011-12 Programmatic and Operating Budgets for the Period of April 1, 2012 to April 30, 2012 and Authorize Staff to Complete Final Contract Execution Upon Approval from the Board. Authorize Staff to Begin the Contract and Grant Renewal Process for Those That Have an Effective Date on or After July 1, 2012 and Complete Final Contract Execution Upon Board Approval of the FY 2012-13 Budget and Authorize Staff to Complete Final Contract Execution Upon Approval from the Board.

CAO Bosch reported that every month, for the past five months, staff has been bringing to the Commission items on the consent calendar. The consent calendar items presented new contracts as well as proposed amendments for existing contracts and grant agreements.

**M/S (Cynthia Harding / Jane Boeckmann)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

COMMISSION: (Items 5 – 16)

5. Announcements by the Commission Chair

Chair Yaroslavsky welcomed Philip Browning to the Commission. Mr. Browning joins the Commission as a voting member, representing the Department of Child and Family Services.

Chair Yaroslavsky also welcomed Dr. Arturo Delgado to the Commission. Dr. Delgado joins the Commission as an ex-officio member, representing the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

Chair Yaroslavsky welcomed Dr. Antronette Yancey back from her leave of absence. Speaking on behalf of the Commission, Chair Yaroslavsky commented everyone was glad to see her return.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

6. Interim Chief Executive Officer's Report

In addition to the written report, the following items were highlighted:

- **AB 99 Decision:** The State of California decided not to appeal the AB 99 lawsuit results where the First 5 Commissions were successful in invalidating that bill. AB 99 would have taken half of the County Commissions' revenue for State purposes. There is a pending motion by the Counties to recover attorney fees and that motion will be heard in May.
- **Staff Work Plan:** In the FYI folder, a copy of the latest update to the staff work plan in response to the Harvey M. Rose audit was provided with changes noted in red. Some of the items are already at 100 percent completion. Some of the items on the agenda, if approved, will take some of the other items to 100 percent completion as well. Staff is making good progress in adopting the policies and procedures that the Harvey M. Rose audit report called for. The work plan has been made available to the public and will be posted on the First 5 LA website. This practice will continue until all recommendations are fully adopted and implemented.

Commissioner Kaufman commented that part of the Harvey M. Rose audit report included a reporting obligation to the Board of Supervisors on the Commission's progress. He asked if a quarterly report was going to be provided. If so, he asked if the Commission would have an opportunity to review it prior to submission to the Board of Supervisors. Interim CEO Steele responded the first official quarterly report would be brought to the Commission for approval in June and then subsequently be submitted to the Board of Supervisors.

7. Adopt Resolution 2012-04 Approving the Proposed Third Quarter Budget Amendments to the FY 2011-12 Adopted Program Budget

Interim Director Ortega reported that staff is requesting the approval of Resolution 2012-04, approving the proposed third quarter budget amendment to the FY 2011-12 adopted program budget. The resolution will increase the February 2012 amended budget from \$182,249,147 by an additional \$1.4 million for a total of \$183,630,379. The increases are reflected on page 144 of the meeting packet. The increases are related to the 50 Parks Initiative for \$1,050,000, Families In Schools for \$31,000, and a Workforce Development Initiative under public education for \$300,000. These actions have been previously presented to the Commission as contract actions; and now for the purpose of amending the program budget.

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

8. Public Hearing Regarding Adoption of Revised Commission Policies and Procedures

CAO Bosch reported that four policy amendments were being presented for review and approval. The proposed policy amendments are in response to the findings of the Harvey M. Rose audit report and are intended to formalize and more completely

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

document decisions of the Commission related to budget and fiscal matters as well as, more clearly define other policies. The Budget & Finance Committee has reviewed the proposed policies a and b. Policies c and d are existing policies previously approved by the Commission and have simply been revised for ease of understanding.

