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COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. Calling the meeting to order for our First 5.

Any reportable actions out of closed session?

MS. YOUNG: No reportable action was taken.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you.

Okay. We'll have roll call please.

SECRETARY: Nancy Au.

COMMISSIONER AU: Here.

SECRETARY: Jane Boeckmann.

Phillip Browning.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Here.

SECRETARY: Arturo Delgado.

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: Here.

SECRETARY: Duane Dennis.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Here.

SECRETARY: Jonathan Fielding.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Present.

SECRETARY: Sandra Figueroa-Villa.

Neal Kaufman.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Here.

SECRETARY: Patricia Curry.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Here.
SECRETARY: Karla Pleitez Howell.
COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: Here.
SECRETARY: Marvin Southard.
COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Here.
SECRETARY: Deanne Tilton.
COMMISSIONER TILTON: Here.
SECRETARY: Don Knabe.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: Here.
SECRETARY: Quorum is present.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you.
Are there any items to be pulled off the consent calendar? If not, I will entertain a motion to approve the consent calendar.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So moved.
COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Seconded.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: It's moved and seconded. So I understand there's no -- nothing to be pulled off. Without objections, so be the order.
Obviously, this is a very important meeting. I'm going to keep my remarks short. But first of all, I wanted to give a big shout out and thank you to Duane Dennis and the entire program and policy committee for their in depth involvement on both the expiring grants discussions as well as the strategic plan. He, I've been told, managed a very difficult meeting here a few weeks
back. Everybody is here to say, thank you, Duane. What I really -- I'm saying thank you.

But, anyway, I think a lot was accomplished there. And I also want to thank all of the commissioners who were present at the meeting as well and gave their input.

As we continue to talk about this, it's a very pivotal year for First 5. And I see our work divided into two steps: First was putting some discipline into our decision making process through our governance guidelines as it relates to board action, spending money, those kinds of things. And the next step is the development of a strategic plan that is going to guide this commission's work way beyond any of us here sitting at the dais today. So we're going to have it completed by the end of my term as chair and, hopefully, sooner than that. But we will talk more about those steps.

And now I'd like to turn it over to Kim for her executive director's report.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In the spirit of moving the agenda along and given your excellent comments noting the steps that we are talking as a commission in terms of bringing greater focus and sustainability and impact to our work, let's move right into strategic planning, which is going to be teed up by
Jessica Kaczmarek.

MS. KACZMAREK: Good afternoon, commissioners.

Today's strategic plan update will be done in partnership with our consultants, Learning For Action, who will be leading the discussion for today.

But before I pass it off to Steven LaFrance who is the president of Learning For Action, I want to provide some context for what we will be discussing and outlining what we expect to accomplish today. So after a brief process overview and update, we will be up introducing a strategic imperative to guide and anchor the strategic planning process going forward, and we will be seeking commissioner endorsement for this strategic imperative.

We will then be turning our attention to six key levers for impact that will -- that we believe will help advance the strategic imperative going forward.

Today's conversation will be centered around introducing these levers to you at a conceptual level. We will be opening up dialogue today to have an opportunity to get your input -- your input into those levers but the more detailed, deeper conversation around each of those levers will be conducted at the upcoming planning -- programs and planning commission meeting to be held on April 24th.

During that P and P meeting, staff and LFA will
be facilitating commissioner discussion with the intention of identifying policy recommendations from the commission on each of the six levers regarding positions. And we will then be bringing back those recommended positions to the full board at May 8th commission meeting. At that time, we will be seeking the commission's approval of those positions on each of those levers.

I want to just share that the levels are important to the overall construct of the strategic plan because together they represent a framework for us. And this framework can help inform our conversation and our decision making around goals and outcomes and strategies and even our role as we move forward in this strategic planning process.

So those are the intentions for today. With that, I am going to quickly move on to a brief update on where we're at today in terms of process. The details around each of these activities you see before you were described in the board memo. So I will just call your attention to one specific activity that we want to highlight, And that is the staff workshop with consultants from the Drucker School of Management and Learning For Action.

Late last month at end of March, a small number of staff participated in all-day workshop to jump start
the strategic planning efforts for the organization. This exercise helped to affirm with staff what it means to think strategically and to explore options that First 5 LA may want to consider. It is this concept of making choices that resonated with staff and helps to frame our work with commissioners as we move forward. And that is something we will continue to explore today.

So with that, if there are no questions around process or the goals for today, I will go ahead and turn it over to our consultants, Learning For Action.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Are there any questions at this point or do you want to wait until after the presentation?

Okay. Thank you.

MS. KACZMAREK: Thank you.

MR. LaFRANCE: Thank you. Good afternoon, commissioners. Steven LaFrance, president of Learning For Action. I want to start by just appreciating the time and effort and good thinking that commissioners provided in the most recent programming and planning committee meeting, adding my thanks to the mix.

Today we're really picking up the work in the sense of getting more focused about the kinds of choices that First 5 LA will need to make in order to establish the direction in the strategic plan that the agency is
seeking. If we think about the frame of good strategy being, essentially, about making choices and decisions to develop focus and clear direction, when we start applying that to First 5 LA, what we're looking at specifically is identifying the unique and highest value of First 5 LA and in the process identifying what First 5 LA is not going to do.

This is about aligning efforts to current and forecasted context, I would add as well as the internal capacity of the organization and what's feasible. It's about blending multiple activities and functions and approaches to achieve the larger goals in the plan and then, of course, about establishing clear and measurable indicators of progress and success so that you know when you're on course and when you need some course correction.

I thought we'd just take a moment to ask if commissioners had other thoughts on elements of good strategy that you would like to offer as a grounding point before we move further into discussing what we're proposing as strategic imperative and levers to advance the imperative.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Is there any input or any questions?

Okay. No. Go ahead.

MR. LaFRANCE: Okay. So why do we need a
strategic imperative for this plan. Essentially, what we're recommending is that we define a strategic imperative that anchors the planning process in the current context so that we can advance the work along the way knowing that difficult choices need to be made. It's essentially the notion of having a touch point that we can come back to over time and remind ourselves in times when there's a challenge in making a choice to know why we have to and what our choices are aligning towards. We're in the welcomed position of having a lot of work done on understanding First 5 LA's work to date, your investments, past performance, et cetera. All of that groundwork has been laid. It allows us to have this focused and somewhat accelerated planning effort this year.

So as we've looked at the data, we've -- our staff have reviewed and synthesized all of the reports and data that are available. We participated in the Drucker conversations and heard the conversation there. Then, of course, in the programming and planning committee, we heard the discussions that commissioners had at that conversation as well. And it is -- has allowed us to hone in on what we're recommending as an imperative for this plan which I'll share in the next slide.

I mentioned it's a touch point, but I also wanted to say that this imperative will enable further decisions
in this process. It will provide what we're calling
guidance and guardrails for decisions about role, goal,
outcomes to achieve the goal, pathways to achieve the
outcomes, and target populations to focus on for those --
in those pathways.

So what we're offering to you today as our
recommended strategic imperative for this plan, based on
the learning input, financial projections, et cetera, and
conversations we've been in, a three-point imperative.

The first is to maximize return on the
commission's future investments to achieve mission and
greatest possible impact for children zero to five and
their families. The second element of the imperative is
to determine a clearer focus for First 5 LA than has been
in place to date. And the third element is to align
strategic goals to long-term financial projections and
strategy.

So we are, essentially, asking the commission --
I can leave the slide up on the -- that has the content of
the imperative itself, but our question before you today
is on the next slide, which is: Does the commission
endorse this strategic imperative.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: You want an answer now?

MR. LaFRANCE: If there's discussion or
questions, that's welcome as well.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: All right.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Just one question on Number 2, in terms of the clearer focus. There's no question that that's a real opportunity, but I'm wondering whether there's one focal that suggests there's one focus. I just want to make sure that that's what everybody is thinking and agrees on. It probably depends on the degree of generality that's included there.

So I wonder, Kim, if you could respond to that or perhaps our consultant.

MS. BELSHE: I'll take the first crack. I think it's an -- a really good example of a needed guardrail for our work going forward. You've heard me at our last meeting, I talked about how in terms of some of my observations, it struck me as we have not one north star but four north stars in terms of our very four -- or four very broad goals. And so I -- from my vantagepoint, we have absolutely an imperative to provide clearer focus. Does that mean one goal, does it mean less than four. I think that's part of the learning that will emerge through the planning process. Is that -- I guess my point is, it doesn't necessarily mean one.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Yeah. That's what I was trying to understand. Okay. Thanks.

MS. BELSHE: But it's absolutely acknowledging we
are too broad and spread too thin.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Understood and agree.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: All right. Marv.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: And the only other thing I wanted to say is that our strategic plan has to also respond to the outside environment as that environment changes. So for example in just two areas, the integration of health, mental health, and substance abuse that's happening as a part of the restructuring of the health programs has profound effects on communities as well as services. So how we engage both on the service side and the community side may be changed and the opportunities may be different as a result of that.

Similarly, but more focused, the restructuring of the criminal justice system and the way that the people are returning to our communities presents additional problems but also opportunities that all of our planning should be cognizant of, I think.

MR. LaFRANCE: That's an excellent contribution to I think this broader discussion of what makes for good strategy. And we absolutely will want the plan to clarify what the policy guidance that the board has given to staff for assessing opportunities as they emerge in the external environment. One of the points later in the slides, but I'll make it now, is that, essentially, a sign of success
in your strategic planning will be that staff will know
how to respond to opportunities, issues, problems almost
regardless of what it is because they will have -- they
will know the policy guidance and position that the board
has determined for them.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Is there anything --
any other questions, clarifications? Neal.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I think that the three
concepts are the right ones. I might have some
wordsmithing. Do you want to hear that now or should I
just give them to you later? Give them to you now.

MR. LaFRANCE: Go for it.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Just because we have a
clearer focus, that doesn't mean it's well defined or the
right focus. I'm not sure how to do the language, but
something like clearly defined -- clearly and well-defined
focus.

The second is, align strategic goals to long-term
financial projections and chosen strategies and tactics.
Is that what you mean? All those require us to make an
action to choose strategy, to choose tactics, and we align
them with those.

MR. LaFRANCE: That's helpful. Thank you for the
contributions.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Any other -- okay.
Good.

MR. LaFRANCE: So I know this isn't an official vote, per se, but we are looking for endorsement of the strategic imperative.

MS. BELSHE: Exactly. General understanding and endorsement because the strategic imperative really is an important anchor, as Steven was saying, to the conversations that we're going to be getting into preliminarily today and then in far more detail at P and P meeting.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Exactly. So if you hear no objections, I would assume that that means it's endorsed. Otherwise, you're taking it's a formal vote. So what's the --

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. I'm --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Anybody opposed? Anybody want to flip it upside down?

All right. Consider it somewhat of an endorsement.

MR. LaFRANCE: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Definite maybe.

MR. LaFRANCE: Okay. So with the --

MS. BELSHE: We're taking that as consider it endorsed.

MR. LaFRANCE: Yes.
So with the -- with the imperative, the question is, how do we advance it. How do we move the work forward so that it's clear how we achieve the imperative. We're offering, again, based on the review of the data, stakeholder input, conversations today, a set of levers that the commission determine a position on.

Now the purpose of today is to understand the levers, not to determine the position on them. I'll steer the conversation back to questions of understanding and clarification if we get into discussion about relative positions on them because there will be the opportunity at the April 24th programming and planning committee meeting which we strongly encourage commissioners to attend and participate in.

