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Good afternoon, everyone.

Good afternoon.

Welcome.

This is the First 5 Commission; right? Numerous events today.

It's Thursday in the afternoon.

Right. It's Thursday in the afternoon.

So we want to welcome everyone. First item of business on the consent calendar, does any member wish to have any particular item pulled? If not, the Chair would entertain a motion to approve the consent calendar as presented.

Motion to approve consent calendar as presented.

Moved and seconded. Any discussion? Any objections? Any change in the minutes? If not, so ordered.

All right. So next is chairman's remarks.

Well, I -- obviously, there's a lot on the agenda, so some of this will be covered there. But in particular, I spent last week in Sacramento for a day,
which is more than enough. Just kidding.

But, particularly, up there on the issue of sex trafficking and meth. I held press conference with seven members -- eight members of the State Senate, virtually covered the entire State of California. I think they are totally involved in this particular point on this issue.

And then also, talked to members of the Legislature individually in meetings in their offices as well as the governor, particularly on issues that are related to First 5. So from transitional kindergarten to home visitation and some other issues that were brought to my attention. So I think we might have some real opportunities in the upcoming legislative session if they can get beyond some of the other things.

Anyway, I -- you know, I guess the sort of good news/bad news, relates to I'm sure you all read about it. You know, at my first meeting, I talked about, you know, when you have a program like this, if it's successful, you're going to have declining revenue, which is an ongoing issue.

But I'm sure you all heard that CVS is stopping the sale of all tobacco. So you can all still shop at CVS, but the kids won't benefit. But anyway --

MS. BELSHE: What the ambassador meant to say --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Obviously, a good thing.
But, I mean, you know, while we may have a little fun with it, it's something we need to keep in mind. That was the whole purpose originally of this commission. One of them was, you know -- the whole thing about Prop 10 and, you know.

So we are where we are, but it just -- to me, it's more evidence that we really need to know where we are and what we're doing and really have to be protective of the revenue that we do have in-house and not be able to spend like we, fortunately over the last number of years, been able to do.

So with that, I'll turn it back over to Kim for the executive director's report.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And we -- to your point of needing to live within our means, we have poster size the chart that provides very graphic and sobering depiction of our revenue and expenditure challenges.

And with the board's formal approval of the long-term financial projection as a part of the consent calendar, we are formally recognizing our fiscal environment has to be -- our fiscal context has to be ever present in our thinking about who we are and what we do today and going forward.

I want to touch on a couple of things as a part
of my remarks before we jump into some substantive board agenda items for discussion.

Number one, is to share the good news that I shared with the board last Tuesday about the appointment of Raphael Gonzalez as our new director of the Best Start communities department.


You are you now looking at the product of a very intensive five, six-month process. Over 80 applicants and multiple interviews, poor Raphael endured the gauntlet. But one of the things I was very pleased was the organization-wide involvement in the final selection.

The final three candidates came to First 5 LA and spent a day meeting in small group discussions with department heads and some other staff and then meeting with the full Best Start Communities department, where the finalists made a presentation and gave written feedback that helped inform the final decision.

But we are delighted that Raphael, notwithstanding his LA Dodgers credentials, which in all seriousness, I appreciate his giving me the benefit of the doubt since I am a San Francisco Giants fan. But Raphael --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I think we might double
check your credentials.

MS. BELSHE: The Chair wants to check my credentials.

But we really are fortunate to have someone of Raphael's background and experience in LA County in communities working to help lead, catalyze, and support community-led change initiatives to step into this important job at this moment in time.

So, Raphael, you want to say a few words about yourself?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. Yes. Thank you very much for those kind words, Kim.

Commissioners, it really is an honor and a privilege for me to be a part of First 5 LA, to be part of this community change movement that is being created with the Best Start Communities effort. I'll tell you, I've been here a week and it's been a whirlwind. But the knowledge, the experience, the amazing people that are part of this organization is really inspiring. And I'm just very thankful for the graciousness that they all have given me in terms of welcoming me to this organization.

And it was a very strenuous process to actually go through this, but it showed me just how invested, you know, this organization and its people are to Best Start Communities, because it is about community change.
I mean, that's what this -- that's what this department's about, right? Recognizing that community-driven process that's just so critical to sustain this effort. And at the end of the day, we're talking about these protective factors that we also care about and we're investing so much of our time in.

So I just wanted to say thank you to everyone, and I'm really looking forward to working with you all and sharing the various experiences that will be happening as I move forward as we continue to build on the great work that this team has actually put forth and, importantly as well, the work that has been identified by the community so far.

So thank you very much for the opportunity to be part of this family.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Raphael. You will -- the board and others will be hearing more from Raphael over the course of the next many months and no doubt years.

One of the things I also want to remind the board, in the announcement was the determination that I made that we needed to really strengthen the leadership team out of the blocks. So we reestablished what had been a second assistant director position, and appointed Antoinette Andrews to be the new assistant director for program and implementation.
Antoinette.

So many of you -- hopefully, the commission knows Antoinette through her leadership roles within research and evaluation. She played an instrumental role in the development of the framework, the logic model, and now the learning and accountability plan to help us assess, along with our community partners, progress towards the core results around families and communities.

So we're fortunate to have Antoinette step into this role. And along with Raphael and Marsha Ellis, I think we have a really strong leadership team that can build upon the assets and strengths of our Best Start departments, maintain the momentum and good work going on in our communities, and really keep us focused on the results we seek, which is strong families and families supporting communities.

I feel really good about the progress we're making at a staff level and also on a program level. And as we move forward with the -- you learn a lot about someone by their ring tone. I'm not sure what I'm learning.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: It's just my wife. Okay. I just sent my staff out to look for my phone. I found it. Sorry about that. Nick, where are you?

MS. BELSHE: Okay. That was funny.
So the timing of Antoinette and Raphael is excellent because we are moving forward with meetings in each of the 14 Best Start community partnerships to move the Building Stronger Families framework forward. So it will be a great opportunity for our new leadership to be in community and underscoring First 5 LA's commitment to this important work.

Couple other things I want to highlight from our work at First 5 over the course of the past months: One of the things we're going to emphasizing in our board meeting today are the two of the three strands of activity that we have been working on, what I characterize as key building blocks, to help shape and inform and strengthen decision making for First 5 LA going forward.

The long-term financial projection is one very important contextual piece to discipline and focus our work going forward, as the chair just noted. But we have two other things in play that are also critical to shaping and focusing our work going forward.

We're going to hear shortly from Jessica Kaczmarek about our initial planning and structure for strategic planning, which will be begin and end this year. And as we've discussed, the intent is for the plan to really be a decision making document that reflects the kind of focus and impact and role we intend to play going
And then the governance guidelines, which we'll talk about in a moment as well, which are really about how decisions are made with an eye towards greater consistency and transparency and discipline and decision making. So very important progress being made in putting those three key building blocks in place.

Over the course of the past month -- and we're going to hear more from James Lau, our policy director, as the final agenda item, is to talk about policy and advocacy. And I'll only preview James' comments by underscoring how terrifically exciting a moment in time this is. There are just some remarkable policy windows that have opened as a result of an improved financial context in Sacramento, but also some really important leadership emerging among the democratic legislative leaders in the California State Legislature, and also in Washington.

We just had a terrific lunch with many leaders from within the First 5 LA staff as well as partners in the child care and LACOE community talking about some new funding opportunities that are being put forward through the Obama administration which provide us with a really exciting opportunity to improve quality standards and expand access to early Head Start with a particular focus
on the zero -- the one to three, the early infants and
toddlers.

So we'll hear more about policy opportunities
from James on the state level. And then we'll be coming
back to the programming and planning committee meeting
later this month to talk more about both federal and
state.

Finally, another area that I wanted to highlight
and foreshadow will be coming to P and P either in
February or March is to talk about some of the work we're
doing to better understand and explore opportunities
around social innovation funding. We sometimes use terms
like social impact bonds, social innovation financing, Pay
for Success. It's this whole idea about using innovative
investment strategies to test new ideas to demonstrate
outcomes and do so in a way where government effectively
pays for success, pays for outcomes. If the outcomes
aren't there, then the investor is basically at risk.