a. Policy and Guidelines for Selecting Strategic Partners

With respect to the issuing of strategic partnerships, First 5 LA was criticized by the Harvey M. Rose audit report as having awarded a significant number of sole-source contracts or strategic partnerships without properly or adequately documenting justification. In response, this revised policy establishes consistent and specific criteria for making those decisions. In this instance, the Chief Executive Officer would be delegated the authority to make decisions on proposed strategic partnerships less than \$25,000; with all proposals for greater amounts subject to Commission approval. Decisions of the Chief Executive Officer would be required to be transmitted to the Board. In either case, the proposed strategic partnerships would require the written findings specified in the policy and those written findings would then be required documentation and maintained in the contract file.

b. Procurement Policy

The procurement policy addresses some procedural shortcomings in the Commission's existing contracting and solicitation policies and procedures. The auditors suggested that the Commission establish specific dollar thresholds for the contracting processes. For goods and services with less than \$5,000 in the aggregate annually, a formal bidding process would not be required. This is consistent with existing practices. Larger contracts are prohibited from being broken into smaller amounts to avoid bidding. All other contracts would require a competitive process unless certain exceptions specified in the policy existed. Those exceptions are part of existing policies and are taken directly from the State-wide First 5 Procurement Guide. All exceptions are required to be documented and, under the proposed policy amendment, the Chief Executive Officer would have the authority to approve contracts less than \$25,000 in the aggregate with full Commission approval on all other contracts.

c. Policy Against Supplanting

The policy against supplanting is in place to ensure that Commission funds are being used to take the place of or replace State or local general fund monies for any purpose. Commission funds can only be used to supplement, which means that it can add to or increase existing levels of service but not to fund existing levels of service. The proposed amendment to the existing policy is intended to make those decisions more specific and to permit the Commission to require documentation that funds that have been used to supplement and not supplant. Commission funds can be used to fund programs that no longer exist as long as official documentation is received confirming that the program is no longer in existence.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

d. Conflict of Interest

Finally, as a public agency, First 5 LA Commissioner and staff must try to avoid conflicts of interest and perceived impropriety. The proposed policy amendment adds language from case law relating to avoiding the appearance of impropriety and serve to remind Commissioners and staff have the personal obligation to avoid conflicts and perceived or potential conflicts. This change does not affect the Commission's existing Conflict of Interest Code which remains in effect.

Commissioner Harding commented she was in support of all the policies. She asked that the language in the second bullet on page 126 of the meeting packet on supplanting be further clarified. Commissioner Harding said that she had no problem with the existing language but felt that it was confusing in that if a federal or state funding stream was terminated, First 5 LA could fund that program if the other funding went away. The way it is written implied that the program would have to be changed.

CAO Bosch responded that clarifying language could be added to that section of the policy. She said that key to the policy was the documentation.

Interim CEO Steele stated that there was no statute on the definition of supplanting. Every County Commission has a different interpretation. The Commission has consistently interpreted supplanting to mean that if complete funding goes away, the Commission can then step in and replace that funding. There has never been a percentage (i.e. 50 percent) versus some other percentage. Interim CEO Steele said that it is quite easy to say there is a 50 percent cut to a program; when, in fact, that is not the case because of alternate funding sources or unspent funding. Because of these variations, the Commission has taken the position that if funding is gone completely, then it steps in; otherwise, the Commission pays for a supplement.

Chair Yaroslavsky stated that it seemed to him that if appropriating money to a program is completely gone because it looks less like supplanting than erecting a new program, there ought to be a decent interval between when the program gets cut and the time it qualifies for funding. If a program is completely shut down by the State, the Commission will be under pressure to fund programs that are partially or completely shut down. The problem is that the Commission has more cash at the moment than anybody else; so everybody is being sent to the Commission. Chair Yaroslavsky commented this was one of those policies that looked good on paper but not in practice.

Interim CEO Steele commented that some Commissions have a time lag provision in the policy. That was presented to the Commission as an option when this policy was first introduced a few years back; and the Commission decided not to have a formal time lag. This is a valid policy because there is no legal definition of supplanting.

Chair Yaroslavsky asked how the Mental Health Services Act worked as the act had a non-supplantation provision in that statute. He commented that this may be

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

something worth looking into because it is rigorously adhered to. CAO Bosch responded that it would be done.