But the notion is that positions on these levers will support decision making, not just in the planning process, but beyond. And it's the point that I made a few moments ago that opportunities come up, issues arise over the course of five years in the strategy implementation period. Staff have to know what the policy guidance is from the governing body to know how to respond to them. And that is what these positions will provide.

So there are six levers that have -- that we're proposing that, again, emerged directly from the L-3 learning, conversations to date, and our experience in the
field, and these are the six. I have a slide for each
that elaborates a little bit on them. They -- the -- so
maybe I will go through each of the individual slides as a
means of explaining what each is. And I think my
preferred approach would be to have discussion about each
And then move to the next.

Is that an agreeable process? Okay.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: Can I propose that
maybe we go through all of them so we understand what it
means to you and then go in depth because we might start
discussing one and it might be something that you're
covering in something else. I'm not sure.

MR. LaFRANCE: Well, why don't we do a relatively
quick pass through the six and then I'll come back to the
first and we'll discuss each. Okay?

So the first is -- you know, and we're using
words to describe these. We can argue about the words,
but the point is to -- the concept behind it is the notion
of, on the one hand -- or one end of a spectrum downstream
work, on the other hand of the spectrum upstream work.
The notion underlying that is that there's an approach to
the work that is essentially about intervention. It's
about treating a problem that already exists and maybe,
you know, moderate, severe, but it is -- it's a condition
that's already present and you're addressing the
condition.

Early intervention is the next point along the continuum. It's when there are, you know -- just as it states, earlier stages of a condition caught and addressed so that the severity and nature and complications from the problem are -- are addressed earlier on. There's primary prevention, which is, essentially, making sure that the problem doesn't occur in the first place. And then promotion, which is working in the policy and environmental context to promote certain behaviors that make it so it's part of a systemic and cultural norm so that prevention efforts aren't even needed.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Can I just suggest that you just invert this whole thing. I mean, the way most of us think about this -- and this is a common way to think about programs that will improve health well-being, is you start with the upstream with the promotion side and the primary intervention and then, you know, for the group that needs it, the downstream usually put on the right of the arrow going the other way.

MR. LaFRANCE: Sure. There's a consistency across --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Going against the current.

MR. LaFRANCE: But my main goal is for us not to
get -- if that makes it easier to have the conversation, we're happy to reverse it.

So okay. I'm going to continue through so we can get to discussion.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: You just heard an endorsement of changing it.

MR. LaFRANCE: Yes, we did, and so noted.

Going broad, going deep; that there is work that is relatively low intensity but higher reach or in the middle, moderate intensity, moderate reach, and on the farther end, high intensity but low reach. You're going deeper into an issue or problem, but not reaching many individuals in doing so.

The third is growing local models on a continuum to leveraging evidence-based models. On the far left of this continuum, we have the notion that innovation means generating and promoting new and promising models.

The next point on the continuum is translating innovation. It's bringing an evidence-based approach, something that was created elsewhere. The innovation is bringing it to a new context and it's an approach that has been proven in other contexts to work, bringing it to a new context and translating it to that new context.

The third and fourth points on the continuum, the emphasis is really on the words sustaining and the words
-- the words sustaining and scaling, which is the function of committing to sustain over time an approach that's known to work, addresses a small but important problem. On the far end, it's the primary role is scaling and evidence-based approach and bringing it to a larger population.

I'm going to keep moving through unless there are questions.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I just say that it seems to me what you have is, you have proof of -- of concept. You have -- which is the really efficacy, does this work in a small, you know, maybe research-based group, and then you have the question, can it be scaled and is it effective when applied to a larger group. There might be a simpler way to think about this.

MR. LaFRANCE: Sure. Sure. I agree.

Another lever is single-benefit approaches and multiple-benefit approaches. There's an aspect here of looking at strategies that have a single or narrow focus and target. And a midpoint might be kind of a dual focus, parent/child. Multiple benefit approach might be, again, multi-generational, it might be incorporating the community beyond the parent/child family.

Yes.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: One really quick thing.
It seems to me it's really about multiple impact. You can call it multiple focus. I'm just trying to make it easy. You're trying to get impacts in a bunch of different ways to make a clear example from the health world, health -- public health world. We want people to stop smoking. Okay. That -- that has benefits. That has a lot of benefits to a lot of folks, but it's trying to reduce heart disease and lung disease and a bunch of other disease, you know, cancers and things. So it has multiple impacts. That doesn't mean you focused on each of those, but that's the impact of putting it in place.

MR. LaFRANCE: Also helpful. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: And reduced income to First 5.

MR. LaFRANCE: Unintended consequences.

The fifth is, again, just the language is for purposes of discussion, kind of going it alone to starting with partnership and the notion being that, on this continuum, you have working independently, working in limit collaboration, probably mostly like when the work is underway or when the approach is ready to scale. There's a moderate level of collaboration that's either early or mid course. On the far right you have up front collaborations, specifically with agents of sustainability and/or scalability.
And then the sixth is the direct services to systems and policy change continuum. And we're offering several points here that move from direct services to enhancing delivery of services to integrating systems to changing systems and changing policies.

Your board materials provide examples and advantages and limitations of each that we don't have time to cover in the presentation. But I think what I'll do is scroll back to the first and then have discussion about -- if there are questions of clarification or understanding about what the intention of each of these levers is in addition to whether there may be other levers that -- that are missing from -- from these six.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Neal.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I guess I have a question on the first two, maybe a common/question. While I think most us, myself included, thought of these first two as, where do you put your emphasis of the direct service. It turns out that -- I think that that's not necessarily the case. Let's just say for the sake of argument you wanted to do workforce development, which is not direct service to a child. You could have workforce development at the promotion end. You could have workforce development treatment, which is helping people who are not doing well in their -- treat.
So do you agree with me that those first two are not necessarily -- should we always have in our mind this continuum of direct services or could any of the ones that are on the last continuum defining the continuum fit within those two different ones?

MR. LaFRANCE: They absolutely could and should apply more broadly than services. I think that there's a tendency to see them in relation to services specifically, but I couldn't agree more that they are more broadly relevant and I think the -- what will be extremely valuable to First 5 LA by making these choices, by determining these positions, is that together they make a package that you can put together in ways that -- that address some of what appears to be kind of a siloing effect of each of these that we're talking about them in isolation in a way because we need to understand your position and your policy guidance to staff on each. But in implementation, staff would look at them across. So if the relative guidance is to do more work at the systems level but to do so, you know, in a way that goes more broad than deeper, you know, there would be a way that they could put together to make decisions.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So you are imagining that, once the language gets agreed to and whether we have six or five or seven levers, that we would be trying to make a
choice? Let's pretend there's five numbers for each lever. Lever one is a two and lever two is a four, and that then gives a focused approach to what we're trying to do, or is it each project has to be written -- what do you think?

MR. LaFRANCE: So our recommendation is that the board determine guidance on each position that essentially would -- we're imagining, you know, applicable 90 percent of the time. We imagine that there will be some -- well, we will also ask for guidance on, under what circumstances and under what conditions would First 5 LA may want to deviate from the general guidance. So I wanted to make that point first. We understand that it's -- you know, that generally speaking your position what is it and it will mean sticking to it. But it's also so that you're clear when you're deviating. That's one point.

The second is, I don't know that it's such a literal exercise is determining whether it's a point one or a two. And I think there's a risk of us trying to make it so formulaic because I think the richness will be in staff understanding what's behind the position that the commission is offering.

Now, that said, you are correct in the sense that we're going to want to know on the spectrum overall where are you guiding staff. And it may be a balance of, you
know, you want the majority of the work to be prevention, but we are open to early intervention work at some percentage of the time.

Again, I think it's dangerous to think that we can quantify so specifically in those kinds of ways but I -- the position needs to be clear and it can be a relative position under certain circumstances and certain conditions.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AU: Just so that I'm clear. You know, in some ways when I'm looking at this, we are talking about wanting to be somewhat defined and finite in these concepts. But in practice, there is going to be some gray and fuzziness because of very much what Marv referenced earlier when he talked about events happen that is outside of our control, and that it may open up an opportunity for us to be able to participate in whatever that situation should occur to make some inroads or impact.

I guess the point I'm trying to make is, in some way in support of what you're outlining is that it's -- it's to give us a point from which we operate from. It's sort of like our pivot point in that it doesn't preclude us from pivoting, I guess you could say, in order to take advantage of some opportunities that may occur.
unexpectedly. Is that what I'm --

MR. LaFRANCE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- I'm hearing from you?

MR. LaFRANCE: How I would play that back is to say that -- these -- the positions on these levers will provide a set of filters to run opportunities through. First to make the, do we pursue or not decision. And then the second decision if yes, is how, how do we plug into, what does our role look like when an opportunity comes up. And, again, these positions will provide that guidance.

So, yes, I think we're understanding each other.

MS. BELSHE: And I think it's a really important issue at a couple of levels. Number one, we do as an organization want to maintain, I would imagine, some nimbleness to be responsive to emerging opportunities. But I think Steven is making some really important point about the levers in terms of providing a filter, a set of criteria, a framework, the guardrails is a term I use a lot, to inform our thinking about, is this an opportunity that aligns with our strategic focus, our direction, the impact we seek, and where we have landed. So strategy -- as Steven said earlier, good strategy is as much about what we don't do as what we do. And every opportunity that merges in the early childhood development field may ultimately not be something that aligns with our new
strategic focus.

    COMMISSIONER AU: Or that we can't finance.

    MS. BELSHE: Or that we can't finance, but it's
-- if we're going to be focused, we want to be nimble to
opportunities align with that focus.

    COMMISSIONER KNABE: Duane.

    COMMISSIONER DENNIS. There's a couple of things,
the first of which, defining the continuum leveraging
evidence-based models. I said this in P and P. We are
dealing with a lot other than evidence in the work that we
do that's promising and best practices. So we need to
include that. The work we do, for example, in Best Start
is at best, best practices. So I would suggest that to
some degree --

    MS. BELSHE: Are you not seeing it in going to
the language if we're looking at that one on the slide
whoever is controlling the slides.

    MR. LaFRANCE: Right. We do have the promising
models on the left.

    MS. BELSHE: On the left.

    COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. That's fine, then.
Then the other thing, historically -- and I don't
know how we want to deal with it, and perhaps we want to
deal with it in P and P -- that there has been a space
that we've developed in this commission for emergencies
where the external world has failed some of the families
that we serve in this county. And First 5 has been, you
know, for lack of a better term, the out. And there are
several of those instances over the last five years that I
at least have been on this commission. And do you have
any strategy on place for those emergencies, you know?
And I don't know how we -- how we want to deal with that,
you know. But, clearly, our agenda right now has a series
of emergencies that for whatever reason, state fundings
fail, the Feds stopped funding or whatever have you, First
5 has come in and really dealt to the needs of those
families.