We have been focusing on something called Pay for
Success over the course of the past number of months where
we potentially, as an investor, put money up front to test
and seed and support quality evidence-based programs with
the idea of government playing, as I said, an investor
role, either at the county or at the state level. But
only if results are realized. So we're looking at some of
the different things we do where this type of Pay for Success model could be applicable.

At the same time, the James Irvine Foundation just a couple of weeks ago put forward a major new initiative indicating that it's really excited and interested in Pay for Success, but it recognizes the complexity and the innovative nature of these. Again, we hear a lot about them, but there actually is, according to the experts, really only one Pay for Success project in New York city that's actually being implemented. Everything else is kind of looking like it, but not exactly it.

So the Irvine Foundation, along with the Nonprofit Finance Fund, has structured a funding opportunity where they'll select a handful of nonprofit and government leaders to provide the technical support -- are you the one that made that phone call just a moment ago, Nick?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That was the governor.

MS. BELSHE: So we've been doing some work around Pay for Success, and we think there's a real potential here. And especially as we think about our future and where we invest, what role we play, this idea of social innovation financing, Pay for Success, may be a really important model for our work going forward. So we're
trying to finalize where we might focus as a project an
see if there potentially is an opportunity for us to apply
for support through the Irvine Foundation and, if
successful, become a part of the learning community of
leaders that they're looking to support to take these Pay
for Success projects from concept to reality. And, again,
that's something we'll be taking to P and P for further
discussion as well.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Can I just add something? I
brought in a motion a while back. We are in the county
looking at -- we call them social impact bonds, and that's
what they call them in New York. And I actually went back
to New York and visited with some of Bloomberg's people
prior to his departure as mayor. It's a very complicated
issue and not easily put together, but we are going to be
looking at that as a possibility as well too on -- you
call it Pay for Success, the social impact bond. Like if
Goldman Saks got involved with New York City on the Rikers
Island piece, they obviously realized that the reality is
there's no real validation until about four years out. So
there's no real return. So they sort of backed off some
of their commitment. I'm not sure how much their
foundation is talking about. But the backstop that
they're able to do it was Bloomberg brought his own money
to the table, his own foundation. So the current chair of
the board of supervisors doesn't have that ability. But it is something that may, you know, have some future. We just need to look at it and we've got a whole bunch of folks, a couple of other counties up the road, too, I think Monterey and Santa Clara looking at it as well.

MS. BELSHE: Santa Clara is pretty far along. And to be clear, Irvine -- there are a number of different roles associated with these social innovation financing strategies. One is investor. Another is an intermediary who kind of helps organize and coordinate the whole project, then there's the quality service providers that deliver the services, then there's an evaluator to track experience and monitor outcomes, and then there's the payer of success, which is typically government where government would then step in and pay for the outcomes that had been agreed to at the front end. So there are a number of different roles.

But Irvine is looking to fund and support, along with the Nonprofit Finance Fund, is a lot of the analytics and the modeling that are so critical to figuring out what project can actually deliver a return on investment within a prescribed period of time. Often, as the chair knows, the funding period is three to five, sometimes eight years, but not everything we do has a return in that short of period of time. Some of it is many years out.
So we actually are playing the role of investor right now in a number of areas, such as Home Visitation -- Welcome Baby and Home Visitation is one example. But we're looking at other investments to see, you know, is there -- is there a project here that we can really step into this very complex but exciting approach to financing social services in a way that --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: The data collection is incredible. I mean, they just finished the first year. It's a very specific population on Rikers Island, a very specific group and not a large group. And so they'll start to compile that data and then to track. It's a whole recidivism kind of thing, but be rare if any payment was made to the provider of the dollars any sooner than four years out to see a real benefit.

MS. BELSHE: That's basically what I wanted to touch on. I'll talk more about governance guidelines after the strategic plan presentation.

But if there are any comments or questions. Duane, I don't know if you wanted to say a few words actually about the federal early education opportunities given your recent trip. I touched on them briefly, but I know these are near and dear to your heart as well as ours.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Not really. I just had a
pretty expansive meeting with staff and some of the early
care folks talking about perhaps opportunities that
we may have here in L.A. to look at head start and
care collaborations. The fed just agreed on another
half a billion dollars coming into the states and actually
coming to communities for those collaborations, really
looking at bringing care up to early head start
standards. So I think there may be some opportunities
here, and Kim and her staff are going to be, you know,
looking at what could be possibly some of the interface
perhaps in our Best Start communities in looking at
leveraging some of those funds.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. Any other
comments, questions for the executive director? No.

Okay. Next is Item Number 5. I'm going to flip
that. We're going to take Item Number 6 first, the
strategic planning process and then do the draft
governance. I thought it would be -- before we deal with
draft governance kind of issues, to sort of understand
where we're going first and then sort of back in through
the structure of the governance guidelines.

So we will begin with Item Number 6.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members.

So as I said briefly in my comments, we have
basically -- we're basically working in three strands of
activity that individually and collectively we think will really help support some of the important and difficult decisions before the commission currently and going forward. Last month, we talked about the long-term financial projection. We began a discussion around governance guidelines which we'll be continuing today. And now we wanted to introduce our initial thinking around strategic planning for 2015-20. And, Jessica Kaczmarek, who is senior program officer within community investments department, is going to be playing the role of strategic planning lead super-smarty pants as we say, with Teresa Nuno serving as senior policy advisor.

So Jessica is going to be walking the board through this.

MS. KACZMAREK: Right. Good afternoon, commissioners.

So I am here today to share with you information about our strategic planning process, which we will begin and complete this year. So I'm going to review with you existing information that will play a foundational role to the strategic plan, as well as sharing some of our goals and vision for the plan and highlight some immediate next steps related to process and timeline. Let you know where we're at.

So First 5 LA is beginning the strategic planning
process with a very comprehensive and extensive level of baseline information, which we collected during 2013 through multiple organizational assessments and scans and analyses. For example, through the listening, learning, and leading effort, L-3, that effort provided an important overview of First 5 LA's progress and accomplishments relative to this current strategic plan. And it noted that, while we have many strengths within the organization, there are also many challenges that affect our ability to achieve large-scale impact.

Additionally, during 2013, we also embarked on an effort to bring greater clarity and focus to Best Start by developing the Building Stronger Families framework. That framework provided a foundation for Best Start that is evidence-based and grounded in research and best practices. And that is another foundational element for this current strategic plan.

We also have many efforts that are ongoing, such as the long-term financial projections and the governance guidelines that will help to inform key questions, considerations, and strategic options for our board to consider.

Because we've invested significant resources into our learning over the past year, we are not beginning this strategic planning process at square one. We have a very
strong foundation and we have the significant head start; and, therefore, we are confident we can complete the process during this year.

As Kim alluded to in her ED report, this next strategic plan will be an important tool to support future decision making for the organization. We expect this strategic plan to provide a very clear blueprint for decision making over the next five years for -- for First 5 LA. At the end, we will have a plan that articulates the measurable impact First 5 LA aspires to contribute to. It will also bring greater focus to the organization's strategic direction and it will clearly define the role that First 5 LA will play in affecting the lives of children and families in LA county.

Again, because we are starting from a place of strength, we will be able to engage the commissioners very quickly in the process and we also expect to involve staff from across the organization and external stakeholders in our conversations.

So quickly, in terms of process, we are in the midst of selecting a consultant partner to work with staff to solidify an approach for completing the work and to help facilitate this process internally and externally. We've posted an RFQ back in December. And at that time, we received 11 applications from qualified strategic
planning consultant experts. Those 11 teams were reviewed by external reviewers and we brought on the top four applicants to meet with us in what we called the bidder's conference at the end of January. Those applicants were then allowed to revisit their initial proposals and to develop scopes of work and budgets that we are currently in the process of reviewing right now. And we will be interviewing those top four applicants next week. So we are very close in selecting an applicant which we will be bringing back to you next in month's consent calendar for approval.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Can I just ask a question?
So what was the reason for the rereview of their application? Was that just the top four all -- every bidder?

MS. KACZMAREK: So we had the initial 11 and then they were ranked by external reviewers based on their qualifications, and the top four were brought back for the bidder's conference which allowed us to review a lot of the learning that we completed in 2013 and allowed them to ask questions about some of our findings and what our expectations were for the next strategic plan, and that allowed them to develop more informed scopes of work so they're not having to make a lot assumptions about what our expectations were and what the information that
existed had.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I understand. But why wasn't that done at the front end with all 11? I mean, why -- because all 11 had to make assumptions; correct?

