

SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

RECEIVED and FILED: 08-29-12

FIRST 5 LA

SUMMARY MEETING NOTES  
Program & Planning Committee  
May 24, 2012

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Philip Browning  
Patricia Curry  
Neal Kaufman (Chair)  
Deanne Tilton

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Nancy Au  
Duane Dennis  
Cynthia Harding (Alternate)

**COUNTY STAFF:**

Lisa Mandel, Social Services Deputy

**STAFF PRESENTERS:**

Linda Alexander, Program Officer  
Tessa Charnofsky, Government Affairs Manager  
Reuben De Leon, Senior Program Officer  
Marsha Ellis, Assistant Director of Best Start Communities  
Manuel Fierro, Senior Program Officer  
Antonio Gallardo, Chief Program Officer  
Kimberly Hall, Research Analyst  
Armando Jimenez, Director of Research & Evaluation  
Stacy Lee, Policy Manager  
Marcella Manzanedo, Program Officer  
Bronwyn Mauldin, Senior Research Analyst  
Jessica Monge, Research Analyst  
Sharon Murphy, Research Analyst  
Leanne Negron, Senior Program Officer  
Teresa Nuno, Director of Community Investments  
Hayley Roper, Senior Research Analyst  
Kate Sachnoff, Senior Policy Analyst  
Jennifer Webb, Senior Program Officer

**RECORDING SECRETARY:**

Maria Romero, Executive Assistant

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Kaufman at 1:41 pm.

**NOTE: The following reflects the order in which agenda items were discussed.**

9. Best Start Communities Department Update

Chair Kaufman stated that everyone was aware that the Commission had approved the idea of having the 14 Best Start Communities coming to the Commission with plans that could get up to \$1.7 million of funding during the next fiscal year based on the plan submission and on a range of different activities.

Presentation of the community plans to the Commission would constitute the formal request for approval at the Commission meetings scheduled for June 14 and 28, and on July 12. Due to the number of communities, three presentations would be done on June 14, six on June 12, and five on July 12.

## SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

The idea of having the presentations done at the Program & Planning Committee meeting prior to the full Commission was for Commissioners, staff and members of the public to have an opportunity to provide feedback so that there would be a clear understanding of the approval request that would take place on June 14.

CPO Gallardo commented that staff was very happy to present an update on the plans developed by the 14 communities. In addition to providing an overview of the community plan development process for general understanding, there would be an opportunity to review the highlights of the community plans for Central Long Beach, Panorama City and Wilmington. Part of the reasons for selecting these three communities was because these specific communities represent the variety of the communities that exist among the 14 Best Start communities. Despite the variations in the levels of planning among the proposals, all have in common the amount of effort that has been put into the plan, the level of commitment, intense planning, and literacy development.

Furthermore, CPO Gallardo reported the hope was to provide a preview of the type of proposal that would be coming to the Commission for approval and to obtain feedback that will allow for the communities to be better prepared when they make their presentations to the Commission. This was the first time the communities would be engaging in a public forum—a glimpse into the seeds of hope that are being planted to change communities in the way they operate. The communities have been engaged in many community meetings and countless hours of planning over the past 20 months with the community plans being the culmination of the process.

Assistant Director Ellis reported there were four levels of engagement within the Best Start effort. From its inception, relationship building and ongoing community outreach have been cornerstones of the Best Start effort. Assistant Director Ellis reviewed the model for levels of community engagement which include the key components of the Leadership Group, Partnership, Best Start Communities, and Community-at-Large.

The Leadership Group serves as an advisory committee to the partnership. It is comprised of community parents, residents and stakeholders.

The Partnership consists of parents, residents and stakeholders who consistently participate in Best Start planning meetings through forums such as subcommittees and workgroups. This group has decision-making authority.

The Best Start Community is comprised of parents, residents and stakeholders familiar and/or affiliated with Best Start, but not consistently or actively engaged in all Best Start activities.

The Community-at-Large consists of parents, residents and stakeholders that live within a community's geographic boundaries.