So I don't know how we -- at some point, I think
we have to deal to that and address it and we could easily
say, no, we're not going to -- no longer have space for
those emergencies, or if we are, what the are the
guardrails, what are the criterion around those
emergencies.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I think it's important
that we be nimble within the focus areas we have. We have
to troll and we have to really make sure we're looking
carefully on the horizon for those opportunities because
people rely on us to be innovators. And we've done a lot
of innovation, maybe too much. But it shouldn't preclude
us from looking very carefully at what's coming down the
pike. We need to make sure we have our antennae out, we're looking at the best research, we're looking at where we can refine what we're already doing as well as perhaps something somewhat different within the overall focus.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I think that's a long-term vision and I think that that's appropriate. I mean the, whole purpose I would hope here is that we don't do policy based on a front page newspaper story. That's the difference. That's when the discipline goes out the window.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Agree entirely.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Karla first, then Marv.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: In these levers, do you see one of the discussions being focusing on the neediest children in Los Angeles then looking towards helping something become a social norm.

There is this sort of spectrum that I think has been an underlying discussion, at least in programming and planning, maybe sometimes during our commissioner meetings. And I'm not sure I fully understand if it would fit into any of the levers that are identified in here?

MR. LaFRANCE: To take them in turn, to your first question, these levers will provide, we believe, guidance to the question of target population. And in the conversations that we have, for example, about going broad
versus going deep, I would imagine we would talk about under what circumstances would we go broad versus deep. And I think going deep is an approach that is often taken with the most needy children and families. And then there's a complex set of issue that they're confronting and so how do we provide a comprehensive approach and a deep intervention that's going to really solve the issue. So I think they're related in that way and that's the kind of conversation that I would imagine occurring in the April 224th programming and planning committee meeting.

And then your second question I think actually is a really helpful addition to perhaps what we've been referring to just -- quote/unquote just systems and policy change. But I think norms is another dimension of that, and I could see building that into this lever.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Marv.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Sometimes I think the strongest interventions that we may play a part of would be dealing with more than one point on the continuum. So, for example, the community partners and care project that many of us were involved in in South Los Angeles looked at from the level of the community was a training program to empower the community to take care of itself, but from the point of view of what the committee was empowered to do, it was to treat members who were suffering from
depression. So it was both an intervention but also a community empowerment strategy at the same time, as well as a convening of community resources. So I think the most powerful interventions will function at more than one level at the same time. And if we can find those kind of sweet spots to do our little part to make a bigger thing happen, I think that's the best kind of investment that we can have.

MR. LaFRANCE: I think you provided an excellent example of this multiple impacts as Commissioner Fielding has suggested that the language change.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Nancy and then Phillip.

COMMISSIONER AU: I guess I'm staying on the conceptual realm here and although I'm the one that usually pushed for something much more concrete. But I guess it's helpful for me to understand what it is that we're about in terms of establishing and endorsing these levers, is that -- for me, what is helpful is that it's -- it's like a not so much -- maybe not so much a pivot point anymore because a pivot point so sort of convey the notion of being quite limited and narrow. But what I'm hearing is that we need to have a strong sort of centering of who we are and what we are and what is going to be our primary mechanism for addressing or meeting our goals and
objectives.

MR. LaFRANCE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER AU: So it's a broader base from which we will be operating from, but it will still have a nuance of us outlining clearly whether it's going to be an upstream activity level or a deepening or a broadening or whatever else. But it's a relatively robust and broader based to operate from.

So anyway, I just wanted to share that point.

MR. LaFRANCE: I think that's absolutely right. I see it as both -- you know, it will make clear what First 5 LA stands for and it will provide a platform. I mean, it's a platform from which First 5 can operate and know, again, what opportunities to pursue and what opportunities not to pursue. And of those that you choose to pursue, how to pursue it in a way that's consistent with what you stand for.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Anybody else Phillip?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: I was wondering if you know whether other First 5 LA agencies throughout the state use a similar sort of concept and how difficult it might be to apply, and also whether you've looked at the current funding that First 5 has done to see how they would fit into this continuum. It sounds a little complex, almost like and RFP scoring process. I'm sure
it's not, but it does sort of make me wonder how complex
it would be when you got in -- or even if you solicited
something. I guess you have to know up front, but if
something came in unsolicited, how would you characterize
it?

MR. LaFRANCE: So, to your first question. Yes,
we have seen not just other First 5's but other grant
makers develop their strategies around positions along
these levers. We've seen other levers. We've seen, you
know, not all of these. I mean, these very much do speak
to what we've seen First 5 LA grappling with, but we can
-- we could share examples of strategic plans that First
5s and other funders have used that bring in this notion.

The question of, you know, whether we've mapped
your current investments to these is sort of, you know,
yes and no at same time. So I'll unpack my answer.

So in our data analysis we have arrayed your
investments according to how we have some of the data
available on those investments, and it does speak to some
of the levers but not all of them. And that's an analysis
that we'll be presenting at the P and P, programming and
planning Committee, meeting on the 24th. But there is a
later step in the process that we'll engage in where we
very intentionally map all of the current investments. So
the analysis we've done has been on past investments.
We'll take your current commitments and array them according to the positions on these levers so that you see where your current investments fall relative to them. And that will, of course, suggest some choices and decisions to manage at that point.

There's a third element to your question about going from determining the position to determining what the work looks like on the ground, you know, once you've determined the position. And you were suggesting that that's a difficult process. All I can say is, we've done it before. And it depends on where you land, you know, what positions you land on that will really make it, you know, easier or harder in a way. But it does -- we will need to get to a level more specific where we're saying, you know, if you choose for part -- you know, your position to be in certain circumstances to leverage evidence-based models, then we have to look at what circumstances you've given guidance to use evidence-based models on and then look at what evidence-based models there are to address those circumstances.

So that's a mapping -- what we -- we call it the pathways, you know, coming up with what are the pathways to achieve the impact that we understand to be your guidance.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: That's helpful. Thank
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Can you give us a timing? What I understand is, today we hear about it, the 24th of April we get into programming and planning to discuss it. Does it then come back in May to be approved or does it come back in --

MS. BELSHE: Actually, you're anticipating our final slide on next step. So if we could defer that, Neal, until -- thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Nothing wrong with jumping to the next slide either.

MS. BELSHE: I just wouldn't want to jump ahead of Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: It's okay.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Everybody else does. Why not.

I just wondered where is this strategic plan is embedded the notion of continuous quality improvement. I don't know how it fits exactly, but it's one thing that we should I think always have as one of our guide posts.

MR. LaFRANCE: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Put more broadly, is there a guide post or a lever that has to do with staff capacity, internal capacities? And I don't know if that's
exactly a lever, but can you -- community quality improvement is one of them. What does it take to actually do something? Is that a lever that we should be putting into this equation because these are policy high level ones?

MR. LaFRANCE: Sure. I see the notion of staff capacity as being part of the imperative, really in a way. That it is -- it's a part of the absolute of, you know, managing within kind of the capacity and financial projections. It's not in the actual wording of the imperative, but the notion of -- I'm not trying to dismiss it. I think there's a place to work these concepts both of continuous improvement, to me, I hear as a value, but I don't want to get into a discussion about terminology.

And staff capacity, you know, the notion of the levers is what is going to drive impact, what's going to advance the imperative. So to me the staff capacity is more a condition -- a necessary condition that needs to be in place. That's my sense and that -- your positions will determine -- have implications for staff capacity. If you determine a very systems and policy focused direction for the organization, that may have implications for staff capacity.

Is that helpful?

MS. BELSHE: If I may, I think that's absolutely
right. We cannot move forward in this process without thinking about at the right time, what is our capacity to execute. But I think what we're suggesting is there's a first series or higher order of questions that we need to work with the commission and get some policy guidance and direction on. And as we bring more focus to some of these key decision points, these key levers of impact, we then need to factor in, so what capacity is needed to execute; how does that align with our current capacity. We may well conclude, oh, this is a terrific idea, but we have absolutely no experience or capacity. And then it's a decision point, well, do we want to build that or do we say, okay, that's not a direction we really are going to go.

So it's the next level of decision making in my mind.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yes. Deanne.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Kind of central to all of this is my basic question regarding the strategy for leveraging and sustainability. We made a point of wanting to assure that whatever we fund or whatever we support is sustainable. So to what degree are we investing ourselves in promoting sustainability? Do we have an actual plan where we participate in the sustainability and have -- you know, the ability or the resources to help assure that?
Or are we just sitting back and saying, show us your sustainability, show us you can sustain yourself; and if you don't -- if you can't, we won't fund you or, if you don't, we'll stop funding you.

MR. LaFRANCE: I see this very much related to the fifth lever, the kind of go-it-alone or start with partnership, because the far end of that continuum suggests that the question of sustainability would be addressed at the very outset of any commitment that First 5 LA made. And the question of sustainability would be something that you -- you know, shared as a concern, but partnered with others in addressing. So that's -- that's an example based on one of the anchor points of that continuum. And I -- but I'm just re-enforcing that I see the conversation you're raising as fitting underneath that lever, and that's where you'll have a chance to have that discussion about what First 5 LA's position is.

MS. BELSHE: Building on that, I would also note, consistent with the governance guidelines that were approved at the commission's last meeting, sustainability and leveraging will be now factored into the upfront design of all of our multi-year investments. So that's going to be a lens throughout our investment strategy going forward. This is -- this is really more where this process is endeavoring to lead to. So where will we
focus, to what end, with whom, how will we measure impact, et cetera. But as we enter into partnerships, sustainability and leveraging expectations will be built into those relationships. Right?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Then I guess my question is, what are we investing in that or is this just an expectation?

MS. BELSHE: Got it. I'm sorry. So we have the board -- with approval of the governance guidelines, I've asked Teresa Nuno to lead an internal work group effort to really flesh out the implementation plan for those two pieces of the governance guidelines so that we can bring back to the commission greater clarity about when will they apply, when won't they, under what conditions.

So thank you for letting me clarify that.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Just one more thing, because I thought -- when you were talking about staff alignment, I thought that was like a level above, so I didn't -- I, mean a level below, so I didn't speak to that, but, obviously, since we're there, we also need to think about commission alignment as well.

MR. LaFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And I said that during P and P, that it's important that commission is aligned.
And so that may require training, mentoring, coaching with regards to a new strategy unlike the one we've had in previous years.

MR. LaFRANCE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: All right. Okay. Next?

MR. LaFRANCE: So I -- thank you very much for the extremely helpful discussion. It will allow us to refine this framework for the discussion at the April 24th programming and planning Committee meeting.

We just wanted to end with review of the work plan and time line. This is a version that is revised from what you've seen to date. It includes some of the parts of the process that the commission has asked us to build in and that we've identified as needs as well. So I'm just going to highlight what's new.

In the earlier stages of the process, in the May, early June time frame, staff and community survey. So we heard loud and clear in the last programming and planning Committee meeting that the commission wanted to invite community input earlier into the process. So we are designing and will be launching survey.

There is a board retreat that is scheduled for the end of June, if I recall. June 30th. Yes, thank you. That was a remarkable feat you've accomplished.

MS. BELSHE: Let's hear it for Linda.
MR. LaFRANCE: We have mapped in and included interviews with potential partners down the road as we have developed what the strategies and objectives are to test the direction with folks who you may want to engage in in cofunding and other strategic relationships. Other than that, the plan remains essentially as discussed, but you can see here how everything is very tightly packed in the time line. The work cascades in a way that makes it so that, if we don't achieve what we need to earlier in the process, we're not going to be able to achieve what we need to later in the process, and that will challenge our goal of having a plan in place during Chairman Knabe's tenure.

So any questions on the revised work plan and time line?

MS. BELSHE: Why don't you go to immediate next steps to just make it more --

MR. LaFRANCE: To ground them. Sure.