MS. KACZMAREK: Well, what we did with the 11 is we really focused on their qualifications. And all of this information was included in the RFQ as well. It was just a chance for the four who really were able to describe their qualifications and what they can -- their experience in doing strategic planning, what they could bring to First 5 LA in terms of their skills and expertise. That was really what that first phase was about.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay.

MS. KACZMAREK: So soon after the applicant is selected, we will be engaging the commissioners on next steps in talking more about decision making criteria, sharing with you a more detailed timeline of the process and some of the strategies that we will be using during this -- this year for -- to come with a completed plan by November.

What you see here is just our preliminary -- our best thinking right now about how this process will unfold. But as I mentioned, when we bring on a strategic planning consultant, we will be updating this and really
building off of their expertise and some of the strategies and best practices that they think will help us achieve our goal by November.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: As it relates to the timeline, I mean, obviously the program and policy committee is going to have a very important role to play, but it's really important that you -- the consult engage community-based groups and public early on so this doesn't -- thing doesn't get torpedoed at the end like -- you know, with late engagement, that's usually what happens to buy time. So, hopefully -- I didn't see that in the timeline, but, hopefully, that's part of it.

MS. KACZMAREK: Yes. We will definitely be having external engagement. And we've asked the consultants to think of ways that we can do that in a very timely and effective manner, given that, you know, we have about eight months to complete the whole process, but we do want to get stakeholder input and also include staff in the conversation, so, you know, representatives from across our various departments and programs.

MS. BELSHE: If I may just to finish up on that, is to also note, as I just connoted a moment ago, there's a number of other efforts underway that are critical to informing our baseline, such as the ECE landscape. And all of those have a lot of public engagements components
to them as well. So there's multiple opportunities underway and forthcoming for further community input.

COMMISSIONER AU: I'm going to assume that a lot of the planning conversation also will be within the context of the P and P committee as well, because it's probably going to be your primary priority agenda conversation for that committee. And it is an open meeting, so what I would recommend is that, when you're posting the agenda for the programming and planning, that it really be highlighted that community is going to be really welcome to engage in that input.

MS. KACZMAREK: Yes, absolutely. Thank you for that.

And our plan is to use the programs and planning committee meeting as the place where we can get into a lot of detailed conversations about some of the options that are available to us and the decision making, but we also will be bringing that information back to the board as monthly updates. So you all will be involved in the -- in the conversation.

So with that, if there are any other questions.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Any questions?

MS. BELSHE: Who is this?

MS. KACZMAREK: This is Tanner Long, and he is about a year and a half now or maybe 15 months. He is one
of our staff's little angels here in community investments.

    MS. BELSHE: Yeah. Ain't he a cutie?
    COMMISSIONER KNABE: Wow. You'd do anything to get a report passed, hu?
    MS. BELSHE: Yeah. They play that card a lot around here.
    COMMISSIONER KNABE: Are there any other questions or comments? Thank you.
    MS. BELSHE: Thanks, Jessica.

    And let me note again my appreciation to Jessica for stepping up and into this role, and for Jennifer -- to Jennifer Webb, who's the interim director of community investments for freeing Jessica up to dedicate the kind of time she has and will continue, and to Teresa Nuno who now, with Raphael's appointment, will be able to spend a bit more time on her broader portfolio as she steps a little bit further back from Best Start as Raphael and Antoinette and Marsha step in. That's why she's sitting there smiling so broadly.

    Okay. If commissioners could turn to item -- it's Item 5 on the agenda. This is the draft governance guidelines. And there's a document in your board book.
    There is not a PowerPoint to stare at, but our goal this afternoon is, I want to walk the board through kind of
where we've been and what changes have been made or
suggested, and then next steps. And actually, from a
process perspective, recall the initial draft was
presented to the commission at its January meeting.
We then had three committee presentations and discussions
with executive committee, budget and finance, and P and P.

Today, we're going to provide an overview of the
revised draft informed by input by commissioners to date.
As necessary and appropriate, there will be further
discussion with committees, later this month and early
next, with the intent of coming back to the board in March
with a final set of governance guidelines for board
approval per the chair's requested timeline.

So I want to quickly just -- I'm not going to go
through it in line by line, but I wanted to share with you
some of the high points in terms of feedback we received
most consistently across the three committees.

First, the very appropriate comment which was a
work in progress at the time and you now see the product
of, which is, so where will these guidelines go relative
to the bylaws, internal policy, board policy, and
strategic plan. And I want to appreciate Craig for his
due diligence in giving us his initial set of
recommendations in terms of where the various guidelines
most properly would reside from a governance perspective.
There was some discussion focusing right now on objectives regarding the exceptions of process and threshold. And to the extent the board is serious about this being a set of important decision making guidelines to promote more consistency and accountability and discipline, it would be important that any exceptions threshold not be too low.

So the first draft indicated two-thirds of voting members, informed by feedback. We have adjusted that upwards to seven of nine voting members, so that would be one change I would call out for your attention.

We also added a new objective related to expectations and making explicit the commission's expectations for contractors and grantees that they not expect First 5 LA's support to be a permanent source of funding for programs and services. So that's a new objective that you'll see.

In terms of the governance guidelines themselves, in terms of process, the process guideline number 1 what I'd call it there is our effort to structure the language in a way that makes clear that the board wants to promote transparency and informed decision making, but we also don't want to end up in a situation where the board is hearing the exact same presentation multiple, multiple times. So the concept is an initial introduction at a
staff level. It may be a fairly light touch. It may be a much deeper touch with a referral to the appropriate committee, discussion, and then it would come back to the board either on consent if it's fairly ministerial, or for further discussion and dialogue with the commission if it's more substantive, as I said.

So, again, trying to find the right balance. That's what this language reflects, trying to draw that distinction between substantive and nonsubstantive matters that have been engaged in at the committee level, goes towards the board's initial discussion.

If you go to the budget guidelines, jumping down to 5 and 6, sustainability and leveraging, and I want to spend a little bit more time on these, because these are probably the two issues that committees grappled with most vigorously.

And a couple things: First, we talked with the board, reminding them of our current definitions and approaches to sustainability and leveraging. And, again, to recall for all commissioners' benefit, basically, First 5 LA has approached leveraging and sustainability from the perspective of a grant making strategy as opposed to a condition of funding at the front end of a new relationship. So grant making strategy in terms of saying, well, we're going to support organizational
capacity building, community capacity building, policy change, systems change. Those are examples of grant making strategies intended to advance our interests around sustainability. With leveraging, we have a community investments department that really is all about mobilizing resources. But, again, that is a strategy that First 5 LA has advanced in the context of its work.

What we talked about with -- in the context of the draft governance guidelines is the idea of -- and this was a consistent set of comments and feedback across the committees, was the importance of us bringing these concepts of sustainability and leveraging into the front end before we enter into a new agreement, particularly multi-year service and project-related grants, that we incorporate into the design some provisions related to sustainability and leveraging.

There's also a recognition among the commission members about the importance of recognizing that, number one, there's a continuum of approaches. It's not like there's one single leveraging or sustainability strategy, but a continuum of approaches; and, second, to recognize that one size doesn't fit all, that smaller organizations or smaller investments, more discrete one-time projects may not call for the same type of sustainability and leveraging requirements as a much larger organization with
greater capacity or a multi-year, more significant investment might call for.

Finally, we shared with commissioners that we were in the field, so to speak, in terms of reaching out to county commissions around the state to learn from them. We want to be a learning organization. All wisdom and truth is not resident within First 5 LA. And the county commissions are enormously receptive and helpful in terms of answering our many, many questions. And we're learning a lot from them, from large county commissions as well as smaller ones. So some of that learning has been incorporated into the revisions.

It terms of the revised language, a couple things I would call out, and this is for Item 5 and Item 6. Number one, around sustainability, making clear, just stating explicitly the commission's expectations that applicants coming to this organization going forward for support are going to need to be able to sustain that work beyond the lifeline, if you will, of First 5 LA's financial support. And that, as a condition of funding, again, incorporating sustainability into the front end of our work, we will have some requirements.