Interim CEO Steele suggested that the situation be remedied by adding the following clarifying language: "...previously existing project or program funded by state or local general funds, *unless the existing funding has been terminated* or the Grantee..." This places both elements in. Commissioner Harding commented that she agreed with the suggested clarifying language.

Commissioner Kaufman asked if general fund money versus other monies was specific in the statute. Interim CEO Steele responded in the affirmative, specifically noted in the Revenue and Taxation Code. Commissioner Kaufman asked if local funds were included in the original Proposition 10 language or was it just State funding. Interim CEO Steele responded that, originally, it was ambiguous as the statute only referenced general fund. Local funds were added because of standardization.

Commissioner Dennis asked that the Commission take into consideration the current state of affairs and that it have more flexibility on the supplantation issue as opposed to rigidity. He would hope the Commission was as flexible as possible.

Chair Yaroslavsky said the Commission has the capacity to be flexible but cautioned everyone about showing too much flexibility because there are a lot of cuts that are happening, a lot more cuts are coming, and if there was any inkling that this organization was going to step into the breach, and then a real problem would be at hand. He commented that everything had to be calibrated against the intermediate term plan the Board has on how it is going to spend its money of the next several years and where it is going to be making its investments.

Interim CEO Steele commented that the amount of the Commission's flexibility past 2013 was going to be reduced quickly based on revenue forecasts and projections.

**M/S (Cynthia Harding / Zev Yaroslavsky)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED WITH INCLUSION OF THE
CLARIFYING LANGUAGE TO THE SUPPLANTING POLICY**

9. Approval of the Process for Selecting and Retaining an Expert Compensation Consulting Firm to Conduct a Benefit and Wage Compensation Study

Director Martinez reported that approval was sought to issue an RFQ/RFP to identify a specialty firm to conduct a comprehensive benefits and salary study for the organization. The purpose of the study would be to review existing salary classifications as recommended by the Harvey M. Rose audit report to ensure that current compensation and benefits are equitable internally and externally competitive. In addition, the study would call for a review of exiting pay classifications and of the organization's compensation policy; and to make recommendations for revisions.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Commissioner Dennis suggested that this compensation study be done in alignment with the current recruitment process for an executive manager. Whatever is done should be done in concert with the current search. He asked if this would be done prior to the completion of the recruitment process for an Executive Director. He felt it should not be done ahead of filling that position. Director Martinez commented that if an agency could be retained that could provide this service, it would dovetail nicely with the anticipated arrival of the new Executive Director. She said it would take some time to identify firms, have them respond to the scope of work, conduct an evaluation of responses, and proceed with final selection of a firm.

Interim CEO Steele commented that the Harvey M. Rose audit report made two personnel-related recommendations: (1) conduct a compensation and benefit study; (2) conduct a staff allocation plan study. These two tasks have been conscientiously timed so that the structurally part, the staff allocation, will wait until the new Executive Director is in place. The compensation study will be done concurrent to the executive search so that the new Executive Director will be informed by the data from day one and will be able to use it in the allocation plan.

Commissioner Yancey asked why the 2007 compensation study recommendations were not approved. Interim CEO Steele responded that a couple members of the Commission disagreed with the methodology that had been employed and the comparisons that had been done. When the issues were resolved, the economic situation of the Commission had changed and there was no room for compensation changes. The study was shelved at that time.

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

10. Adopt Resolution 2012-05 Approving a Funding Allocation Not-to-Exceed \$1.71 Million for Each of the 14 Best Start Communities to Implement Elements of the Community in FY 2012-2013

CPO Gallardo reported that Best Start was an opportunity for the Commission to impact 124,000 children, ages zero to five, and their families in the 14 Best Start Communities. These children will grow healthy, are safe and are ready to be successful in school. This is intended to be accomplished by bringing together parents, resident and other community members by empowering the members to have a voice on how to best address the needs, build the strengths of those communities, and set the foundation to create structures that are sustainable over time