Each of the community plans will all have key components: summary, community background, vision and objectives, Best Start strategies, communications, evaluation and learning, implementation, budget. The plans will outline how communities came to decisions on each of the components. While there are many elements that are consistent across communities, there are all very diverse communities and this will come across in their plan.

## SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

CPO Gallardo reported that there were many consistent elements across the 14 communities. Of importance was the realization and understanding that each community has resources. The community plans will propose ways to coordinate those resources within the community. By the communities working with First 5 LA, they have similarly expressed the intent to work together and figure out what can be done with existing resources before adding more resources. Another element consistent across all communities is that parents want to be trainers. The parents want to be the individuals who train the community. Because of this, some communities will propose such projects as “train the trainers” and “parents as leaders.” Additionally, community strengthening is very important to the Partnerships as well as accountability. The Partnerships want to assume ownership of the Best Start effort within their community and be treated with respect.

Representatives from the communities of Central Long Beach, Wilmington and Panorama City presented their community plans, focusing on the vision, proposed family strengthening projects, and proposed community capacity strengthening projects.

Chair Kaufman reminded everyone that the Best Start Liaisons (Nancy Au, Antronette Yancey, Arturo Delgado) were available to provide guidance and facilitate staff questions on how information gets presented to the Commission.

On behalf of the Best Start Liaisons, Commissioner Au applauded the presenters for a job well done. She said it was very important for the Commissioners to hear that what was being presented truly reflected the voice of the community. She cautioned that there would be tough questions regarding resource allocation. In the spirit of how the presentations were made and the communities wanting to take ownership of Best Start, she said it was awesome. Commissioner Au commented that the Partnership wanting to hold service providers accountable was good.

With regard to obtaining ongoing feedback from the community, Commissioner Au suggested having a “Yelp” system where members of the communities could provide their feedback, whether services received were appreciated, and how well services were provided. Commissioner Au said that data becomes obsolete at some point in time and this system would provide current feedback and responses so that change could be timely.

Commissioner Harding echoed Commissioner Au’s comments. She said that while the presentations were excellent and the proposed projects were worthy, she felt that the plans should include how, as a result of those projects, would the communities change. Commissioner Harding further commented that Commissioners needed to clearly understand how the Commission’s investment would make a change in the future.

Commissioner Tilton commented the community presentations provided a good sense of an overall picture.

Commissioner Curry commented she looked forward to seeing the entire plan and found it interesting how the community was working together.

Commissioner Browning commented that the presentations were enjoyable. He asked for a more definite measure of change. Specifically, he asked what was the Commission trying to accomplish and how would the Commission know when it had been accomplished. Commissioner Browning also asked what measures were in place to hold the providers accountable. Furthermore, he asked if there was any duplication among the different

## SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

proposals with same amount of money. Commissioner Browning also asked if projects could be pilot-tested in one area and implemented in other communities.

Commissioner Dennis commented that he was always interested in how Best Start efforts were interconnecting with the other service providers in the communities—i.e., NACs. He was interested in learning about the connection Best Start has with not only Commission funded initiatives but with the other social and human services initiatives focusing on the zero to five population.

Chair Kaufman commented he was excited to see the community plans coming forward. He attempted to describe the process that would be taking place at the June and July Commission meetings. Chair Kaufman said that the approval would consist of authority being granted to Commission staff to negotiate a process and a contract to implement what is being proposed in the community plans. Staff would then bring back the proposed contracts to the Commission for approval.

Chair Kaufman suggested that a workplan be developed aimed at completing the community plans and while he was not interested in the detail of the workplan, he wanted to know the deadlines. He stated that staff could present the workplan with the community plans for approval or the community plans would be approved in concept with staff coming back to the Commission with the workplan at a later date. To him, either was fine. Otherwise, Commissioners would not really know what they would be approving. For instance, it was his understanding that there was no lead agency necessarily; but rather a multiple of groups.

Commissioner Browning asked if the contracts were going to be awarded through a competitive bidding process or if they were going to be sole source contracts. Chair Kaufman responded that in each case it could be different.