Now what we're proposing here -- and, again, this is more at kind of a policy level with implementation details would need to be worked out more specifically.
But the concept we are suggesting to the commission is that, as a condition of funding, applicants would have to develop and provide a sustainability plan. So not after the fact, but at the front end as a part of our work together. We would provide guidance to applicants in terms of what information would need to be required. We need to make clear, for example, what specifically are we looking to sustain and what objectives, what other anticipated sources of funding might be -- do they believe would be available, what are some of the specific action steps they would intend to take to advance that sustainability plan.

The thinking is that these kinds of provisions, this plan, would be incorporated into the solicitation process itself. We would have a scoring tool, as we have now, that would also score, have some level of points associated with that plan, and that it would be a product of evaluating performance in terms of how a successful applicant ultimately does.

Now, sustainability and leveraging, while different, are also very closely related because leveraging is often a strategy for sustainability in terms of how an organization identifies and brings -- uses First 5 LA support to bring in additional funds. In terms of leveraging, what we're suggesting here is that, as a
condition of funding, applicants would have to demonstrate to us how they intend to secure funds beyond First 5 LA to support the particular project or work. And for those that are unable to demonstrate the ability to secure funds, they'd have to give us a sense of what's their plan over the period of the project for acquiring funds outside of First 5 LA for the project. For those applicants that are asking for First 5 LA funds for multiple years of funding, we would want to work with them to demonstrate that our support over a period of time would be gradually going down as other resources would be coming up. And we might want to structure it in a way so that our release of support in years two, three, four, if we are in a five-year project for example, that the additional funds would be dependant upon certain milestones being met.

We've begun to do that in the context of some of our most recent grants such as the WIC grant that was done this past summer. But the idea is to work in a collaborative, constructive way with prospective applicants and making clear at the front end the expectation that First 5 LA's funds are not going to be the only funds supporting a particular project and that those who are going to be successful partners with us are going to need to be able to demonstrate over a period of time their ability to secure additional support. And,
again, those leveraging provisions like the sustainability provisions would be included in our solicitations, our scoring tool, and our performance evaluation.

A couple of final quick comments, additional comments from the committee discussions, drop guideline number 7 related to expiration of contracts and grants, consistent feedback was to clarify that this is really intended to apply to multi-year projects and initiatives as opposed to personal services contracts or consultants. And suggested revision we've brought here is to drop what earlier had been a sit-out requirement and instead put language in that makes clear that future requests be evaluated. So say we have a contract that comes to an end per the terms of contract. Should future requests come forward, they'd be evaluated. They wouldn't be rejected right out of hand, but they would be evaluated based upon the specific criteria that would be applied consistent with the new strategic plan.

In terms of the strategic plan and the draft guidelines, generally we got a lot of very good and constructive feedback. There was some clarifying questions regarding the criteria for consideration of new initiatives and programs in context of the next strategic plan. It was noted that these criteria are consistent with already board approved policy that dates back to
2012. The one particular change I would call out relates to alignment and making clear that, when we talk about alignment, it's alignment with the outcomes embodied in the next strategic plan, specific objectives and strategy. Otherwise, those criteria are generally consistent with what was in the earlier draft and, as I said, are consistent with board approved policy from 2012.

Finally, finally, we have definitions on the back trying to make more concrete what we mean by these terms of assigned, committed, and unassigned, as well as offer some accessible and straightforward -- reasonably straightforward definitions of sustainability and leveraging that are generally consistent with our current definitions.

So with that, I would invite comments, questions, and again note that, from a process perspective, next step is we would be working with the board committees to get additional feedback, discussion to bring a final set of governance guidelines to the board in March.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I would just ask a couple of questions: One -- obviously, the two things: One, is that this is not a permanent source of funding I think is critical to those whole governance process, that everybody understands that going in. And the actual -- I believe it was under Item 7, expiration dates are so important.
The other important piece to me is the sequencing of the action items, that we don't do it multiple times and more importantly it goes through. I was a good boy, didn't hold the vision to learn thing on the agenda that was covered for action because that is a poster child of what can't happen anymore in front of this commission. With the downgrading of our revenues and everything else, you can't just all of a sudden bring in a motion and spend that kind of money without it going through a process to see what other options might be available, whether opportunities are funded, the whole sequence of events. And that's why I think this whole piece is really important. We've got our timeline and need to do it, But your input is invaluable to this. And then, hopefully, at next meeting, we can take some final action.

Questions or comments? Yes, Dr. DelGado.

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: First, I want to comment that I think this is a really comprehensive plan. I appreciate the manner in which the committees have come together and then brought these points all together. I'm very supportive of them all. I like the balance between sustainability and leverage. The leveraging piece I'd like to speak to just a little though because I know that we're speaking in terms of all that's going within our Best Start communities. And I made a comment like this
sometime back, but I wanted to just put it out there, keep it fresh in our minds that, oftentimes, our communities with the least ability to be able to conduct these types of criteria in order to -- to even be eligible for any monies, those are the communities that need the most help.

A decision was made sometime back that we were going to go with communities that had promise and so on, and I get that and I'm supportive of that. But this is the reason why I like this leveraging piece. I just wanted to make a comment to that the leveraging does at least allow for a community that doesn't have the wherewithal at least to be able to organize enough to come to First 5 LA. I hoping that we'll be open to communities like that. And say that, if you can show us a plan, if you can show that you're moving toward sustainability and recognizing that our funding here at First 5 is going down in the direction that we don't like it to go, but nevertheless is a reality, then I just want to promote that type of input from those communities because knowing well that the poorest communities tend to be the most mobile communities, and they don't stay put long enough to be able to have the organization that we are going to require from this. And so I'm hoping that we can help in that areas as a commission as well.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: All right.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And I said this during P and P. It has been our practice on occasion to be the emergency service when in fact other funds have been, you know, just gone away because of our executive order or whatever have you. And I would not want to lose that. So -- and -- and -- but in so doing, it doesn't go through the normal processes that have been outlined. So -- and I could give you a couple of examples: Black Infant Health was one, when we bailed out stage three, when the governor stopped a program, that was another. And those -- those were essential services that, if First 5 hadn't been there, it could have been very, very traumatic for a lot of families. So to that end, I don't know how we want to deal with that.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: It's in there.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah. The last -- it's such a -- it's an important point. And the intent of the guidelines is not to be totally inflexible and not allow the commission to be responsive in times of emergency and significant need. So that's why we've offered that final bullet under objectives to -- and we changed the language a little bit really to respond to significantly changed circumstances or emergencies as you described by authorizing exceptions.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And I don't want that to
be, okay, now everything I want to do, let me put it in
the emergency section. I really wanted -- I want the
language to reflect -- be reflective of critically; if
these funds are not given, the service like go away
tomorrow or something like that.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: That's a rarity. I mean,
it's an emergency situation, but it's a rarity when you
have to bring it before and take the action the same day.
It would still be vetted properly. And my comment was not
to say we wouldn't do that, but at least get the proper
vetting so that we know that there are other funding
options; maybe it might impact how much we participate or
don't participate. But that can be done within 30 days.

I agree. I totally agree. I wasn't advocating
to get rid of emergency services.

Any other? Yes.

COMMISSIONER AU: May I just ask sort of a
timeframe? I know that it's still informational at this
juncture. When do you envision this coming forward to act
upon?

MS. BELSHE: We intend to have the guidelines on
the agendas for the next committee meetings to just ensure
opportunity for further dialogue and input from
commissioners as well as members of the public and then a
final version would come to the board for action in March.
COMMISSIONER AU: Then I'll ask another somewhat technical question. Knowing that once it's acted upon it will be the policy by which we will be operating from that point forward, but there are a number of components within this governance policy that may -- we may need to tack into to guide us, especially when a number of our -- our previous investments are coming up for sunsetting. And is there going to be that kind of -- let me see. Can we use this policy to guide us in terms of making those kinds of decisions. Because as the chair sort of pointed out at our last commission meeting, there are a number of investments that we've done that have made tremendous impact in the communities and we are going to get folks coming to the podium saying, hey, you know, we've -- this is a very important program, you really need to prioritize us and continue to fund us on some level.

Do you know what I'm saying?

COMMISSIONER KNABE: But I think that's the purpose of the guidelines is to use it for that going forward, that you're not making seat-of-the-pants kinds of decisions, that you have a proper vetting process and stick to the guidelines.