In order to support the communities as they are developing their community plans, staff is asking the Commission to approve an allocation of \$1.71 million for each community for them to propose projects and activities in support of the objectives the communities have defined according to the priorities they have set. These proposals would be brought to the Commission in June or July, by introducing community plans that are realistic, at a stage in their development where each community is.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

For the past 18 months, over 1,000 community members and residents have actively participated in 14 communities and have become stronger within their efforts to provide an environment where children ages zero to five can grow safely, healthy and get ready to go to school. Led by parents and residents, the 14 Best Start Communities have been honing their skills on how to make informed decisions and develop sustainable partnerships to address the needs of children in these places. The next phase in the development of Best Start Communities include the communities' ability to co-manage, along with First 5 LA, projects and activities that would be presented to the Commission in June and July.

Best Start Communities will be making decisions on the projects and activities that will support the agreed upon objectives. These objectives fully align with the long-term strategic goals, are based upon the community needs that have been identified through community assessments, and will incorporate the perspective of parents, residents, CBOs, faith-based organizations, providers and other stakeholders for each community.

The two main areas that the community plans would focus on would be in proposing projects and objectives in the areas of family strengthening as well as in the community capacity building areas. Those are two areas that the Commission defined as integral components of the place-based efforts. Through family strengthening components, the present activities of the communities will intend to provide the support systems that will allow them, present and future community parents, to be ready to provide a support system for children to succeed. Some of those projects are in the areas of parent education, parenting classes, working with ECE providers to improve kindergarten readiness, parents being trained on health and safety matters, health screenings, connecting parents to community resources, child and family homes, safe use of community parks, and healthy eating or exercising, among others. On the capacity building area, the committee will share additional efforts that need to be put in place to ensure the continuous engagement of stakeholders, the continuous development of parent leadership skills, the strengthening of existing infrastructure in those communities, and what they will do about attracting additional investments.

It is in these two areas where the community readiness will be observable. The more established communities, like Central Long Beach, will likely focus more on the investment in the family strengthening area than in the capacity building area; while others like South El Monte and El Monte will let the Commission know through their planning that they need to continue working more in developing their capacity in this first year. The proposed allocations for these areas were estimated based upon experience in community-based projects in Metro LA and in the in-house experience of providing direct support in the community capacity area.

Additionally, in the first year, the communities will start setting the foundation to assessing progress toward accomplishment of their goals by working side-by-side with the Research & Evaluation Department in developing the community specific evaluation efforts. Similarly, working with the Public Affairs Department, the communities will start working on ways to promote their Best Start efforts not only to recruit more stakeholders but also to message to the entire community what Best Start is all about. For both the evaluation and communication components, the

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

allocations proposed were estimated by First 5 LA experts in Research & Evaluation and Public Affairs.

Finally, the requested allocation includes support to continue the efforts to minimize the barriers for the parents and residents to continue participating actively as an integral part of the community partnership efforts. Those efforts include transportation, childcare, translation and facilitation, among others. The final allocation for each community will be approved by the Commission based upon the community plans that will be brought to the Commission between June and July. The communities might propose multi-year projects. This allocation is intended to cover the actual expenses that a community could realistically execute in year one.

Commissioner Dennis referenced page 134 of the meeting packet. Under the community plan component, there is an activity exclusion clause. He stated his disagreement with excluding costs for children to enroll in and attend preschool or childcare. Commissioner Dennis said that he would agree for the Commission to not want to double dip and support universal preschool that may already exist in the communities but there are other childcare arrangements that Best Start could support such as drop-in care and exempt care.

Commissioner Kaufman stated he appreciated the clarity in which the resolution was written. He referenced page 135 of the meeting packet and asked what was meant by funds not encumbered by June 30, 2013 would return to the general fund. For example, if a particular Best Start Community provided a plan which was then approved, when does the funding get encumbered. Interim Director Ortega responded that for accounting principles, encumbered means anything that is actually contracted. For the Commission's interpretation, encumbered means actual contracts that are in place by June 30, 2013 and any other items that have been approved through the consent calendar but do not have a wet signature on an actual contract.