CPO Gallardo commented that the process to be followed in the communities should mirror the process approved by the Commission. The process is for an allocation to be approved for a concept of a project, staff then returns at a later date with specific details on how it will be executed, and how the contract is awarded is dependent upon the project (solicitation or sole source). CPO Gallardo assured everyone that existing practices would be followed.

Chair Kaufman commented that this type of information would probably not be included in the detail to be presented at the June and July Commission meetings but he did want to know the dates of when decisions for RFP and RFQ processes would be made.

Commissioner Au commented that the Commission will have to tread very carefully because they are other [legal and legislative] requirements that the Commission must comply with. At the same time, this was truly the test because Best Start was about community empowerment. The question then was, “when does the community voice come into play in the process of selection?”

Commissioner Au said that she did not have clarity at this point because she was not sure of the legal parameters. If the Commission went with sole source contracts, it would give the Commission the most latitude in working with the community versus the competitive [bidding] process. As Commissioners, a conversation would need to happen around this issue.

## SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

Chair Kaufman agreed with Commissioner Au. He suggested having this discussion at a future Program & Planning Committee, not for any particular contract or community, but in general. He then commented that perhaps the Commission may need to change procedures because of a new model.

Deputy Mandel commented that in thinking through the contracting process, she did agree that another meeting to reach agreement should take place. She stated that the Commission initially said that contracting would be done by delegated authority. This made her uncomfortable because there was a lot of money being contemplated and there needed to be a standardized way of approaching the contracting process. While sole source contracts may be the only way in certain instances, this would be a true test for the Commission. Deputy Mandel stated that it would help the communities to have a more rigorous and very transparent process. It seemed like the Commission was going to approve the community plans, give delegated authority to the communities, and for them to issue contracts.

Chair Kaufman and CPO Gallardo both clarified that this was not the process.

Chair Kaufman stated that he envisioned the Commission providing feedback to the community plans in June and July, possibly approving and/or delaying approval, and then parallel to this process, discussion taking place on the issue of contracting and how to go about it in the communities.

Chair Kaufman commented that he believed this was the right place and approach to start with community building and with place-based strategies. However, he did not believe that it was the place where the Commission should end. The Commission started with asking how to make services more efficient, effective and accessible for vulnerable children and their families. The key word was services and every one of the presentations was about services. He said there was another whole approach to improving capacities of communities to nurture children and their families that had to do with making a place where people felt connected and safe, where communities could nurture and support themselves without the requirement for a service.

Chair Kaufman stated that he would be a consistent voice that will continue to say the Commission needs to think about the other parts of how to improve the sense of community.

### 2. Review of Program & Planning Committee Meeting Notes – April 26, 2012

No changes were made to the meeting notes.

## THE ITEM WAS RECEIVED AND FILED

### 3. Census Data Mining Project

Director Jimenez reported that on March 8, 2012, the revised accountability framework was presented to the Program & Planning Committee. There were two critical pieces: (1) actual evaluations of projects; and, (2) whether the Commission contributed to outcomes that were meaningful in Los Angeles County.

As a Commission, difficult decisions have been faced. It seems that the decisions get more difficult every time. Therefore, there is an urgency to provide the Commission with recent and reliable data for it to make decisions.

## SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

This project was part of the revised accountability framework. Staff realized this was an opportune time to get new information about who lives in the 14 Best Start communities and Los Angeles County, as a whole, being that the census was conducted in 2010. Because of this, a study was commissioned to utilize the new data. In addition, data from the American Community Survey (ACS) 2005 – 2009 was also used. This data consisted of multi-year estimate (MYE) surveys of 2005-09, centering on 2007 MYE, and all references to 2007 use that data.

A presentation was made on specific characteristics of the 14 Best Start communities including households with children, median household income, poverty rate of children under six years of age, homeownership rate, type of housing, race/ethnicity, percent of foreign born, languages spoken, and parental marital status of families with children, and school enrollment of children ages.

#### 4. PHFE-WIC Data Mining Project

The WIC Research Partnership has been in existence for the past 10 years between PHFE-WIC and First 5 LA. WIC is the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children. The program serves pregnant and postpartum women, infants and children up to age 5 who are low income (<185% FPL) and at nutritional risk.