I think the bottom line is, everybody has to understand there are no guarantees now. You can't guarantee anything when you're getting 90 million and
you're spending 200 million. We don't operate on personal budgets like that. So it's going to be more difficult. There's going to be some tough decisions based on these guidelines that we're going to have to make on a very specific program.

COMMISSIONER AU: So the previous investments will not be immune to this new policy. And I'm looking at Craig.

MR. STEELE: That's correct. And you have two, as I see it, sets of decisions that are really coming this year that will be affected by this. One would be sunsetting or expiring grants. The other is decisions related to this strategic plan going forward. You'll have the opportunity to make those decisions based on these guidelines in both instances. So these will apply once you adopt them.

COMMISSIONER AU: Thank you. I appreciate that clarification.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Any other questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: I have a question. Can we just get -- these are fabulous in terms of the guidelines and getting some direction on how we're going to look at some decision making. For numbers 8 through 9 for the strategic planning, is there a reason
why we're not including board -- as board and internal policies also?

COMMISSIONER KNABE: What item are you referring to?

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: 8 and 9.

MS. BELSHE: Let me ask Craig to speak to that. I think Karla is asking for a guideline --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Under governance --

MS. BELSHE: Under governance and strategic planning 8, 9, and 10, the distribution of the -- the implementing mechanisms, Craig.

MR. STEELE: With regard to number 8 and 10, there bylaw -- they're going to be incorporated into the bylaws which is your operating document. And so there's not really a need to have something for the board below the bylaws. We don't need to have a policy and the bylaw because we tend to start having conflicts and confusion. So the bylaw is kind of the primary document.

With regard to number 9 and also number 10, those are program specific. And since you're going to be making decisions on a strategic planning basis this year, you'll be able to make those program specific decisions and put them into the strategic plan which governs everything we do for the next five years.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I appreciate this color
coding. That really is helpful as it related to the various items and what they applied to or where they're going to be inserted.

Mr. Steele: And by the way, these are recommendations just sort of my best judgment on these. We're not married to these particular allocation of these items. If folks think -- if commissioners think that this would be better served to add it somewhere else, we can discuss that as well. This is just an initial recommendation as to the allocation.

Commissioner Pleitez Howell: Based on that, I'd like to ask that we consider number 10 as a board and internal policy just because of the difficult decisions that we will be having in the upcoming months, and it's a strategic plan. That -- we took some time to discuss those specific criteria and I think it would be really helpful in terms of every time we're making a decision, we're able to point to this criteria. So I'd like to ask to take that into consideration.

Commissioner Knabe: We're in effect doing that by putting it in the bylaws; is that correct?

Mr. Steele: That's correct. What I don't normally like to have is two documents that say the same thing because I don't want to have any inconsistencies potentially between the two. But we can look at the
hierarchy and see if that's the right way to do it. And we'll take a look at that and report back.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Other questions?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: I just had one quick question. As far as sustainability plans may be really new to a lot of agencies who may be new to applying to First 5. And you mentioned that there may be some assistance available from -- would it be from staff or their other external experts that would be able to maybe have some type of joint meeting or --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Probably should do workshops.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Yeah, exactly, because, again, they're new ideas and some people may not realize that they have something that is matchable, they have something that can be leveraged, they have maybe even product or services that can be -- they can get money back on. And since this is something new to them, it could open their eyes having a workshop like this just to hear about the opportunities.

MS. BELSHE: You're absolutely right. And as a part of our survey work with other county commissions, we've been asking that question. So what are the requirements, if any, around sustainability and leveraging, to whom do they apply those requirements, what
type of enforcement and monitoring and what type of
technical assistance and support. So we're gathering some
good information about what has worked well as well as
what hasn't worked so well.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: One of the other things I sit on. Unfortunately, you can't do it here because we don't have contracts that expire at same time. But at some of the other entities, one of the processes that work that say, from January until the end of February is the application period. When you go through the entire process to, you know, sustainability, the whole thing, so everybody is sort of competing at the same time. Then you poll and, you know, November to December, you start holding your workshops kind of thing.

But, unfortunately, we'd have to probably schedule two or three a year as it relates to just because we've got contracts that are necessarily tied to our fiscal year.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah. Although we're trying to get them closer in line --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: It would be nice if we could, but based on the way we've approved things in the past, that's going -- almost impossible.

COMMISSIONER AU: And just another comment is that First 5 LA has had a history of providing some assistance to agencies previously regarding
sustainability. And so perhaps what may be helpful is to build upon that experience, I think, and so that we're not -- we're a whole lot more effective in terms of the technical assistance regarding sustainability. And I'm looking at Teresa because it was her unit that ran many of those seminars and workshops.

    MS. BELSHE: And that's right in the context of a grant making strategy. So now, it's -- it's related, but it's a little different.

    COMMISSIONER AU: It's a --

    MS. BELSHE: But you're right, where we can build upon something that's --

    COMMISSIONER KNABE: At the end of the day, it's going to make every entity that applies for money, it's going to make their application that much better, not just for us but for other groups and organizations that they apply to. Because if you start coming up with good grant applications and you have sustainability and leveraging, that makes a very, very heavy impression. We all know that because we've been involved with other entities that evaluated based on that.

    Yes, Deanne.

    COMMISSIONER TILTON: I guess I'm a little bit confused about Number 9. In other words, if there's a -- an initiative that is coming to the close of its -- of its
contract in order to continue, then it has to align with
the new strategic plan, but there won't be a new strategic
plan for -- until next September. Is that when we'll have
the new strategic plan? So how will they -- how will we
assess that?

MS. BELSHE: I -- I think what we're getting at
with -- endeavoring to get at with number 9 is the
recognition that we have 58 separate projects and
initiatives that are due to end at varying periods of
time. And so some are coming to an end this year, some
early next year, some the following. So guideline number
7 is really about contracts and grants that are expiring
now. And the item 9 is really more those that will be
coming to an end next year or the following year.

So it's like, when they're coming to an end in
the context of the new strategic plan. We're not there
yet. So that's really the difference between 7 and 9.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: You do call it out as 2015,
2020.

MS. BELSHE: So it's for those legacy investments
expiring during the period of our next strategic plan.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Any other questions or
comments?

MS. BELSHE: Let me close by thanking and
acknowledging the entire contracts compliance department
that have become best friends with the county commissions around California who have been, as I said, very, very generous with their time and our contracts and compliance folks lead by Jennifer Ekert have done a great job, and our community investments team that has a long history under Teresa and now Jennifer's leadership around all things sustainability and leveraging. I understand we have a long history with these issue. So we're drawing upon a lot of good knowledge and wisdom and learning and want to thank CI as well. So thank you for your feedback, and we'll be talking with the commission in committee.

And, Mr. Chair, I think we have one final agenda item if you'd like to charge ahead.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yes, I would. I was informed, during my briefing with the executive director, that some policy that you all adopted somewhere along the line over the last 15 years required a yoga break or something. And I -- and he was --

MS. BELSHE: And he was so enthusiastic about it.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yeah, right, I'm saying -- you know -- I mean, I love you all, but if we can continue to move forward, I think, if you don't mind, if you're willing to sacrifices your yoga break. If you want to go ahead and get a cookie and feel better about yourself, do that, too. But we'll plow ahead with the last item and
then we can adjourn.

MS. BELSHE: Since we're moving with dispatch --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: If we get done early, we can
do the walk then.

MS. BELSHE: We'll take a family walk around the
block.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: We can walk through Union
Station.

MS. BELSHE: Go to Union Station?

COMMISSIONER KNABE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER AU: Do you know you have an expert
sitting in the corner regarding --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I know. That's why -- he's
the one that put the funny comments in here.

Legislative update.

MS. BELSHE: James.

MR. LAU: Thank you, commissioners. Thank you
for this time to provide a quick update about -- about our
-- some of the work that we've been doing for the past
year and also just to share some of the new opportunities
as -- as Kim highlighted about -- and I the chair also
alluded to in his visit to Sacramento, about some
opportunities that we can undertake. And then I also want
to close by previewing our criteria for the 2014
legislative agenda.
So just as a way of background, I wanted to just give a little context of what we do. So policy, we support -- we work around trying to achieve the four outcome goals through our ten policy goals. We do this in two ways: One is through grant making strategy. It's supporting organizations that align with trying to achieve our ten policy goals. And then the second part is that we directly, as an agency, actually lobby and influence legislation around our ten policy goals.