Commissioner Kaufman referenced page 134 of the meeting packet. He said that certain buckets had a designated amount. If the communities chose to modify the allocations within the \$1.71 million, the communities could come to the Commission for approval as long as the total did not exceed the \$1.71 million. CPO Gallardo said that was the intent. Each community would be given a ceiling of \$1.71 million with required justification for each community plan component.

CPO Gallardo stated that each community plan would need to justify their proposal for spending the allocation with a maximum amount of \$1.71 million.

Commissioner Kaufman asked if an organization states that it wants to do a program that is going to take three years, do all of the three years come out of the \$1.71 million allocation. CPO Gallardo said that communities could propose multi-year projects but the component allocations (listed on page 134) were for actual expenses expected to be incurred in year one.

Interim CEO Steele said that future approvals would be outcome driven. Commissioner Kaufman said these projects were long-term work and he wanted to know how things that were funded in the first year would have the financial

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

capacity for future years. He suggested dividing the allocation over the number of years of the proposed project.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented that he was not supportive of funding multiple year projects without having first seen the community plans.

Commissioner Kaufman stated that his approach would be that if a three-year project would be proposed, funding for the three years should come out of the \$1.71 million allocation. This way, the allocation covers the total number of years for the project. He said the \$1.17 million was a reasonable number and did not want to get too far ahead.

CPO Gallardo said that this was a first phase decision as the Commission has not seen the community plans. The type of projects that will be proposed will be short-term projects because the community needs to demonstrate to the Commission that they can define outcomes, manage financial resources, and be held accountable. From experience in the Metro LA community, the projects were anywhere from six to nine months projects. These short-term projects yielded outcomes.

Commissioner Kaufman said it was his expectation that the projects that are brought to the Commission can be completed in the six to 12-month timeframe to be able to learn from that and to see if it should be maintained, sustained or go to scale; and not to look at programs that naturally take three, four or five years to complete.

CPO Gallardo said this would be the idea in grooming them as a community. The communities will come back next year and tell the Commission what they have accomplished or what they are capable of doing, at which time the Commission can make a commitment. Commissioner Kaufman said that this was a very clear expectation.

Commissioner Yancey echoed CPO Gallardo's comments in that many of the communities are going to be shifting more toward the capacity building, especially those who are not as far along. The projects the Commission is looking for are going to be an important part of the evidence-based that is being built. There is not enough to build really long projects at this point. The communities have to adapt the existing models to fit where they are. Piloting and pretesting is where the communities should be at this point.

Commissioner Kaufman commented that for this particular allocation, it should not go toward covering preschool or direct services such as stipends, tuition and health insurance. These are long-term things and not an appropriate use for these funds.

Commissioner Dennis he was referring to having a parenting class where the participants need childcare in order to attend the class. He was not referring to the formalized universal preschool setting but more so to drop-in care situations. The language in the staff recommendation excludes this type of service.

Interim CEO Steele said that he understood Commissioner Dennis' point and the language would be further refined to provide clarity.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Commissioner Browning asked if there was an expectation of only having one award in each of the communities or could there be multiple entities that could get awards adding up to \$1.71 million. CPO Gallardo responded that multiple awards could be given to fulfill the community needs.

Commissioner Browning asked if there were any restrictions in terms of private, profit-making entities. CPO Gallardo responded that the only restriction is for the same funding protocols to be followed. The communities want the providers to be in line with the community values. The communities would like to have a voice in deciding what provider services are selected.

Commissioner Browning asked about process, specifically who would be approving the community plans. CPO Gallardo responded that the communities would approve the projects, help select the providers, and Commission approval would be done via the consent calendar.

Chair Yaroslavsky asked when the plans from the 14 various communities would be delivered to staff. CPO Gallardo responded that this would take place toward the end of May. The plans would be brought to the Commission in three groups at the Commission meetings of June 14, June 28 and July 12.

Chair Yaroslavsky asked if it was conceivable from some of the plans to not be ready for primetime. CPO Gallardo assured Chair Yaroslavsky that all plans would be ready for primetime. The level of detail of each plan will help the Commission decide wisely.