WIC provides nutritious foods, nutrition education, breastfeeding support and referrals to health care and other services. Funded by USDA, WIC serves 9 million participants nationwide, approximately 1.4 million in California and approximately 550,000 in Los Angeles County. Furthermore, WIC serves approximately 69 percent of all infants born in Los Angeles County.

There are seven local agency WIC Programs in Los Angeles County: PHFE WIC, LA Biomed/SLAHP, NEVHC, Long Beach, Antelope Valley, Watts Healthcare, and Pasadena. Additionally, the research partnership harnesses data from all seven programs.

Prior to this partnership, WIC data were only used for internal administrative purposes, were not shared across agencies, and were not available countywide. Many of the data elements WIC collects tie directly to current and past First 5 LA Strategic Plans and Priority Measures, so they can be used to help track impact of First 5 LA programs and initiatives. The WIC administrative data is disseminated annually on the Healthy City website and PHFE-WIC site. The Los Angeles County WIC survey, which has just completed its third administration in 2011, provided additional rich information on the WIC population served in Los Angeles County. In December 2011, the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition published a paper (co-written by Dr. Shannon Whaley, Director of Research and Evaluation, at PHFE-WIC) detailing the effects of breastfeeding and low sugar-sweetened beverage intake on obesity utilizing data collected from both the WIC administrative and survey datasets.

It is the goal of the WIC Research Partnership to use administrative and survey data to continue to support First 5 LA strategic plan goals, projects and initiatives. Additionally, the visibility of First 5 LA will continue to be promoted through publications and presentations.

#### Public Comment:

Jan French, LA Best Babies Network

## SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

(Per the Commission's Activity Break Policy, the Committee took a break).

### 5. Family Survey

The Family Survey will look at children 0 to 5 and their families within the Best Start Communities to assess how they are doing on the intermediate outcomes that are important precursors for our four priority goals. These intermediate outcomes are specified in the Theory of Change pathway for the 2009-2015 Strategic Plan. Those intermediate outcomes are:

- 1) Parents/caregivers are resilient
- 2) Children bond with parents/caregivers
- 3) Parents/caregivers support their child's learning
- 4) Children have adequate physical activity
- 5) Infants and children have good nutrition

Data will be collected from a representative sample of households with 0 to 5 children in each of the Best Start Communities. Using Family Survey data, First 5 LA will be able to describe functioning in terms of the intermediate outcomes at multiple levels: 0 to 5 children and their families, individual communities, and across the Best Start investment. No other data collection activities planned in the Best Start communities will have the ability to show trends utilizing quantitative data at these three important levels. In addition, the Family Survey instrument includes previously tested survey items that allow us to compare data from the Best Start Communities to county, state and/or federal data. In each community, the same sample design, instrument, data collection plan and analytic approach will be used.

The expected learning outcomes of the project will be:

- 1) Baseline data on each of the First 5 LA intermediate outcomes before services and supports are provided in the Best Start Communities on a large scale.
- 2) Comparisons of each Best Start community and the Best Start investment, as a whole, to Los Angeles County; and in some instances, the state and the nation.
- 3) Data to inform Best Start Community governance groups and funded agencies regarding the prioritization, planning and implementation of programs and services.
- 4) Psychometric properties of the survey measure to inform future administrations.
- 5) Facilitate First 5 LA's ability to support and leverage efforts in each community.

The proposed cost is \$1 million for the initial administration across FY 2012-13 and 2013-14; with \$400,000 specifically for FY 2012-13. Additional funds would be requested for subsequent administrations of the Family Survey, as needed.

### 6. Workforce Evaluation Plan

The purpose of the Comprehensive Workforce Development Evaluation is to carry out a set of multi-year evaluation studies that will allow First 5 LA to understand and explain the combined effects of the Workforce investments. Outcomes in six key areas will be evaluated: recruitment, qualifications, ECE quality/practices, retention, compensation and systems change. These evaluation studies will commence in FY 2012-13 and continue through the life of the Workforce investments.

## SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

Funds will also be used to complete evaluations begun in prior years of the Workforce Initiative (WFI) and High School Recruitment Pilot Program (HSR). A measure will be developed of ECE provider competencies and a Los Angeles office will be opened for the pilot stage of the California Early Care and Education Workforce Registry.

The expected learning outcomes of the project will be:

- 1) Knowledge of the short, intermediate and long-term outcomes achieved by participants in our Workforce Development programs.
- 2) Knowledge of progress toward outcomes by Workforce Development program, type of participant and/or workplace.
- 3) Understanding of which program strategies are associated with the greatest participant progress.
- 4) Understanding of system changes within and between participating institutions that support the ECE workforce.

The proposed cost is \$331,000 in FY 2012-13 (WFI and HSR evaluations) with \$1.13 million in contract authority across FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 (Comprehensive Workforce Development Evaluation). Additional funds would be requested in subsequent years as needed, through the life of the Workforce investments.

### 7. Community Investments Department Update

Director Nuno reported on three key programs in response to interest expressed by Commissioners, during the April 12, 2012 Commission meeting, of learning more about the types of leveraging and matching investments the Community Investments Department is implementing as well as the process that is followed.

#### ***Match Grant Program***

First 5 LA has awarded 13 matching grants organizations serving young children and their families throughout Los Angeles County. With First 5 LA's commitment of matching funds of close to \$3.4 million, these organizations raised close to \$2.4 million from private foundations and corporations nationwide. The purpose of the matching funds program is to help organizations improve their odds of successfully securing funds from non-First 5 LA sources. Awards range from \$50,000 in one year to up to \$400,000 over two years. Some of the private funders that were matched by First 5 LA include the Weingart Foundation, the Ahmanson Foundation, Boeing Company, Met Life Foundation, Atlas Family Foundation, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Matching grants went to organizations who proposed projects aimed at impacting the First 5 LA four priority outcomes: (1) children are born healthy; (2) children maintain a healthy weight; (3) children are safe from abuse and (4) neglect, and children are ready for kindergarten. In addition, to the notable funds leveraged from private foundations and corporations, this program strengthened and further developed First 5 LA's relationship with private foundations and corporations, and facilitated new relationships between some funders and nonprofit organizations.

While the Matching Funds Program builds upon the success of the ARRA Matching Funds program, there were several lessons learned from the first time implementing the Matching Funds Program. These lessons include the need for a longer time period for organizations to secure a match, the flexibility to raise funds from multiple funding sources and possibly in multiple ways such as through an event fundraiser or donor donations. The first year of the Matching Funds Program has seen great success with close to 70 percent of all First 5 LA dollars committed being matched by private foundations and corporations.

**SUMMARY MEETING NOTES**

***Challenge Grant Program***

First 5 LA staff is working with Families in Schools to develop the Challenge Grants Program and RFP, scheduled to be released on June 30, 2012. A total of \$1,050,000 will be granted to up to 11 organizations over a two-year period, with a maximum grant award of \$100,000 per applicant. Grantees may only draw down First 5 LA funds as they secure matching funds from other sources at a 1:1 rate during the two-year challenge period. The Challenge Grants Program grantees will also receive individual coaching, peer exchanges and learning institutes in addition to the cash grant. Applications will be due August 30, 2012. Grant award letters will be issued in November 2012.

***Social Enterprise Program***

In partnership with Families in Schools, First 5 LA released an RFP for the Social Enterprise Grants Program on April 30, 2012. This program is for organizations looking to diversify their revenue streams by launching or expanding a social enterprise. A distinct aspect of this grant program is combining funding with technical assistance, which includes coaching, peer exchanges and learning institutes. A total of \$350,000 will be granted to seven organizations over a 12-month period, with a maximum grant award of \$50,000 per applicant. Applications are due June 30, 2012. Grant award letters will be issued in October 2012.

8. Policy Department Update

Staff presented an overview of the Policy Department including the department mission, defined policy activities, a review of the policy agenda, and 2011 accomplishments.

10. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 pm.

**NEXT MEETING:**

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be taking place as follows.

1:30 pm – 4:30 pm  
June 21, 2012

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.