So we have the April 24th programming and planning Committee and special meeting of the commission where we will discuss and recommend positions on levers to advance the strategic imperative endorsed today. We'll also present and discuss the data analysis that I referenced earlier. To the May 8th commission meeting, we'll bring the recommended positions on the key levers to
advance strategic imperative, and the commission will have
the chance on May 8 to review and discuss and approve the
positions. You will also receive and discuss the data
analysis that will have been in the program and planning
committee meeting. So those are the immediate next steps.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay.

MS. BELSHE: Is that responsive?

COMMISSIONER KNABE: See that slide, Neal?

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Perfect. I'm just trying
to push it along so you'll be happy.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: No, no, no. We want to take
our time.

Anything else?

Great. Thank you.

MR. LaFRANCE: Excellent. Thank you very much,
commissioners.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: All right. Next is Item
Number 6.

MS. FICEK: All right. Well, good afternoon,
commissioners.

At the March 27th program and planning special
commission meeting of the board, staff provided the annual
expiring grants presentation as required by the newly
approved governance guidelines, specifically Guideline
Number 7, which states that each First 5 LA contract and
grant will have an expiration date and that multiyear
services-related investments and pursuant to the time
stated in the original allocation of the grant award.
The materials from that meeting were included as part of
your board packet today and also serve as the required
expiring grants report.

Seven different investments were reviewed as part
of the expiring grants presentation which included a
project overview, participant level impact as none of the
investments demonstrated population level impact. And we
also highlighted opportunities for sustainability.

At that meeting, staff also provide a
recommendation to extend funding for the Partnerships For
Family or PFF program as it was the only expiring
investment with a clear and viable sustainability plan.

So before I turn to PFF and staff's
recommendation, due to the timing of new information
related to 211's developmental screening project, it is
another expiring grant that staff will be recommending for
a funding extension. The 211 extension is based on the
fact that three outstanding variables are in place that
are informing staff's future recommendation for this
project, and the variables include appending descriptive
study which is due to be completed next month in May, a
scheduled discussion between 211 and our policy department
regarding the project's opportunities for sustainability, and also the relationship of 211s telephonic screening approach with the community-based screening activity to be supported by our autism investment which was a part of today's consent calendar.

Given these three outstanding variables, we will be bringing to the April 24 program and planning special commission meeting a recommendation to extend the 211 developmental screening project for an additional three months. And if the board is supportive of moving forward, that extension would then come to the May commission for action.

Moving into PFF and its sustainability plan. As part of it's original design, PFF was to be transitioned to DCFS. In 2012, DCFS released an RFP that included PFF as one of its core prevention programs. However, future funding for PFF was tied to and contingent upon future DCFS resources. DCFS has identified resources to cover a partial year of funding for fiscal year 14/15 which has therefore guided staff to recommend the following:

To first waive Guideline Number 7, the expiration of contracts and grants of the First 5 LA governance guidelines and then to jointly fund PFF with DCFS for fiscal year 14/15. This would be include an additional six months of bridge funding to support the implementation
of PFF's sustainability plan and cover the period of July through December 2014. The total amount of First 5 LA funding needed equals 5.3 million, which would then maintain support for all nine current PFF programs.

If approved, funds for the six month extension will be included in the 14/15 proposed budget and will come from the First 5 LA assigned fund balance. The funding amount will be reflected as committed when the commission approves the 14/15 budget in June.

And that concludes the presentation and recommendation. We can open it up.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Are there any questions at this point? We have a number of people in the public that have signed up to speak. So before we do that, you want to hear from the public first.

First speaker is Maribell Marin, followed by Alex Morales.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Thank you, commission. Maribell Marin, executive director of 211 LA county. I appreciate the recommendation for three-month extension. I definitely want to take advantage of that to map up the funding pathways for the sustainability plan which we believe is very strong at the moment.

But I also want to make sure that we're focusing on outcomes beyond those every being reported like the
average screening age and the fact that we are doing much earlier intervention for a target population that is currently not being found through traditional means and looking at the population impact based on that population group as opposed to all zero-to-five children. We haven't really done that work. So, hopefully, by the time we come back, we'll have had a discussion on how that can be done so that we can bring you that data based on the outcomes information that we have collected already.

But we do appreciate the three-month extension. We think that there is a very strong potential for this to be funded through State means, and we are very glad that First 5 is going to be meeting with us to discuss how we can do this together.

But I definitely want to point out that we're talking about a program that currently doesn't exist in the county. So should it go away, we're talking about children who are being found right now at twice the rate of the general public that wouldn't be able to be found at all because this program is reaching the hardest to reach based on in reach. So we're screening children whose parents are not even calling us for concerns with developmental delay. They're calling us because they're homeless or they need food or they need help with bills. So we are screening children and finding them even though
they have health insurance because nobody else is
screening them. So were this program to go away, this
mechanism for identifying the hardest to reach children
would also go away.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Alex and then
followed by Catherine Roiter.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I know that we're getting
closer to you folks making a decision on the PFF program.
I just want to recap and say a lot of thank yous. I was
here when the idea was first born and the First 5 wisdom.
I thank Deanne Tilton for her saying, can we do something
about child abuse before it become as a deep problem and
overwhelms our county agency. The design of what you
implemented was not just a service, but you implemented a
research and evaluation and learning program that was
associated with this. That allowed the organizations
themselves to get feedback often from the evaluation work
to enhance what they were doing. You designed a model
that allowed us to partner with DCFS from the very
beginning so we established a deep partnership. In fact,
that relationship building is what was so important that
we wanted to keep sustained versus just closing everything
out and starting anew. Those relationships had been
built.
It's been no easy feat for DCFS and everyone in this climate of limited financial resources to come up with solutions to allow us to -- to have a steppingstone to move forward. So I appreciate what DCFS and the commissioners have done and, of course, obviously, the PFF organizations have come through to do their work.

So thank you.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm Catherine Roiter. I've talked to you many times about PFF, and I am coming here today just to say I thank you, I hope that we can continue our good work. And as the strategic planning group was presenting their -- their levers today, I saw PFF all over that. In addition to DCFS, we really have been involved over the years in system integration and working with our partners with DMH funded agencies and a variety of community agencies, health care agencies, public health, all kinds -- WIC, everything. So it's been a model project I think that's addressed a lot of the levers that you're looking at for going forward.

And I specifically want to give a personal shout out to Deanne for having conceived this beautiful project in the beginning and working on making sure it is sustained. I have gone across the country and presented PFF and attended various conferences. And I will tell you, this PFF program is a -- there are mirrors of it all
over and some of them DO have good published data. Like
out of Yale, there's a child first program that's exactly
the same intensive intervention with highly-qualified
people.

So thank you again and we really look forward to
continuing our systems integration with our DCFS partners
and our mental health partners in working with this very
vulnerable population.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you.

Roberta Landerman and followed by Caroline
Blockard.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm Roberta
Landerman. I'm with Long Beach Unified School Districts
Family Literacy Program since 1992. I know that we're not
-- we're on the expiration, thank you. And this is not an
action item. And so I just wanted to update you and put
this on for the record because we are really charged, when
we came from the program and planning meeting to look at
your recommendation to use LCFF funding. So I immediately
went and met with my superintendent on the following
Monday and generated a letter of his support, which I have
with me here. And I'm proud to say that, not only did we
get his letter of support, but we also -- or commitment
from another school district. Thank you. So we have two
of the three superintendents that have committed to work
with us on the LCFF funding. However, it's the timing of it all. And I know that Commissioner Knabe, you did address the one letter that was from Mary Martinez, but I just am here to ask if we can do another gap-type funding so that we can work closer with our superintendents on this issue.

I am meeting with Title I directors and with elementary school principals and I have off the -- hot off the press a very nice tool to use with them, and to please have them consider funding us to because of our loss of First 5 funds.

So I wanted you to know that we do look at your recommendations and we do go back and do -- I believe was a lot of work in 14 days since that program and planning meeting. And we're asking for a six to twelve-month bridge funding like you've done for PFF and for 211. Please help us as we're on the verge of really a systematic change. This is a kind of community impact and policy that First 5 LA can make a difference for our youngest learners in LA County. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. I would just add, in all due respect, while it's only been two weeks and you've done a lot of work and I've received numerous phone calls, you know, it's been a year. We talked about this a year ago. There was bridge funding for that year.
Okay. Caroline Blocker.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: But LCFF was new. That's new funding.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Followed by Julia Castinata.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Caroline Blocker, and I'm the parent education teacher from the Long Beach Family Literacy Program. This is the first time I've ever done anything like this, so excuse my nerves. But I came here today because funding aside, and I know there's a whole lot that goes into that, I want you to understand that my -- that this program means so much to so many families.

Today was career day at my daughter's school and for the first three hours of school, I spoke about what family literacy does to help families. And do you know, all of those children agreed that their parents needed some parent education classes. It didn't matter what level of economic group they fell into. They all knew that their parents needed education because it's not easy to raise a child and they don't come with owners manuals.

They asked me what my least favorite thing about my job was. And I told them that it is in June when I have to say goodbye to all the families that I've worked so hard with all year. We have worked so hard. And last year, I was able to receive the award for a national
teacher of the year. I started a project and that has led to so many ideas. I really want to continue with that.

So we need your support. I thank you for what you have done in the past and I ask you to continue to support us so that we can make a difference for the future. Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. Julia Castinata followed by Kathy Shriner, if I said that correctly.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Julia Castinata. I'm here representing the hundreds of parents that are and have been in the family literacy program. I'm from Long Beach. I have two girls, Vanessa, ten, and Gabriella, four and a half, that have been in the program for the past three years. This program has guided me and helped me with my high school diploma in 2012 and currently Long Beach City College student in getting my degree in accounting. I work for a nonprofit organization and help the community in various ways. Last month I was invited to the national conference of family literacy in Washington DC to be a guest student speaker.

This program has not only helped me with my education but also has helped me with better my parenting -- be a better parent and community leader. I'm involved in my daughters' school and I have volunteered in PTA, Box Top treasurer, auditor, and PTA president. My four-year
old is very advanced and knows all her letters and sounds and is starting to read on her own and adding.

I know that this program is very successful and I wish my oldest would have had this opportunity to start learning that at such a young age. Family literacy has changed my life and my family's.

I want to thank you, first of all, for funding a program like this one and ask to -- if you can keep helping funding programs for family literacy to give other families the opportunity for a strong foundation and grow like my family has.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. Kathy and then followed by Rick Overdorf.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Kathy Shriner, and I'm a member of the guidance body of Best Start Panorama City and Neighbors. So we take in Panorama City, North Hills East, and the northern part of Van Nuys. And I'm authorized to make this statement on the behalf of the guidance body.

I am here to express the concern and dismay of the guidance body of the Best Start Panorama City and Neighbors that First 5 LA is terminating programs that serve our Best Start community. We will lose three current programs and a fourth program, PFF, has lost staff
due to the uncertainty of its future.

We are confused because we understood that these programs had been extended so that Best Start partnerships would have a voice in any decision about whether funded programs or program models would be continued. We did not receive any formal notifications from First 5 LA that these programs in our community were going to expire at the end of June. We understand that these services are ending in compliance with the First 5 LA governance guidelines. It seems to us that the results of your guidelines are incompatible with your expressed concern to improve the lives of parents and children within the boundaries of our Best Start community.

How do these actions improve the lives of parents and children in our community?