Given this conversation that's been taking place, the poster over there about declining revenues, we're looking at ways that we can begin to sustain the types of investments that we care about. So one of the things that we did was to retain the services of Sacramento- and DC-based advocates. Those are California strategies and the Ruben Group respectively. And then per the guidance of this commission, to prioritize our policy and advocacy efforts around early childhood education, home visitation services.

So when we began to do this work of trying to prioritize -- prioritize our efforts, we began to look at some short-term, intermediate-term, and long-term goals. So this is a chart that we had developed and presented previously to this commission. It lays out what we wanted to try to accomplish in the long term, five-plus years.
Then in the short term of leading towards these long-term, goals. So in the short term, we're looking at, you know, in this year and over the next three years, what can we do to begin to move the needle towards supporting these services.

Developing these goals we also looked at -- because these goals don't operate in a vacuum. It also -- we have to consider the political and policy context, the landscape that's occurring, and it also helps to inform -- to inform these goals. So I just wanted to remind us of what had happened during 2013.

The major thing was Prop 30 had brought in new revenue, and that revenue was used to pay down much of the debt that had occurred in previous years. The major reform in 2013 was around the local control funding formula, which I'll talk about a little bit more in a little bit. And then, specifically for us, you know, ECE was a budget priority for this Assembly, but not necessarily in the Senate. When California strategies was talking to staffers and legislators, home visitation wasn't even on the radar for anybody. We also saw that in the budget that went to the governor, he vetoed $5 million of the $30 million in preschool spending. In that veto message, he said that he consider this a one-time expenditure. So this wasn't a priority for the governor.
So taken what this policy and political landscape, combining it with these goals, we wanted to -- we were assessing what we can do and what impact we can make.

So in 2013. We looked at ECE and home visitation. For around ECE, we saw that there was potential for state policy and budget success in near term. We also saw that the local control funding formula provided major opportunity. So this is the reform that -- that shifted the decision making on how education dollars are spent from Sacramento down to the school districts. And it also bumped up not only the baseline spending per pupil, but also focused much of those dollars to communities that need it the most. So these are communities that served low-income population, low-income children, foster youth, and English language learners.

We also saw that -- that you know, being the new kids on the block, we also needed to work in close collaboration with other ECE advocates up in Sacramento.

The last thing is that, being here in -- again, being new kids, we needed to work more closely with and develop those relationships with LA county legislators.

So on home visiting -- home visiting, it was a much different story. We had to do a lot of ground work in just trying to build up the story about what home
visiting is. We also needed to engage public and private providers on -- on this issue. We needed to educate policymakers about their cost benefits of home visiting. So taking this, we wanted to, you know, make it concrete, look at specific strategies and activities that we can undertake to begin to move forward in trying to achieve those short-term goals.

So let me talk about ECE and home visitation. So around ECE, we dove in and we made an immediate impact. So on the local funding control formula, We took a two-pronged approach: One is we targeted the state board of education. They're the ones that have and made a decision on how the local control accountability plan would be developed. And this is the plan that the school districts would use to invest their resources into services. We wanted to make sure that the state board allowed -- allowed investments into early learning programs.

The second strategy we took was influencing local districts and to educate them that they can actually use this money for early learning programs. We brought in a coalition of early -- early childhood advocates. We, you know, coordinated our strategies and talked about messaging, looked at what school districts we could have an impact. We knew that, given the number of school districts here in Los Angeles county, that we couldn't
necessarily hit all of them. So we made a focused effort
on those school districts that we could build in those
early successes and show that early learning can be
incorporated into the local control accountability plans.

As part of this process, too, school districts
and school board wanted to hear from parents. So we
worked with our Best Start communities and also with
families in schools to engage parents, encourage them to
be a part of the process and to say that they wanted early
learning to be a part of the local control accountability
plans.

So because of that, we started seeing some
positive traction. State board in -- earlier did release
their LCAPS, and it did allow for early learning to be
included in it.

At the local level, we started to see in working
with some school boards, LAUSD in particular, wanted to
have from us a specific proposal on what does it actually
mean for school districts to invest in early learning.

So this was a great positive success that we saw.
We want to take this model and also replicate it up at the
state level. So we developed specifically a
Sacramento-based advocacy coalition. We brought together
other advocates and began to -- again, began to coordinate
messaging and used this as a way of -- of making sure that
we're all coordinated, the messages that go out there are similar because we know that, if there's divergent messages, it reduces and it hinders our efforts to be able to move policies forward. So we -- we have regular meetings up in Sacramento through California Strategies, includes advocates -- children's advocates, business groups like LA Chamber and the Bay Area Council, and then also public safety, like Fight Crime Invest in Kids.

The other area that we made an immediate impact was around the -- around the workforce credentialing. So at the commission for teacher credentialing, there was beginning to look at developing a credential for preschool. So a P to three credential. And this is one of the strategies that we thought was important because a qualified workforce will bump up the quality of programs. So California Strategies serves as our representatives to the advisory commission as we're developing a work plan around that.

So that's -- early childhood education. I'm going to move on to home visiting.

So again home visiting is a much different ball game. So around home visiting, what we're doing right now is trying to build -- you know, pull together the different pieces that would help us begin to make a case for home visiting and for sustainable sources of revenue
for home visiting. So we also took a similar model of trying to bring together the different groups that are involved in home visiting. So federally-funded state home visiting program began to talk to other First 5 commissions who are doing in this work. Aligning our data interests so that we have this rich pool of data that can be used to tell the story of the successes that we're having with -- around home visiting.

The other thing, too, is that not only do you want to engage our -- our supporters, we also want to build and expand who's -- who's supporting home visiting. So these are the groups that we would think that would benefit from home visiting services. These are hospitals, medical groups, and health plans. We began to sit down with them try to find out about what their data and -- and information needs are so that -- that we can find this information out, we can provide this information, work together, and then start to -- to advocate for these programs in a coalition. We're beginning to -- you know, as we're beginning to ramp up Welcome Baby program, this is the information we're taking as we're looking at the research and evaluation of these programs so we can build it in at very beginning and provide this information later on.

The other strategy that we're taking is around --
around sustainable public sources. And we're looking at opportunities within Medi-Cal, Title 19. So we've subcontracted or hired the services of Health Management Associates. They're experts in Title 19, so they're looking at how Title 19 can be utilized to support Welcome Baby services.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: You might explain what Title 19 is so maybe for the public.

MR. LAU: Sure. That's Medi-Cal.

And, lastly, just on home visiting, we're trying to educate policymakers and raise the visibility of home visiting. We find a champion in the Assembly, the chair of the Assembly Health Committee, Richard Pan. He's a former Sacramento commissioner, a pediatrician, and he's been a great supporter of home visiting. He's agreed to host a home visiting legislative briefing in Sacramento on the 25th of this month. This is going to be used to -- and he's going to use this to bring his colleagues, policymakers, staff, and administration to -- to this to hear about what kind of services and how this benefits the zero to five population.

So those are some of the strategies and activities we've taken around home visiting.

So given those two -- this work around ECE and home visiting this past year, we've learned a lot of
things around what our value and contributions are. So, you know, advocates have said that they've appreciated our serving as a convener, we bring a strategic mindset. And I'll give an example. We're working with the Assembly speaker's office in embedding the investments that we have on -- within each one of the legislative websites so they can see within their communities what we're doing to -- to benefit their constituents. We also bring political help. We come from Los Angeles. So this is where many of the legislators reside. And we have a much different relationship with legislators because we actually invest into their communities where they see that we are serving their constituents.

So we take this, what we've learned and the activities that we've done, and this helps to inform the exciting opportunities that we have going forward in 2014. So I'm going to transition now to talking about some of these exciting opportunities that Kim had mentioned early on.

So on -- I wanted to first talk about early childhood education. Again, this -- I think this is a very exciting part. There's a lot of movement, and I'm sure a lot of you have been hearing about -- about ECE this year. So Prop 98 is -- there's about $10 billion, with a B, in new monies. Both legislative leaders, both
in the Senate -- Senate President Pro Tem and the Assembly Speaker have said and made this issue a top priority for them. When -- when advocates were developing the proposals for ECE this year, they shopped it around and both of them said that they wanted a transformative and visionary policy for this year. And I'll talk about that in a minute.