Chair Yaroslavsky also asked if all the plans were going to be at the same state of readiness. CPO Gallardo responded in the affirmative.

Chair Yaroslavsky asked specifically what that meant. Interim CEO Steele commented that all the documents will be ready for review by the Commission and the Commission may decide that some of the documents need additional work. This is at the discretion of the Commission.

Chair Yaroslavsky asked if the Commission was going to be provided with a staff recommendation on the community plans. Interim CEO Steele responded in the affirmative and also stated that by no means would the Commission be rubber stamping the plans. A real consideration needed to take place with each of the plans and this is why the plans will be presented in groups for approval. There is anticipation that staff will give a full evaluation and make recommendations to the Commission but the Commission would also take time to consider what is being proposed and what level of capacity is being demonstrated.

Chair Yaroslavsky asked what would happen to the funding of the community plans that were not approved in either June or July. Interim CEO Steele responded that on the outside edge, funds need to be encumbered by June 30, 2013. If the Commission believes more work is needed on the plans, the plans will be sent back to the community with input. These plans would then come back in the fall to determine whether those plans will move forward. If the funds are not encumbered, there will be no carryover of funds.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Chair Yaroslavsky asked if none of the \$1.71 million allocation could be spent until the community plan was approved. Interim CEO Steele stated this was correct.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented he was concerned that the Commission bit off more than it could possibly chew. He said he would keep an open mind to see what is submitted because if there were 14 solid proposals, he would be the first to celebrate. Out of common sense, some proposals may not be as ready as others. The Commission at that point would have options: (1) string that community along for four, six or 12 months; or (2) invest the funds where there are solid proposals.

Chair Yaroslavsky said he was concerned that he was not Commission Chair when the 14 communities were selected. He said he was also concerned about the Commission getting stuck on the number 14 and losing sight. This is a test for the 14 communities to see who is ready to step up to the next level. Those communities who are ready should be rewarded and ridden to greater success while others should not be kept on life support.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented that based on the way this is being handled from the ground up, things will be uneven. There is not a standard. This is not a criticism but a reality. At that point, a decision will need to be made by the Commission. This may be an opportunity to recalibrate and invest where the Commission stands to get the maximum return on investment rather than getting stuck in the mud on the number 14, referring to Best Start Communities.

Commissioner Browning requested information on the Metro LA pilot because he was cautious about funding soft services. He said it was easier to see outcomes in hard services such as preschool or childcare. Commissioner Browning said it was difficult for him to see the outcome in soft services, which he considered Best Start Communities to be. He wanted to see data that showed how great the expenditure of money was in the Best Start Metro LA project. CPO Gallardo said that he would be happy to bring this data back.

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

After the vote, Chair Yaroslavsky asked Interim CEO Steele to keep a close and rigorous eye on how the 14 communities were proceeding. He asked that Interim CEO Steele provide the Commission with an unvarnished assessment of where each community is in late May or June.

Public Comment:

Zoila Bravo, A.R.C.
Salvador Diaz, Walnut Park Community Resident
Victor Dominguez, YMCA Huntington Park
Rick Overdorf, WFLP

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

11. Approve the Revised Conference Funding Protocols

Director Oaxaca reported that staff was asking for approval to revise the conference funding program protocols. In July 2002, the Commission approved the original protocols for providing grant funding to local conference organizers. The protocols have been previously updated by the Commission in October 2003; and in 2006 by the Public Affairs Committee.

The staff recommendation is based on recent input from the Public Affairs Liaisons. Since 2002, the Commission has provided local conference organizers with the opportunity to apply for grant funding to partially cover the costs of their events. The Commission regularly authorized an annual amount of \$150,000 in the program budget for this program. Since 2006, nearly 50 conferences have been funded with the entire budgeted amount usually being expended in each year. Applicants cannot receive more than 25 percent of the net total cost of the conference and cannot, in any case, exceed a request greater than \$25,000. Applicants also cannot receive funding more than once in a single fiscal year or three times in a five-year period.