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. Rick, and then followed by Lacette Guarte.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hello. My name's Rick Overdorf. I think I've been here before. So I'm with the Lucinda Family Literacy Program in Lake Los Angeles, California. I have a letter here from our superintendent which everybody should receive to -- we are asking you to consider gap funding so that we can move on and sustain our program.

At this point, it's very difficult. However, we have
talked -- I have talked with the superintendent and
several other people, and we are working very hard to try
to keep this program going. Our community absolutely --
absolutely must have this program one way or the other.
It's imperative. Read the letter and our superintendent
will tell you why our community depends on this program
quite a bit.

So I don't have much more to say except I might
suggest First 5 has the capacity to help us find
sustainability. I would suggest that. You could just
help us. We're small. We don't have a big organization
to come along and write 47 grants or what have you, not to
mention the fact that we're small so, therefore, we don't
have the capacity to diversify grants to fit into our
program. We're one program within one small, poor, very
small community. If you could just get us through this, I
think we could find a way to keep us going. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: What was that?
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Timer.
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: That was AFLAC.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: Lacette and then followed by
Kesha Gates. I want to try that before the supervisors,
that little noise. I like that.

Lacette Guarte and then followed by Kesha Gates.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Yes. Good afternoon, esteemed
commission. My name is Lacette Guarte. I'm a parent of two children on the autism spectrum, and I'm here just to thank you, first of all, for funding a program like the developmental screening project at 211. My children were diagnosed very late. My son was diagnosed at age 11 and my daughter was diagnosed at age nine. And this developmental screening project has really helped me in my community work. I have been working in the South LA community for the past nine years with community partners like my former employer, Special Needs Network. I'm now with Autism Speaks. I worked with a lot of community programs. And I'm here to tell that you the developmental screening project has been a lifeline in my work in the community when families have difficult times accessing services and getting screenings for their children, that the incidents rates now are 1 in 68 children are diagnosed with autism. It's a really important program, and I want to thank you for funding and I hope that you will continue to because it's been crucial for a lot of families who are low-income minorities of color like my own.

This project is doing really wonderful things and it's helping identify kids at an earlier rate which will save us money in the long run. I just want to thank you for funding it, and I support it, and I hope you will continue to.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. Kesha and then followed by Antonio Hernandez.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hello, everyone. My name is Kesha Halier Gates. I would like to thank the board for the 211 developmental screening funding services and for the opportunity to express my gratitude for the early intervention program. I cannot speak for everybody, but I can speak as a mother of two sons with autism, ages seven and four. And I can voice the concern as a pediatric neonatal intensive care nurse and as a public health nurse and as an advocate for child safety and accessibility to quality of care for all children.

With my background and with my knowledge of growth and development, I still experienced extensive challenges with resources. For example, the help I received from my care provider, my dual coverage insurance was a card to a social worker, and the regional centers advice to -- not the regional centers but advice to move up and pack up from where I live and to find some place else because the resources were not available.

And that call I made to 211 for info regarding something else was -- I was -- got that question was, do I have any children under the age of five. Yes. A door opened. It was a front line to me and to the parent that
may be afraid, embarrassed, or in denial that something is
not right with their child. You don't put your child in
the driver's seat and tell them go; you set a foundation
for success.

211 development program services and the phone
screening is much more. It is the first line of
identifying and obtaining advice for the most vulnerable
and underserved persons, our children.

As a full-time working parent, between two IEPs,
speech therapies two times a week for my children, 15
hours for ABA for one child, seven hours of ABA for
another child, following up, following through, making
people accountable, the phone and the care coordination
and the help that I receive from 211 is important.

So I ask you to continue the funding. And here's
Lavelle and David. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. Antonio.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm
Antonio Hernandez. And I'm a father. I'm here to thank
First 5 for funding the developmental screening program.
I'm nervous. You know, I'm just here basically to let you
guys know that this program is very effective. The
developmental screening program, or 211, is very
effective. My son was diagnosed at an early age thanks to
them. I went through numerous agencies and numerous
people that told me often and many times that there was nothing wrong with my son, but by the developmental screening, they got it right on time, and they were very accurate with their help. I was -- I got help from the Harbor Regional Center from Harbor Regional Center, from Newport Therapy. I mean, numerous agencies that were willing to help. The Alliance For Children's Rights. This is just to name a few but I know it's very effective and I know that, if it keeps on, it will help us fathers.

As a matter of fact, it made me a better father to understand how to be a parent and it changed my life forever. To this day -- to this day, I still volunteer and I do whatever it takes for my son. If it wasn't for them, I wouldn't understand what it is to be responsible as far as getting the help that my son needs. I want to thank you guys again and I hope that this program continues to get funded because I know there is fathers and mothers that are willing to take that extra step, the initiative to get that help for their sons, their daughters, their nephews. You know, this is just beginning. I hope this goes a long ways and God bless you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I wanted to leave some CDs of my story. I forgot about it. I'm so nervous. I hope you
guys watch it.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. That ends the public testimony. Any other comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER AU: Are we going to take each of these separately in terms of a vote?

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Why? There's no vote.

MS. BELSHE: There's only one action item pending before the commission, which is to waive the governance guidelines, Guideline Number 7, and approve the staff recommendation of Partnerships For Families sustainability plan funding for a six-month period.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: That's the only one for us now?

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: So the item before us is the recommendation of PFF six months. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: So move.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Second?

COMMISSIONER AU: Second.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Any objections? Okay. So be the order.

MS. BELSHE: Question for Serita, our counsel. Given that this requires a waiver of the rules, which is
of seven of nine voting members, is a voice vote sufficient or do we need a formal --

MS. YOUNG: Why don't we do a formal roll call?
MS. BELSHE: A proper roll call. Okay. Is that all right, Mr. Chair?

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yes.
SECRETARY: Philip Browning?
COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Aye.
SECRETARY: Arturo Delgado?
COMMISSIONER DELGADO: Yes.
SECRETARY: Duane Dennis.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yes.
SECRETARY: Jonathan Fielding.
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Yes.
SECRETARY: Neal Kaufman.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Yes.
SECRETARY: Don Knabe.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yes.
SECRETARY: Motion passed.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: The easy way, if there's anybody object, please raise your hand.

MS. BELSHE: So moved.
COMMISSIONER AU: So moved.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: So moved.

Item 7 is a policy that was created prior to my
arrival here, but it's break time. So my favorite thing, right? I mean, break time. I've never been on a commission that has break time. Just a little playtime, you know.

MS. BELSHE: Five minutes.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Five minutes.

(Brief recess.)

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Here we go. Wow.

MS. BELSHE: Works every time. The power of the shush.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: We have Mr. Law. Is he going to give us an update?

MR. LAU: Yes, Mr. Chair. So at the last commission meeting, I did a few things. So I brought before you for approval the legislative criteria, which is what we used to develop our legislative agenda, and then brought before you the list of bills that were approved. So that was the first batch. So I also mentioned during the commission meeting that I would come back and present a second batch of the legislative agenda presented to the program and planning Committee. And having done that, bringing it to you all for approval. So that's -- the goal for today is to introduce the legislative agenda to you and then provide some next steps.

So just a quick background, when staff did the
analysis, we looked at over close to 700 bills. And at that time, just in terms of the process, a lot of those bills were still in what's called spot bill form, so still in development. So many of those bills that -- that -- or what we're bringing before you is four bills for approval, which is added on to the seven bills that were approved last month.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: More bills to support?

MR. LAU: Yes. Bills for support. So the four bills that are before you for support are as follows:

AB 1805 bolsters the -- bolsters the provider participation in Medi-Cal as the State implements the rollout of the health care reform. 1902 -- AB 1902 eliminates the family fees for children who attend a part-day California state preschool program. SB 1000 is -- requires labeling on sugar sweetened beverages and also where they're being sold. Then lastly, SB 1002, which strengthens the alignment of Medi-Cal and CalFresh reporting periods to streamline the benefit delivery of both those programs.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: The chair would entertain a motion to support those four bills.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: So moved.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Second.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: What's the status of the
Steinberg bill?

MR. LAU: SB 837 was heard yesterday, and that was passed. That's going to be referred to --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Passed out of the House, passed out of the Senate, or passed out of committee?

MR. LAU: Passed out of the Senate education committee.

MS. BELSHE: With amendments? Do you want to say a word about --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yeah. Were there any amendments?

MR. LAU: Yeah, there were quite a few amendments, too many to go into.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: In other words, you don't have the list with you.

MR. LAU: I don't.

MS. BELSHE: So what we can do is, we'll send around a summary update to --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yeah, because I'd be curious about the amendments too, so that would be good. Just send us out a summary. Okay?

MR. LAU: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: When is the House hearing, James? Do you know the date of the House hearing?

MR. LAU: For which, SB 837?
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yes. Not House, Senate.

MS. BELSHE: It's still on the Senate side.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: It just came out of the education committee.

MR. LAU: Right. So it just passed out of the committee. Next week is spring recess and then it's going to the appropriation committee and it hasn't been set yet for a date.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Yeah, it will have to go to props probably first.

COMMISSIONER AU: Just a question about AB 1902.

MR. LAU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AU: Could you tell me when they say elimination of preschool program fees, is it total universal elimination?

MR. LAU: Right. Right. So I can't remember what year, but they -- you know, because of the State recession, they assessed a fee for parents. And as a result of that, that created a huge drop in the number of children who actually went through the three-year old and four-year old California state preschool program. So this would eliminate the fee and this would help to, hopefully, bring back more children to California state preschool programs.
COMMISSIONER AU: Is there any provision for it to have a need-based criteria?

MR. LAU: I'm sorry. Commissioner Dennis was --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: State preschool system is only for low-income families. So what the Governor did a couple of years ago, because of the fiscal crisis, he imposed a fee on all these families. But as a result -- the unintended consequence was that many low-income families could not use the program. So now there is, you know, a move to restore it at a no-fee level for all those low-income families.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. So the --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It was only for low-income families.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. That's all.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It was a state preschool.

The other piece I wanted to bring and I talked to earlier, James, is 2125, and that's Ridley-Thomas' bill on RMR and SRR. That's going to be really important, folks. I just want to make sure we understand what's going on there. That's an attempt to deal with the compensation issue for childcare providers in this state. We're working at 2005 regional market rate. So this would be a bill to, one, collapse the state reimbursement and regional market rate to make it one system; and two, to
help compensation of childcare providers. So I hope this will come back at our next meeting.

MR. LAU: And it is on our watch list. So one of the next steps was that, as any bills change from -- on the watch list, we will bring it back to update you. I think a lot of the bills were still in development and we understood that in conversation with the authorize's office, that that was the intent behind it.


COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Yeah. What are the prospects for SB 1000? Are there any competing bills that? We should be aware of.

MR. LAU: I'm not familiar if there is any competing bills that -- that would be a significant bill. I expect that it there will be a lot of challenges. I think any time going against -- going up against the soda industry is a challenge.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Not shocking.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: As he has his Coke in front of him.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: But it's obviously something we feel strongly about. We know that the impact that has on childhood obesity and on into adulthood. So that's a really important one. Whatever we can do to important that vigorously would be important.
MR. LAU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Anything else?

Anything else?

MR. LAU: No. I neglected to put this up there.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: You win the chairman's prize today for the briefest report.

MR. LAU: Not only that, this is Roberto, our policy analyst's, staff. I think he --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Why is he in early childhood education?