Even Governor Brown has started to reconsider his position on it. We've heard from his appointees that, you know, they're starting to talk about this. We're -- especially with both the Senate leader and the Assembly leader, aligning this. It provides very powerful and political supporters on this issue.

So on this transformative and visionary policy, it's a -- it's an early learning legislation. There's two companions, and I'll talk about that really quickly.

So the first one is around transitional kindergarten. So this one would provide transitional kindergarten for all four-years olds. So it expands on what's currently about a quarter of the four-year olds in California. So it would ramp over five years so that all four-year olds would have access to half-day transitional kindergarten. The bill also calls for improving quality and access. Because this is a half-day program, it also diverts or redirects existing dollars so that wrap-around
services can be provided. So it can be for full-day programs for low-income children. And it also includes a mixed model delivery system.

The other companion piece to it is what's called a strong start bill. And this would cover the zero to three population. It's currently a spot bill, which means that it's -- there's a just placeholder right now. There's a technical advisory committee that's informing the authorize on how this would look like. But in concept, it would double the number of zero to three-year olds that would be served. It would take the -- it would build upon the evidence-based approaches from early head start.

Not on here, too, but on the Assembly side, the speaker did put into his blueprint that making transitional kindergarten a high priority for him. So we have on both sides of the House strong support from them.

So I'm going to transition to home visiting. So, again, with Assemblyman Richard Pan, he's taking this home visiting legislative briefing as an opportunity to educate his colleagues. He's looking at -- at using this as a way of potentially using some budget plates to support home visiting. So this is -- it's really exciting that he's actually doing it. We're also seeing it at the state level that the benefits are crossing the different arms of
health and human services agency. And then the data and
the benefits of home visiting are becoming more and more
well known.

So on -- on the governor's budget. You may be
wonder how all this is going to be funded. Because this
is all new money. The governor's budget, his spending
plan, spending increased by $11 billion. And as I said,
there's $10 billion in new Prop 98 money. He is using
that currently right now to pay down much the deferrals.
And unfortunately right now there isn't anymore money for
ECE spending. Like I said, with both legislative leaders,
they are working together and in unison to advocate for
more money for ECE.

The last thing I'll just mention is that there is
a proposal for Calworks to do a six-county pilot and it
has an opportunity to have some home visiting components
in there.

So with the other thing that we had to consider
when we were first looking at developing the goals was
also first -- internal considerations. One of the -- you
know, given that we have these three around the TK, around
round ECE and home visiting and the governor's budget, we
see that policy and advocacy can play a critical role in
the sustainability strategy.

We also see that and conversations have taken
place at this commission about Title 19, Medi-Cal, as a possible funding source for vision services and for dental. The other consideration that wasn't on our radar at the time was also trying to apply the Building Stronger Families framework within best start to nonplaced-based work. So we're looking at how we can apply the core protective factors in our legislative work, and I'll talk about that more in a minute.

The last part, too, is just not only trying to coordinate and provide better access to services, but it's also identifying within Best Start communities what kind of services are lacking there. And this is information that can be taken to advocate for those services.

So those are some of the internal considerations, but I think overall considerations, too, up in Sacramento that, if we're going to take and if we're going to affect, I guess, these new opportunities, we also have to be mindful that there's some other policy and political implications. One is that the legislative leaders, these leaders who are champions, they are terming out this year. It's going to require a heavy lift on -- heavy advocacy lift to influence all of these proposed policies. And also -- there's also worry, I mean, like in ECE field about all these changes that it would require the school districts who have also seen a lot of reforms, you know,
with Common Cower, LCFF to now also see this too. It also
requires worker force investment changes since TK does
require both teachers and -- lead teachers and associate
teachers to have either a BA or an AA. And then there's
also macro issues around the prison realignment and, as we
see here, a drought and high-speed rail.

So I want to return to -- as we're considering
all these things. You know, I had shown earlier the
short-term, long -- intermediate-term, and long-term
goals. So because of these opportunities, we're not
working just on the short-term goals, we're actually
working on -- we're also working on the intermediate-term
and long-term goals.

As I said, it's going to require a heavy lift on
all of our parts if we're going to be engaged in this. So
what we've done, too, is that we've requested the
extension of California Strategies contract and also to
reflect the contracts so that we have an increased
engagement in these activities. And I just want to thank
you for approving that as part of the consent calendar.

So I wanted to shift from these new opportunities
specifically as it relates to ECE and home visiting and
just talk about our broader legislative agenda. We do
have a legislative agenda that -- that mirrors our policy
-- our ten policy goals. So this is a tool that was
approved by this commission in June of 2013. And this is how we -- how we sift through the hundreds of bills that come through. We're right now in February of -- February and bills are being introduced. And there's hundreds of bills that are introduced. So this is a way for us to prioritize the bills that come through.

And not -- so I wanted to bring this up just for that -- for the reason just to let you know that we will not bringing a legislative agenda at the P and P meeting for full discussion. But also, too, to illustrate how this be can be used to -- to look at protective factors or core results within the Building Stronger Families framework. So as you see up in the alignment, we do have parent supports up there. And as we're looking at legislation, we're giving consideration to bills that increase parental support, helps increase their knowledge and their ability to be parents, and also reducing the barriers to these services for -- for parents.

So lastly, again, just on next steps. So at the February P and P meeting, we'll have a full discussion on the legislative criteria that I showed. We'll also introduce just based upon the bills that have gone through this legislative criteria tool to begin to present that. We'll also bring, as part of that legislative package, the staff analysis of the TK -- the TK bill and also the
strong start, the zero to three component. We'll also in -- in the February or in March and April commission bring for your approval the legislative agenda that comes from that legislative tool. And then we'll provide, as this is a very heavy, intensive year, updates to leadership about legislative developments.

So with that, I want to conclude and take any questions. Any questions? And that is Stacy's daughter.

MS. BELSHE: At age?

MR. LAU: Two.

MS. BELSHE: And how old is she now?

MR. LAU: Eleven. Resemblance.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Duane?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think a piece that is probably missing that we should include is, there's a lot fervor on the national level as well. I think Calderon is doing a bill on annual visits through licensing. And I think part of licensing the oversight of early childhood programs. California has some of the most horrific licensing policies in the country. We see providers once every five years, and the national standard is once every year, and that -- that's coming out in the new CDC -- CCDF regs. So I would suggest that part of our policy agenda deals to licensing. And I know Supervisor Antonovich recently had the Office of Childcare do some work and
research around some, you know, mishaps in the valley. So I -- I would suggest that we -- we take, as a part of our advocacy agenda, the -- the oversight of childcare programs and make sure that's a part of our agenda.

MR. LAU: We do look at the federal level and we'll be, during P and P, be talking about some federal policies that are going through, and the CCDF is one that is on our radar.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I was just saying, it's on the docket. I don't know where it's going to go. I think it's Calderon -- is it Calderon, I think. Calderon has a licensing bill in this session that moves towards annual visits. And I think that's something that here in LA County we can, you know, work with our supervisors around, because this has been a major issue as we look at, you know, QRIS and all of that, you know, the oversights of our childcare programs.

MS. BELSHE: I'm confident, if there's a Calderon bill on licensing oversight, it will be being evaluated and let's see what the reviewing tool produces. I'm confident it will be identified as a priority, but that's why we try to come up with some criteria and weighting to help us prioritize. So if it doesn't emerge, let us step back and back at the criteria and weighting.

MR. LAU: And you'll hear about that at our next
P and P meeting later this month.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. If you could expand a little bit more on Prop 98 because I'm somewhat confused at this point. We talked about initially there was $10 billion for ECE out of Prop 98. No, you're shaking your head. That's a misunderstanding on my part. So could you elaborate further?

MR. LAU: Yeah, there's a formula that guarantees how much money that education receives, K through 14. And it's based upon the general fund. So, typically, it's about -- you know, above 40 percent. So it goes towards just education spending. So the point I was making was that there's all this new money coming in through Prop 98, about $10 billion, and this is going towards K through 12 -- I mean, through 14. But none of that has been segmented for ECE, but it can be. And that's what the TK bill is doing. It's using Prop 98 dollars as a way of supporting TK services.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: That's the problem are too. That's the competition, right? How we use it.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. Now I'm clearer.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Any other questions?