The proposed changes in the protocols begin on page 139 of the meeting packet and are focused on the following:

- Asking that an applicant's statement of purpose demonstrates the connection of the conference/event to the needs of children 0-5 in Los Angeles.
- Provide an estimate of the number of attendees who are from Los Angeles County.
- Show how the conference/event targets First 5 LA's primary audiences. Conferences/events with a national or international focus will not be considered for funding.
- Conferences/events must be held in Los Angeles County.

Director Oaxaca reported that the title of the program would be changed to "Conference/Event Funding Program" to reflect the now more frequent dual nature of gatherings that combine traditional conferences with workshops and health/education/family fairs.

Commissioner Kaufman asked why national or international conferences would not be eligible for funding if they fit the mission of First 5 LA.

Director Oaxaca reported that based on the input of the Public Affairs Liaisons, when presented with requests for conferences that were being promoted as a national or international type conference, the proportion of attendees that were expected from Los Angeles County was, in essence, a very low percentage compared to the total number of attendees. The Public Affairs Liaisons felt the funding should be directed towards events and conferences that would benefit practitioners and subject matter experts based in Los Angeles County. Thus, the conference would be providing direct benefits to the children of Los Angeles County.

Commissioner Tilton said the Public Affairs Liaisons were not against having national or international experts come and present at the conference. This would be

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

an advantage. While she agreed that it is important to have difference perspectives, if the conference is for an international audience and people are being brought in from other parts of the country, Los Angeles County would need to have strong presence.

**M/S (Cynthia Harding / Jane Boeckmann)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

12. Approve Policy and Guidelines for Approving First 5 LA's Positions on State and Federal Bills, and Related Advocacy Activities

CPO Gallardo reported the proposed process had two main components.

- (1) Each March through April, the Policy Department will bring to the Commission a comprehensive list of recommended positions on legislation that align with the First 5 LA policy agenda, inclusive of both State and federal policies. Staff will have already vetted the list with the CEO and the County legislative staff.
- (2) Any additional bills of interest would be reviewed by the Chief Executive Officer in consultation with the Commission Chair, who will approve them for action or bring them to the full Commission for consideration.

The ability to be proactive and timely is essential to being an active player in this arena. Approval or partial approval will authorize the staff to engage in the strategic plan approved advocacy activities on behalf of those bills such as writing letters of support and publishing articles about the bills in the First 5 LA Monday Morning Report. These activities were detailed in the strategic planning implementation plan.

Commissioner Kaufman suggested the Commission Chair have a designee as part of the process. Chair Yaroslavsky agreed.

Commissioner Dennis said that the body he represents, the Policy Roundtable for Child Care, also has a responsibility for making legislative and policy recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. He thought that there should be some sort of convergence because the responsibility of making legislative and policy recommendations falls under the realm of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care on issues around childcare such as budget reduction recommendations. Commissioner Dennis said that both entities should be working together and arriving at similar recommendations.

Staff responded that many of the bills tracked by First 5 LA are not tracked by the County. However, an effort would be made to work together on legislative recommendations to the Commission whenever possible.

Commissioner Browning asked if the March to April timeframe noted in the staff report would present a problem if there was something that came up in January or February that was critical. He did not want the timeframe to be a barrier. CPO

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Gallardo responded this is why there was a two-step process. CPO Gallardo clarified that legislative recommendations that took place outside the timeframe would be addressed through the second step of the process.

**M/S (Cynthia Harding / Zev Yaroslavsky)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

13. Approval of the 2012 Legislative Agenda

The legislative agenda reflects, supports and implements the Commission's five-year policy agenda which was approved as part of the strategic planning implementation plan. There are a number of factors that are considered before staff recommends legislative action. The following criteria were endorsed by the Commission's strategic plan: (1) alignment with the policy agenda; (2) impact on young children; (3) timeliness; (4) feasibility; (5) focus on a prevention approach; and, (6) the value added of First 5 LA contribution. Also acknowledged in this analysis is the opportunity for relationship building with bill authors and sponsors; and the value of advancing the policy issue even when the likelihood of passage of specific legislation might be slim. This practice results in a portfolio of bills that reflects the diverse area of concern of the Commission and the range of levels of risk and timeliness for potential enactment. Bills are not chosen exclusively on any one of these factors. For example, whether a bill has a high likelihood of being signed into law.