MR. LAU: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. So far you win the chairman's award for the briefest presentation. You're in first place.

MS. FICEK: Do I get the chairman's award for back-to-back or multiple presentations?

COMMISSIONER KNABE: You'll get the one for the multiple brief ones.

MS. FICEK: All right. I'll try to keep it brief.

Well, today staff is going to be a presenting an update on a motion that was introduced by the chair at the November 2013 commission meeting that authorized the following: It was an expansion of the Black Infant Health program, increasing funding by 25 percent, and also
extended that program for an additional five years. It also included 500,000 to address poor birth outcomes and disparities among African-Americans, and it also included a $600,000 investment for a two-year effort to support at-risk fathers.

So let's start with Black Infant Health. Just a quick program overview, the BIH program is a State program of the California Department of Public Health. First 5 LA funding began in 2009 at the request of the LA County Board of Supervisors when it was cut from the State general fund. And then in 2010, California Department of Public Health revised the BIH program shifting its focus to more of a group intervention, however still including case management as part of its new model.

First 5 LA supports Black Infant Health programs at Los Angeles County Department of Public Health through the City of Long Beach and also through the City of Pasadena. And as a result of First 5 LA funding stepping in back in 2009, these programs are still able to draw down their Title 19 Medi-Cal matching and reimbursement funds.

So what does the increase in First 5 LA support look like for Black Infant Health programs moving forward? For the cities of Pasadena and Long Beach, they have already been implementing the new models since 2011, so
the increase will be used to strengthen specific services for women. Mental health services is one area that's been highlighted. For the Department of Public Health, they have not yet implemented the new model. DPH will be releasing an RFP this July 2014 to align with the requirements of the new model. New subcontracts are expected to come next year. LA county DPH anticipates the increased support coming from First 5 LA in 14/15 to assist in transitioning to that new model and to help build capacity for the current providers. And then in 15/16, the increase in funding will be used to support newly contracted BIH programs to provide individualized case management services to clients that aren't able to attend the group intervention.

Next step, staff is going to be working with the three BIH contractors to develop their 14/15 budgets and performance matrixes.

Moving on to birth outcomes and disparities. After that motion was passed back in November, First 5 LA contracted with Harder & Company to help inform us on models and best practices, promising strategies that could positively impact health disparities and address poor birth outcomes among African-Americans. A draft of this report was included in your board packet and the executive summary was included in your board packet and is entitled,
Birth Outcomes Exploratory Study, and it was released just this past month in March 2014.

In the area of policy and systems change, the Harder report highlighted the following: The issue of health disparities is a complex one with multiple factors contributing, including lack of quality of care, access to care, poverty, social isolation, and racial discrimination. Future efforts need to focus our funding beyond direct services and examine the systemic issues that are contributing to preterm and low-birth weight for African-Americans. Focusing on policy and systems change requires multiple sectors, of course, various systems with different levels of government and engagement across many issue areas. In order for us to achieve meaningful population-wide change, policy and systems strategies must be regional in nature. Once we identify this regional focus, staff looked at data for LA County, noting that South LA and Antelope Valley have the highest preterm and low-birth weight births in the county.

Additional recommendations from the Harder report also focused on looking at opportunities to align policy and systems change approaches with existing First 5 LA initiatives. Staff focused on Best Start communities work once we had already identified the high rates of poor birth outcomes and disparities in South LA and Antelope.
Valley. Working with our South LA and Antelope Valley Best Start community partnerships and developing a systems change approach is important. Since also the Antelope Valley and South LA partnerships identified birth disparities as one of a number of priorities that they are interested to focus on.

Next steps then related to the birth outcomes and disparities investment is, we want to reach out and partner with two trusted, locally-based organizations that engage in community-based policy change and advocacy within South LA and Antelope Valley to convene key stakeholders such as WIC agencies, hospitals clinics, and so forth to gather additional community input on possible systems change approaches that can address then these birth outcomes and disparities. Staff will then be bringing back to the commission any future recommendations that emerge from these community convenings.

Next is the at-risk fathers investment. Before we get into the recommendations and next steps, however, though, we wanted to start with a definition of at-risk father. And for this investment, we are defining that as a male who is expecting a child or is a father of at least one child through age five who lacks the desired parenting and life skills to support their child to be healthy, safe, and ready to learn. We realize future research is
needed to refine this definition and staff is going to be
looking to both local and national focused initiatives to
help further inform it.

The Harder report provided a number of
recommendations related to a future First 5 LA investment
focused on at-risk fathers. An immediate opportunity
staff also identified that requires no additional funding
includes leveraging our current First 5 LA programming to
better support dads.

Staff has reviewed current programming and
identified specific investments that can be enhanced to
insure services delivered are being more inclusive and
responsive to fathers. The investments that can be
immediately enhanced are listed here on the slide and
further details on how each investment is strengthened to
better support at-risk fathers was provided in detail in
the board memo.

For Black Infant Health, staff will be reviewing
short-term opportunities to support the BIH programs to
engage fathers more fully in their work and will also be
looking to explore how to best use the BIH investment as a
platform for engaging fathers.

And finally, another immediate opportunity that
exists would be to repurpose unexpended public affairs and
current fiscal year 13/14 dollars to create a public
education campaign for at-risk dads.

Last June, First 5 LA conducted a Father Really Matters public education campaign and it promoted general awareness around the importance of fathers. While this campaign wasn't designed to reach at-risk fathers, it was designed county-wide, public affairs staff believes some components of it could be reused for a campaign this year to focus more on at-risk dads. Staff is looking into using up to 150,000 of those unexpended funds from the current budget to implement this campaign.

Next steps for the at-risk father investment include further planning by First 5 LA is needed to have a better handle on the wide range of local existing fatherhood programs. To continue this effort, we would like to release an RFI, a request for information, this July to solicit information on effective programs and supports that have been or are currently provided for fathers by local community groups and organizations. And as suggested in the Harder report, this RFI can then help First 5 LA better understand the landscape of LA county fatherhood activities, potential partners, and also gaps in programming.

Then following in November of this year, a multi-stakeholder planning group identified from the RFI would be brought together to convene to explore the best
way to leverage other partners and efforts in the region to identify outcomes, both short and long-term and identify indicators of progress and key implementation considerations.

Staff will of course, similar with the birth outcomes, community convenings, be bringing back any recommendations from that multi-stakeholder group to the commission then for your review.

And that covers it.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I have a question.

MS. FICEK: Sure.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Are Pasadena and Long Beach doing something different than the other BIH providers?

MS. FICEK: Well, they have been implementing the new model since 2011. So they have been on a different path than what the currently the Department of Public Health is doing. The Department of Public Health will be moving to that new model next year.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Why are we so far behind?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Am I allowed --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: You're not allowed to say.

MS. BELSHE: Tara can speak to --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Susan Bostwick can.

MS. FICEK: So a lot of the -- there's a lot -- the services are still -- they're still doing group
intervention as a part of both old and new as is case management. It's just a different focus with the new model, it's placed more on the group intervention side of it, but case management did still continue.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Yes, Duane.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: If I remember correctly from the discussion when we had this, and it's been some time ago, and I remember the chair had asked the review at this particular time. I think the -- the old model and -- and I'm just rephrasing what Jonathan said at that time -- that the old model tended to be a lot more effective because it dealt more with one-on-one intervention as opposed to the new model. And I may be mistaken, but the newer model was a lot more cost effective. Is that correct? Is my memory serving me correctly?

MS. FICEK: I'm going to ask my R and E colleague to get ready to walk up here. But I don't think we've had enough data from the State to necessarily determine if the old model was more effective than where they're going with the new model. Mario.

MARIO: You called me.

So actually I attended the state directors meeting in Sacramento a few weeks ago. And the thing that came through very clearly was the other sites that have been implementing this model for multiple years are still
in different stages of implementation even though they probably should be at a fully implemented point right now. And I think that DPH made the decision to delay to wait to see how this model pans out. And I think it was a really good decision because we're seeing that there's a lot of lessons learned now in terms of how to implement that model in a more effective manner. And we're working very closely with Susan and her other team to make sure that we put in place a good plan to make sure that we leverage those best practices from around the state that, you know, make sure we don't run into the pitfalls that some of them have run into and make sure that we leverage those good experiences.

In terms of data, we have been having conversations for over a year trying to get data from the State. And it's been challenging, but I think we're closer than we've ever been, which that's -- but we're getting there. I think we're probably a couple of months away from getting the actual individual level data from the old model so that we can be able to say what that really impacted, what the outcomes really were.

So once we do have that information, we certainly will bring it to this commission.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Are we in a position to get our own data? Are we in a position in LA county to get
our own --

MR. MARIO: It's my -- and we've certainly advocated for that strongly. It's my information that the State owns the data and the State is the one who determines who can have access to the data so that we don't have -- as much as our contracts actually say that we have joint ownership of the grantees, the State says they -- that that's not exactly the case. The State has the soul ownership and can decide --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: What would be the reason they wouldn't share the information?

MR. MARIO: I don't know the answer to that.

COMMISSIONER AU: Aren't we funding -- aren't we funding the Black Infant Health program?

MR. MARIO: You're singing to the choir here. Let me tell you because I went up to the State and I advocated very strongly for that, and I have been for a year and a half. Susan can certainly nod her head to that one. We really pushed very strongly and let them know, we want to be able to talk about the great outcomes from this program, but we need data to do so. And we're still having conversations to try to get those data. So we are trying very hard to get those data.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Mario, do we know anything about what -- about Pasadena and Long Beach? Because,
obviously, we're in direct support of them directly. I mean, do we have any outcome data with regards to those particular entities?

Mr. MARIO: So they've been -- they've been implementing the new model. We've been told by the State that they're not looking to release individual level information or aggregate information about the sites until they're at fidelity. Unfortunately, at this time, our information is that none of the sites statewide are at fidelity, so they're not looking to share that information yet.

We've made the very strong case that, if our sites are at fidelity, we want our data; and even if they're not at that point, we need to see some data soon. We've established relationships with the State that I don't think have existed in the past, so I think we're going to get a lot closer to that point, but we still have not gotten those data.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Anything else?

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Supervisor, I have one question. Does the agreement we have with those two programs not require that they report back data to First 5?

MR. MARIO: The agreement that we have with those
two programs says that we're co-owners with the data, but the State says that we're not.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: It's hard for me to believe that we would be funding them but not have any data that they would be required to send unless the State is funding them at a greater degree.

MR. MARIO: And we do receive a very basic level of information like we'll be seeing with our getting better data, midyear report in the budget and finance committee meeting this month, as well as the commission meeting next movement, but it's just more widget counts in terms of what was accomplished; it's not outcomes data.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Is part of it because the state funds a different model than what we do?

MR. MARIO: My information is that because it's state funding and federal funding, that those usurp any -- any role we have in terms of being able to get the data directly.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: At what time should we -- I mean, I just want to push this a little further. At what time should we expect to have a report back to the commission on outcomes with regards to that which we are funding?

MR. MARIO: Are we referring to the old model or the new model?
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Both.

MR. MARIO: I would say, in terms of the new model, we're really hoping by the end of this fiscal year that we are poised to be able to deliver that type of information to you. It factors in the cooperation from the State. So we're hope that's going to happen.