Yes, Deanne.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Are we really pulling on
the very well documented and passionate advocacy of child
abuse prevention for home visitation? Home visitation is
like the number one called-for service to prevent child
abuse on a national level. It also reduces cigarette
smoking in mothers, so it's not all good. But on the
other hand, I don't know that my constituency has been
called on to really make some very -- very compelling
arguments for home visitation, for a lot of reasons, but
also with the documentation of reduction in child abuse
over the years. And we, of course, have focused on that
here in some of our sessions, but I'm not hearing it now.

It's also prevention, and I guess I also had a
question about why prevention is at the bottom of our
criteria when the return on investment really is much
higher than in some of the other areas.

So I'm just offering that there's -- there's no
lack of willingness to help push for home visitation from
the child serving population, particularly the child abuse
population -- child abuse advocacy population. The
anti-child abuse advocacy population.

MR. LAU: I'm sorry. I'm not sure what the
question was.

MS. BELSHE: I think it's like --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: You like smoking.

MS. BELSHE: Deanne's underscoring that there's a
large -- we need to build as big a tent as possible of advocates to make the case from a variety of perspectives in support of home visitation, the child abuse prevention community is a good example. So we've been working with law enforcement, as James said. So I think it's a good reminder that we need to look more broadly.

And in terms of the weighting, that's something actually we've been taking another look at in terms of -- so we have our legislative agenda development tool has a number of criteria, as James noted. We are -- we will be coming back to P and P and then back to the board in March, recommending some modifications. And James touched on we want to make sure that review tool now incorporates our placed-based focus and priorities. And that will change some of the bills we get engaged in. I think that's a very positive development and a good example of better connecting countywide in placed-based work.

But secondly is this issue of weighting because we've been talking internally about, well, what does that mean that prevention be weighted so low and what in practice do those weights really mean. So we may be coming back to P and P with some alternate ways of thinking about that and then to the full board next month.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: I have a comment and a question.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: First, in terms of a comment, the policy group is just really doing really, really great work. What you've outlined in terms of the meetings in Sacramento are completely needed, especially at this time. Having a conversation about home visitation is incredible. So thank you for presenting this information and doing this work.

The question relates to the dental and vision. Has First 5 looked at Obamacare or AHCA in terms of what's going to be provided under insurance for young children there because it's my understanding that children zero through 19 might get dental coverage under AHCA. So it might be something align in terms of the work that's being done with First 5 and making sure that either we are giving information to the public or about that -- about what's happening with Obamacare for young children, at least the zero to five population, or we're trying to figure out how to continue to leverage those dollars. But it would be great to get some information about how we're looking into that in terms of what First 5's doing.

Has there been any work done on that?

MR. LAU: I don't want to overstep because --

MS. BELSHE: Let me step. Wearing my other hat.

It's a terrific question and it's one that this
commission has grappled with for quite a while. And I recall my very first commission meeting in November of 2012, there was a big dental initiative before the commission, which was enormously important. But I remember asking, so who are these kids and aren't they all in Medi-Cal? Or shouldn't they be in Medi-Cal? And if they're not eligible for Medi-Cal but they're under five or their incomes -- and their incomes either because of their immigration status or incomes -- we've got the healthy kids program. So who are these kids? And the same question with vision.

The punch line is, these kids are all insured or they should be insured. And they've got a card that does make them eligible for all of these services. So the Affordable Care Act absolutely. I mean, even before the Affordable Care Act, Medi-cal coverage includes eye screens, eye exams, eye glasses, includes dental services.

The issue isn't a coverage issue. It's really one of parental education and awareness and knowledge. It's also a big issue of provider participation because, while the benefits may be covered, the reimbursement rates are very low. Part of it is parents may not -- they may not even know something's covered. We've actually had a couple of discussions with Susanne about the work that the LA County Department of Public Health has gathered through
some support we've provided that provides really
interesting insights into what's going on with parents who
have Medi-Cal coverage for these services for their kids.

And so there's a range of issues. And then we
need to use that learning to help inform what we might be
able to do to help contribute. At the end of day though,
in my mind, it's really about policy change. And both on
the dental side and the vision side, we're supporting some
very innovative models that mobile-ly deliver, they bring
the services to the children. And even though these kids
are already covered for them, we're paying separately.

So we've got to work with Medi-Cal, got to work
with those providers, and we're using the smarty pants
that James touched on that bring Medi-Cal Title 19 funding
expertise to help us think about how do we use existing
resources and policy to pay for this.

But it's going to take a little bit of time. But
with the commission's support, that's where we need to be
emphasizing. But for now, we're trying to --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: And that's exactly the kind
of thing I was talking about is not -- to not funnel out
emergency kinds of services, but when you have
opportunities like that, what can we do to enhance the
educational piece to make everyone aware of that. So
we're not spending money we don't need to spend when we
have all these other competing projects right now that are
going to be coming to us and contracts expiring that we
really need to not only educate ourselves, but be aware of
what other opportunities are out there.

MS. BELSHE: The governor in his budget -- I
touched on this briefly last month -- in his budget
proposal, he includes just over $18 million to support
education and outreach for dental -- around dental and
vision services who for kids who are in the Medi-Cal
program. That shows an acknowledgment on the
administration's part that there's some issues and needs
associated with connecting families and their children,
young children, to these services. So that creates I
think an important window of opportunity for us to be
constructive. And I've already spoken with Secretary
Dooley who is very eager to hear more about what we've
been learning through our efforts here.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: It seem like in conjunction
with that, we should also be looking at some of the big
foundations like Wellpointe, you know, the Carrier
Foundations that are -- have insurance and getting them to
help us in public service and education campaign so that
the word gets out about it.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: Good idea.

MS. BELSHE: Agreed.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: All right. Anything else?

Any other comments or questions? All right.

MS. BELSHE: James -- I want to acknowledge James and Stacy and Tessa and our policy department, along with Calstrat. They really have gotten their game on in recent months. But it's going to be a fun and exciting year in the policy world of 2014.

And I don't think you mentioned it, but it is an election year as well. So that always makes it fun and exciting.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Fun and exciting.

MS. BELSHE: It's redundancy, I know.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I spent three days here last Thursday.

All right. Anything else for the good of the cause? Oh, and we have -- so there are no further comments? Nothing else on the agenda. So under public comments, Rick Overdorff.

MR. OVERDORFF: Hello. I hope you're not too tired. I wanted to -- I'm Rick Overdorff. I'm the program director at the Wilson Family Literacy Program in Lake Los Angeles, California. That's that huge place that has 13,000 people in it, and I -- I'm so glad to be here.
But I -- I wanted to thank you for bringing up the subject of alignment with strategic plan because the strengthening family plan that just came up, if you consider that we are like the program on steroids because we really address that issue.

I'll give you one example because I don't have much time, but we -- this year alone in that community, we have 11 people who got their GEDs. And there are two more who are one test away from getting their GEDs. We strengthen families. Our family -- and it's family literacy. Our kids long-term, they make changes. Our kids are successful in school, not just initially, but all the way through school.

Data from First 5. They tested up to fifth grade. Our kids are still above the average, still above the average. Our families are empowered. Our families are leaders in the community. Our families have taken part in Best Start quite a bit. Our families are going to school beyond our program. They're going to college.

So if you want to strengthen families, let's keep family literacy. Let's think about this. I'm going to be 69 in a few days. As I look around the room, I see maybe some people that are above 40. And we normally think that, you know, we have to have new things and because we are above 40, should we be sent out to pasture.
No.

I know our program is sunsetting, but sometimes the best things are the ones that have been around for the longest time. And we've proved ourself. Keep us.

I would like to suggest one more thing. I would like you to consider voting on each individual program. Please do not vote on this as all sunset programs. I don't know if that was the plan or not.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: That's not the plan.

MR. OVERDORFF: But I ask that you consider each program individually.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you.

MR. OVERDORFF: Thank you. I'm out. Bye.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: All right.

Anything else for the good of the cause?

This meeting adjourned. All right.

(At 3:19 p.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
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