Staff recognized that policy change often takes years and introducing bills is one way policy ideas can take root. The Policy Department will be making a comprehensive presentation at the Program & Planning Committee scheduled for April 26, 2012.

**M/S (Philip Browning / Jane Boeckmann)
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

14. Receive and File the Investment Portfolio Report as of January 31, 2012

Interim Director Ortega reported that the investment portfolio report as of January 31, 2012 began on page 161 of the meeting packet. The Commission continues to invest its cash balance in the Los Angeles County Treasurer's Pool Surplus Investment Portfolio. The Commission is earning .90 percent. As indicated on page 170 of the meeting packet, returns beyond five years have yields ranging from .71 percent to 2.59 percent. The 2.59 percent yield is for a 20-year term. Staff will continue to monitor the market and collaborate with the Los Angeles County Treasurer's Office to see if there are any opportunities to invest outside the pool.

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

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

15. Receive and File the FY 2010-2011 Annual Accountability and Learning Report

Director Jimenez reported the Accountability and Learning Report was an integral part of the recently approved revised Accountability and Learning Framework. He thanked the Commissioners for helping to frame the report through their feedback.

The report is also a response to the recommendation made in the Harvey M. Rose audit report to regularly report on the outputs and outcomes from the Commission's investments. This is the first attempt to really compile this type of information in a single report across all of the investments and initiatives that have been implemented during the last fiscal year.

Subsequent to the distribution of the report, several discussions have taken place specifically around the Healthy Births Initiative that has created a new set of data not included in the current report. Staff has been working with the Best Babies Collaborative and the Department of Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health and will be issuing a revision to that section specifically, and include additional information offered by these two entities.

The Commission has accomplished a tremendous amount of work. Some of the highlights presented by Director Jimenez included:

- In 2010-11, over 21,000 children, age zero to five, were provided preventative dental services who otherwise would not have received such care.
- Over 13,000 caregivers and parents were provided education on oral health.
- Early care education in the form of preschool was provided to 10,900 children that involved 327 providers. In addition, for those kids that attend LAUP programs, measurable and statistically significant gains in key learning areas have been made.
- Parents in family literacy programs have actually increased the amount of time they read to their children from 70 percent at the beginning of the year to over 91 percent at the end of the year.
- Breastfeeding has improved at California Hospital, a baby-friendly hospital, by 10 percentage points within the year.
- A total of 418 childcare programs were enrolled in a quality improvement system.

Director Jimenez reported the hope is for the report to become a tool for making better decisions and to share learning with folks outside the First 5 LA network, outside Los Angeles County, and outside California.

Commissioner Yancey commented that she found the report very interesting and it provided hard outcomes. She said the report findings were impressive and commended staff for their good work.

Commissioner Dennis echoed the comments of Commissioner Yancey. He said he was quite impressed. He said a marketing strategy should be developed for this report to be disseminated so that people outside First 5 LA could become aware of the work the Commission is doing.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Commissioner Tilton commented that the report was excellent. She provided a minor correction to a graph on page 205 of the report.

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

Public Comment:

Janice French, LA Best Babies Network

16. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Bernadine Gonzalez, North Valley Caring Services
Rick Overdorf, WFLP
Sharon Polkinghorn, Shenandoah Family Literacy
Marni Roosevelt, Los Angeles Valley College
Marlene Rowlett, MCCN-Black Infant Health

ADJOURNMENT:

With the conclusion of the agenda, Chair Yaroslavsky adjourned the meeting.

The Commission adjourned at 3:22 pm.

NEXT MEETING:

The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be on:

May 10, 2012 at 1:30 pm
First 5 LA
Multi-Purpose Room
750 N. Alameda Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

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