The new model, I don't know whether there's enough data to really tell you much. If you look at scale of LA versus Pasadena and Long Beach, LA serves about a little over 1,300 moms per year; whereas, Pasadena and Long Beach serve a little over a hundred each. So being able to tell you outcomes based on some of those smaller programs may be misleading, so we want to make sure that we don't give you data that are misleading. So the short -- I'm sorry. With new model data, it will certainly be the longer than the end of this fiscal year.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: But 200 to a thousand is 20 percent. So that's -- that's important. That's significant.

MR. MARIO: I agree.

MS. BELSHE: We'll learn something.

MR. MARIO: We're trying to fight the fight for the big data and the old model because there is -- the difference also is, Commissioner Dennis, is that the old model data is much richer. It really identifies those
birth outcomes and those types of outcomes that we really
are very invested in hearing about. The newer model
doesn't track those outcomes the same way. So they're not
going to tell you the same things you're going to want to
hear. So it is important and we'll make sure we get it to
you, but it's going to tell a different story.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Anything else?
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Can I change subjects to
another one?
COMMISSIONER KNABE: No, not really.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Okay. I'll wait.
COMMISSIONER KNABE: No, no, go ahead. I was
just kidding.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Just wanted to make sure I
didn't step on anybody's toes.

This question has to do with the at-risk father
program. Have we considered and should we consider
looking at father support activities -- I'll use the broad
terms -- within all of our grantees? So if you look at
every program we have, there's a father somewhere attached
to everything we do.

MS. FICEK: Right. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Could be as simple as on
your quarterly or annual report tell us what you did to
bring in fathers. It could be more aggressive than that.
Have we done something like that? Have we -- does it make sense?

MS. FICEK: We haven't done it in that way, targeting like a specific question on their mid-year or year-end report. We do -- in the initiatives that were highlighted in the presentation are ones that staff scanned and found clear opportunities to enhance current --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I'm trying to figure out a way --

MS. FICEK: -- get a better sense of what we're doing now.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: -- a nonlinear effect, which means, we don't have to micromanage each one of the programs, but we let the programs know and maybe in the future discussions have part of their -- the expectation of their outcomes are father related. And it could be as simple as, how many fathers came into preschool to spend time with their kids, whatever. I wouldn't try to get in the middle of that. I just wonder if you feel like, has anyone tried to do that by changing that kind of a basic rule saying that fathers are important to us and we think you should think they are too?

MS. FICEK: I think it would be something we can easily do, a scan of our programs, and I think -- we know
of certain investments where there's been greater emphasis
on dads, like our Partnerships For Families has a lot of
programming targeting dads. Where it's been coordinated
and includes kind of cross all initiatives in the same
way? No, we have not done that.

MS. BELSHE: Although to be clear, in the board
memo articulated and you touched on more briefly, you
know, six or ten programs where we've already done some
work in terms of saying, okay, where are there the
opportunities to be more inclusive and responsive to
fathers. And what I'm hearing you say, Neal, is maybe we
need to go back and think a bit more about the continuum
of kind of a light touch that might --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Just by asking the
question --

MS. BELSHE: -- minimum reporting requirement
just to gather baseline information --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I can imagine, if you just
ask people the question, oh, First 5 LA cares about
fathers, maybe next year I'll do something more about it,
I think it would probably have a ripple effect that maybe
would help.

MS. FICEK: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Anything else?
Thank you.

MS. FICEK: All right.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: We do have a member of the public signed up. Pardon me?

MS. BELSHE: I was asking if we're going to see Tara one more time, but that's it.

MS. FICEK: That's it.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Ray Jones.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Chair Knabe, commissioners, Ms. Belshe, and Mr. Wagner. I want to thank you for hearing us.

And I actually came up here to say thank you. I'm very excited about the evaluation process and looking at the rollout of a new model. And I really just came up here to say thank you, but Chair Knabe opened up a can of worms when he asked why we hadn't rolled out the new model.

We met with Ms. Belshe, Mr. Wagner, and Tina -- I can't pronounce her last name -- and we expressed what -- what Mr. Dennis has said over and over again, that we were concerned about the lack of effectiveness of the new model. We have fought actively for the last three years to not roll out the new model, but with the intervention that we're looking at right now, especially the evaluation, the rollout, and the extension of the original
program, what we're doing right now in LA is a much more hands-on program. What we saw on the group model across the state was pretty much decimation of the program, and it looked like no one cared until we came here to you.

So I want to thank Ms. Belshe and Mr. Wagner for having the -- for listening to us and having the sensitivity in bringing that sensitivity to First 5 LA.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. All right. Next item, please.

MR. GONZALEZ: Good afternoon, commissioners.

It's great to be here to be able to -- thank you very much -- to be able to share some of the exciting work that is currently underway and the action that we've seen a lot of our parents take in our Best Start -- in our 14 Best Start communities.

Last month, I was able to provide an update on the Building Stronger Families Framework implementation plan and the various components that are currently underway in the 14 communities. I also had an opportunity to provide a high-level review of our implementation activities to date relative to the Building Stronger Families Framework indicators and their application within the learning-by-doing process. That's one thing that you're going to be hearing a lot from us during -- well,
throughout this whole process and in this presentation, is
this whole notion of learning by doing, particularly as it
relates to the family core results.

Additionally, last month at the P and P
committee, we were able to provide the commission some
context and provide a case example of how the BSFF, the
Building Stronger Families Framework, indicator data and
other relevant information are being used by community
partnerships to make more informed decisions. At that
meeting, we highlight -- and many of you were actually at
that meeting -- we were able to highlight the Central Long
Beach Community Partnership. And Lillian Lu, who some of
you know, joined our staff to discuss the process by which
the Long Beach community was using data to select their
family core result. We're also able to share a video
given that it was in the afternoon a lot of parents
weren't able to make it here, but we wanted to include the
parent voice in that presentation. So we were able to
share a video that basically highlighted what parents,
what residents were doing in terms of their engagement
with learning by doing.

So for today's discussion, I will provide an
update on where we are with learning by doing, share with
you some progress on resident engagement to expand that
resident participation, the voice, the influence
throughout this whole learning-by-doing process, also be
able to share out some of the criteria that we are looking
at right now for our results focused action and more
information on that in a bit. And, lastly, to also review
the next steps in the Building Stronger Families Framework
implementation game plan.

So my goal today is for you all to see how
learning by doing is the core. It's a thread that ties
all the implementation components of the Building Stronger
Families Framework and at the center of learning by doing
lays the results focused actions of our community
partnerships.

As we've discussed in past meetings, learning by
doing is a decision making process that community
partnership are utilizing that involves a disciplined way
of thinking, taking action, and building the capacity of
our partnerships to achieve the core results for families
and communities. One aspect of this capacity building is
understanding its valuing, actively soliciting parent and
resident participation in decisions and actions to address
concerns that are in the community.

To insure this broad participation, some
community partnerships are working on their governance and
decision making structure to insure strong leadership and
influence from parents and other community members. Other
community partnerships are at the beginning stages of learning by doing, meaning they're in the process of selecting a core result, utilizing the Building Stronger Families Framework indicators and other data to inform the decision making and understanding the story behind that data.

And this data is very important. And one of the things we're very fortune about is that we've been able to develop with our partners in very user friendly, very colorful information such as infographics, doing gallery walks, doing posters. These are -- this is basically data that makes it very accessible for our community to kind of walk through these issues. For example, in Central Long Beach, the community has used infographics to help them understand the issues related to our family capacity core results. I know that in Panorama City, the community partnerships there have used a gallery walk to display the data in a way that best resonates with that partnership.

As a result, both partnerships were able to research consensus on their selection of a family core result. And through this process, the developmental evaluator, which we talked about last time, was actually a member of the learning team, has been a valuable resources in facilitating the use of data within the community partnerships so that they're able to make decisions.
So in terms of resident engagement, maximizing resident, parent, and stakeholder engagement around issues that affect families and communities is critical if we expect to see lasting community change in our neighborhoods. Active engagement in collaboration with community residents and families is a fundamental role the community partnership and is really at the crux of what the Building Stronger Families Frameworks is.

Other local and community decision making and change efforts across the nation have demonstrated that a foundational and critical first step in this work is the engagement of residents in order to build trust among community members to have that credibility in this effort. So to help the community partnerships strengthen resident engagement, additional supports have been made available to them. For example, our investments in this area help community partnerships with resident outreach planning. They build connections to informal and formal resident networks and to individual residents who may not be able to attend partnership convenings and they facilitate engagement activities that are easily accessible by both parents and other residents.

It's critical for resident engagement to be anchored in relationship building which over time strengthens the community partnerships, social networks,
and their collective ability to bring about the community change around the core results they've identified.

To engage more parents and residents in Best Start, First 5 has entered into a strategic partnership with the South Bay Center for Community Development to conduct relationship-based resident outreach via the resident outreach coordinators. So just to give you a little background on this relationship-based model, it's about grading connections; it's about strengthening community relationships and purposes for increasing knowledge of and support for the Best Start vision for change. To date -- and we actually have 153 up here, but we were actually with them yesterday and they were able to inform us that we have 221 additional parents and residents that have expressed an interest in being connected to Best Start as a result of this relationship-based outreach.

The idea of an organized community effort to support families is being well received. So we're getting a lot of really great feedback that really validates the Building Stronger Families change and why it's important to get parents and other residents involved in these efforts. So additional, in terms of our next steps here -- additional relationship efforts will continue to be conducted as learning by doing moves forward.
Criteria for results-focused actions. So at the core of learning by doing, as I mentioned a little earlier on, is this results-focused actions. Now, results-focused actions are community change activities that are focused in advancing the core results. It allows for community partnerships to address complex community conditions in a very focused, integrate, and had strategic way. Now these actions will be selected based on the following criteria that was actually approved by this board back in November. So results -- criteria that we're looking at right now are: Influenced actions, meaning that those that have the ability to leverage other resources, thus having a stronger effect on our core results. And these are actions are ones that are -- that build upon momentum and commitment throughout the community. Part of the criteria also is that they're evidence-based or promising practices and reflect communities wisdoms; that they have outcomes achievable and measurable within five to ten years, and performance measures are achievable in the near term, and they offer the potential for resource mobilization, scalability, and sustainability.

The results-focused actions that will occur in the coming months will be based on the decisions that will be made throughout the learning-by-doing process. So, for example, just to kind of give you an example of what's
taking place out in the community, the Southeast LA partnership is interested in family capacities as a core result. They’ve discussed leadership development to increase knowledge about parenting and child development while also building a capacity of parents to engage and affect change in the neighborhood. In East LA, the partnership wants to focus on advocacy work related to core environmental conditions in community spaces for families as a way of addressing the social connections core result.

So First 5 LA staff is developing -- is currently developing the parameters for these actions based on best promising, place-based efforts, and our lessons learned so far relative to the building community capacity. Staff is also working to provide additional guidelines and implementation details for results-focused actions which will be presented to the board at the April P and P committee meeting. So more to come on that.

In the coming months, several community partnerships will be engaged in the initial stages of learning by doing. Other community partnerships will be entering the latter stages of learning by doing and be in the process of selecting their target population and identifying strategies -- strategies and their performance measures.
As I mentioned earlier, we will be reviewing the funding approach for results-focused actions at the program and planning committee later this movement.

There is much headway and the community readiness on this front, and we look forward to sharing more information. So as you can see, it's an exciting time for Best Start communities and the community partnerships as we enter into the action phase of the Building Stronger Families framework, which is anchored in our theory of change and the learning-by-doing process.

Thank you, and would love to open it up for questions at this point.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Any questions? Yeah, Duane.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yes, sir. Just a comment. As -- as we're dealing with sunsetting grants and many of those grantees are located in the Best Start area. Rafael, if we can make an effort to make connection because they are -- they are parents, they are kids, they are a whole other connections like from -- you know, family lit or school readiness or whatever have you. If we can make some kind of connection and bridge for those consortia to the Best Start communities, I think that will be something that we should really think about.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: I think the other important
thing -- and while all the reports are good, the process really needs to move along. We have a short time frame here I think to keep the communities' interest and to make them our partners. So the process really needs to move along on sort of a fast forward kind of an operation to keep the community energized like they have been.

MR. GONZALEZ: Right. And it is very excited. I mean, in the next coming months, you're going to see more people engaged in the learning-by-doing process. There's a lot of thinking in terms of the issues that are related to the community capacity building, you know, which -- you know, is led by parents, but also knowing very well how strategic it is to have those relationships with other entities, with other stakeholders in our respective neighborhoods. So it's important to have all these pieces in people's minds I think as we move forward and we start thinking about the social capital that's in our neighborhoods, right, being able to mobilize community resources as an organizational development, so.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Thank you. Yes.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL. Just along the same lines that the supervisor brought up right now. Is there a visual timeline on what you're thinking in terms of the steps and -- or all of that -- and are all the Best Start communities on the same timeline?
MR. GONZALEZ: They're not at the same timeline. I mean, the four -- all of our partnerships are at different levels. We have some right now that are preparing themselves, right, because they want to make sure that the infrastructure, the governance infrastructure, is strong so that it's able too integrate more parents, more residents in terms of the decision making, in terms of the entire process.

So while we have others that are, you know, in the process of saying, hey, you know what, we have this, we have that. But we're ready to identify our target population. We're ready to look at what the strategies are. You know, you still have some that are in the middle that in the beginning stages of learning by doing. So it varies. It varies.

And we're hoping, you know, that -- you know, that in the next couple of months that you'll have the majority of our partnerships already involved in the learning-by-doing process and be able to identify the strategies, the result-focused actions.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: I have a follow up question.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER PLEITEZ HOWELL: Then if they're all in different timelines, does each one kind of know where
they're heading? So, for example, the ones that are
further ahead in the timeline, they know, okay, we're
coming up with our strategic goals and this is where we're
going afterwards. Are those timelines at least in place
for the different communities or are they kind of showing
up to meetings and trying to figure out when different
aspects are happening? Do they know --

MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah. And, actually, that is not
one of the pieces that's happened. I mean, this is very
thoughtful. This is very organized. I mean -- and we
actually, when we're rolling out this whole process, we
were very intentional and very descriptive in terms of
what the learning-by-doing process is and the different
stages. And data plays a very big role in terms of
identifying what is it that people want to do.

Now, a lot of folks -- because people have been
involved in these partnerships for a couple of years and
some even longer, right, and they've been grappling with
certain issues. So they have a pretty good sense, right,
from -- from their experience in terms of the wisdom that
they bring at the table, but also having been able to
identify other data, you know. They're bringing
information to the fold, so it's not like, you know,
they're starting from square one.

And the fact that we have a learning team, that
we have developmental evaluators and our capacity builders, we're able to keep this whole process focused, right, but we also have to understand, you know, that in some partnerships -- some communities, it's going to take a little longer because -- and part of it is because a partnership is asking, you know, that we need to build up our parent and resident voice, we need to have that infrastructure in place so that we can sustain this. So for them, you know, being able to kind of follow these steps and also be able to be in a place where they can say, this is what we want to do, is important to them. So setting that foundation to be at that point is critical. And our learning team is insuring, you know, that we actually have people going in through -- you know, going through this process.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHDARD: So are they -- are the communities at a developmental stage in which, for example, you can give us a list of contact people so that, if there were in public health or mental health partnerships or ideas that were -- could be developmentally attached that we can start making those contacts to build -- for example, to help neighbors that we're trying to build, or would it be premature to do that?

MR. GONZALEZ: We're going to get to the point --
and actually one of the things that we're thinking about and the purpose -- one of the key components of learning-by-doing process and looking at results-focused actions is being able to sort of leverage, right, being able to identify, you know, what these, you know, important areas are, you know, what these strategies are and how we're going to match them, how we're going to be able to have that influence, right, the influence actions that we talked about, so that we're not doing it alone so that we're also being very intentional and strategic about being able to identify what else is taking place out in the community so when we do get to that point -- and you're going to see it very quickly with areas like Long Beach. You know, we're going to be able to come to you, to our other partnerships and say, you know what, this is what's coming out of the community. So we need to identify so that we can match and we can maximize that --

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: But you're not at that point yet?

MR. GONZALEZ: We're not at that point yet.

MS. BELSHE: Although what I might suggest is, I think we are -- given where we are relative to now moving forward, most of the partnerships in the early stages of implementation and some moving further along than others, I think it is timely, Marv, for us to sit down with your
-- whoever is the right person -- maybe it's a co-convening with DMH, First 5 LA, DPH, DCFS to just give you a more detailed landscape of where the 14 partnerships are and what the direction appears to be relative to some of the core results they're focusing on.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Because we're currently in the process. This is all happening in real time and we're trying to create partners with faith communities and other people in specific neighbors. And so if it was ripe and not going to disrupt the process, it would be a perfect time to try --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: It would be perfect for everybody to talk to each other.

MR. GONZALEZ: And, commissioner, we've actually even had some contact with your office, so we're ready to have the conversations, you know, with somebody from your office to kind of share with them where we had are in terms of this process.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Duane.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: At one time when we began with Best Start, there was a countywide launch where Nancy and I actually represented the commission. This was some years ago. And perhaps we need to think about a relaunch a Best Start in which we invite the countywide stakeholders. We had folks who got up 4:00 o'clock in the
morning from Antelope Valley and came down to -- I'm old, I forgot.

COMMISSIONER AU: ITT Tech.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah. ITT Tech. So we may think about some time in the future having a relaunch of Best Start because it's much different than it was four years ago when we did the initial launch.

MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah, we -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER AU: I'm sorry. I also think that it may be time where we're -- it's clear that the organizing of the residents is -- there's a clear pathway and the linkage to the partnership. The part that is still fuzzy, and as it's been brought up by Marv as well as now with Duane, is the -- the organizing of the resources. So then perhaps a rethink about the role of Best Start program officers in that it's not just a focus on residents. We have a clear pathway. We have a strategic partner in doing that work. But also talking about, how do we go about convening the partnership among the resources, the Department of Mental Health, the department of Public Health --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Call a meeting.

COMMISSIONER AU: But it needs to be done.

MR. GONZALEZ: Then --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: That's my point. Call a
meeting. They're talking about it so they can do it now, right?

Marv, Jonathan, put a meeting together. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AU: And it needs to be regionalize -- not regionalized. It needs to be community focused because residents will need to be able to eyeball the representatives to say, these are the folks that we need to have available to support us so -- in a way that it is going to be meaningful for us. So I think there's -- there's a coming together here that needs to happen.

MR. GONZALEZ: And as we enter this active phase of Best Start communities, it's beginning to make a lot more sense that, you know what, we're getting close to identifying that and the conversation -- the suggestion that's coming from the commission makes a lot of sense to us, and we definitely want to do that.

COMMISSIONER AU: And it will also address the real frustration that was articulated, especially the representative from Panorama City I believe, when she talked about multiple projects that First 5 LA invested in is coming to sunset, that we don't have the alignment in place where the community folks were going to articulate, these are the priorities for us. We need to have the resources available to fill in so that we're not talking
about sunsetting and programs disappearing --

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Easy now. Easy.

COMMISSIONER AU: I know.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Don't be an encourager. We have some tough decision as head. We all the want the resources, but -- I'm just warning.

COMMISSIONER AU: But there are other sources.

MS. BELSHE: I think that's -- that's the point. The first question under the model that the board has approved that we're moving forward with, the first question is not, so what is First 5 going to invest and fixing a problem; it's what is the community identifying as a focus informed by data, informed by community wisdom and priorities, and then bringing greater specificity to, given the core results we seek on behalf of families with young children, what other resources are at the table to help implement some very specific action strategies and where there are gaps. Then we talk about, well, how can First 5 LA add value consistent with the principles that Rafael spoke to earlier.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes. This is where the alignment is.

MR. GONZALEZ: This is the exciting part and I'm really looking forward to having these conversations.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: No, but I'm just saying, the
value that will be added by us will be, they still want
our money, you know. I mean, I'm just -- you know, you're
not going to go away. We are the bridge.

   Anything else?
   You didn't have to raise your hand, but you did.
   COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Yeah. I could just start
talking. I'm really excited about the way you've laid out
a progression learning by doing. You start out in one
phase and there's another phase, another phase.

   I make the assumption that, with all the things
we're doing in the community, and pick a number of
whatever they are, but there are similar milestones. So
the milestone that says, we've decide the groups come
together, pick what it's going to do. It would seem to me
very, very helpful internally for communities and
externally for us if we had a sense of what were those --
visual.

   Imagine that you've got a list of five, ten, 15
whatever it is dimensions along which a community changes.
Learning by doing would be one dimension. The depth of
partnerships could be one. How well it's being governed.
How is leadership being enhanced. A series of things that
we've been working on. And imagine that you've got five
or six or seven points along that scale. It starts out,
no work is being done on this, it's fully mature and it's
really burning beautifully. If periodically, the community could self-assess how it was doing on each of those ten different spokes and staff could assess it, see if there's differences, come to consensus, we then could look at it and say, look at these different communities.

And I'm using visual because there's a spider web map that does this where you have the lines coming out and you always have some strands that are fives and some that are ones. But I wonder, does that make sense in terms of --

MR. GONZALEZ: It makes a lot of sense, and we're actually looking at that. You know, we -- in the upcoming months, we're going to actually organize and convening some across community partnerships convening so that we can discuss where are sort of those --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Before that I can think the question becomes, can you define the dimensions along which a community is doing something. So governance is a dimension. You can start out with governance meaning, no governance structure whatsoever. First meeting people are talking about it. Final meeting you've got a well structured governance, got a good succession plan, you been able to -- you know, do you -- if you have those continuum, any community can know how it is doing compared to what it was. And if today I'm a two, next year I'm a
three, we've made progress; and if I went back to a one, something happened.

MR. GONZALEZ: And as part of the learning-by-doing process, we're able to measure that, right. That's the purpose of having our learning team there, is that there -- the capacity building, the resident outreach coordinator, the developmental evaluator. We're actually learning a lot from that person alone. Given that the information that they're able to share out is real time information that's shared also with our staff that we're actually sharing with the community partnerships so that we can do some of those adjustments as we go along.

But I think some of the points that you're raising there would love to share, you know, what that's looking like out in the community and can definitely bring it back.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: Okay. Dare I ask anyone else? Just kidding. Just kidding.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: By the way, Rafael, you're in 7th place on the briefest report.

MR. GONZALEZ: I'm in trouble.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We only had six report.

COMMISSIONER KNABE: That's right. I'm just
saying okay?

Mr. Lau. Mr. Lau, give him some love. We actually voted on Lau's.

Anyway. Okay. Do have I any public comment? No public comment.

Okay. All right. With that, meeting adjourned.

Thank you.

(The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.)
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