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Commissioner Dennis: We want to call this meeting to order and thank you all for being here at the noon hour. For those of you who do not have lunch, we have some, and so feel free to get some. Before we start, let’s do the short introductions.

Duane Dennis, chair of programming and planning for First 5.

Nancy Au, commissioner.

Patricia Curry, commissioner.

Art Delgado, commissioner.

Kelly Goods, research and evaluation, First 5 LA.

Tara Ficek, program officer for First 5 LA.

Armando Jimenez, research and evaluation, First 5.

Parker Blackman, executive director of the LA Partnership for Early Childhood Investment.

Jennifer Pippard, director of community development.

Teresa Nuno, acting chief of programming and planning.

John Wagner, chief operating officer.

Sandra Figueroa-Villa, commissioner.

Deanne Tilton, commissioner.

First 5 LA commission.

Kim Belshe, First 5 LA.

Suzanne Bostwick, Department of Public Health.

Jennifer Cowin, First 5 LA.

Kim Belahe, First 5 LA.

Vista Del Mar.

San Fernando.

Shiner.

Best Start City and Neighbors.

Larry Renick, First 5 LA Public Affairs.

Brian Shell, research and evaluation.

Sandra Figueroa-Villa, commissioner.

Deanne Tilton, commissioner.

Karla Howe, First 5 LA commission.

Kim Belshe, First 5 LA.

Suzanne Bostwick, Department of Public Health.

Jennifer Cowin, First 5 LA.

Kim Belahe, First 5 LA.

Vista Del Mar.

San Fernando.

Shiner.

Best Start City and Neighbors.

Larry Renick, First 5 LA Public Affairs.

Brian Shell, research and evaluation.

Thank you.

The next point of order is meeting notes. Could have I commissioners review the notes from the last meeting? Understanding that you’ve already read through them; so this is just a refresher.

Deanne.

Deanne, you’re on.

Parker Blackman, the executive director of the LA Partnership For Early Childhood Investment.

Ms. Belshe: You were not, that’s right. We’ll make that adjustment. Sorry, Deanne. Thank you for that coach. We know you were with us in spirit.

Any other edits, corrections, or deletions?

Hearing none, we will submit and file.

The next item is Item 3, Community Investments Partnerships.

Jennifer, you’re on.

Parker Blackman, who is the executive director for the LA Partnership For Early Childhood Investment. First 5 LA has been involved with the partnership since its inception. It started as a learning collaborative, which was a safe place for public and private funders to come together to look at how to learn together. And we have come a long ways since those learning days. But in 2011, Community Investments formalized our relationship with the partnership. And Parker will talk more about what that looks like today, but he’ll be doing an overview of the partnership, one of our most exciting projects, the LA Baby’s Fund, and opportunities for the future.

So with that, let me pass it over to you.

Mr. Blackman: Thank you. And if you -- would you all prefer that I stay here or do you want me to go up to the podium?

Ms. Belshe: Whatever you’re comfortable with.

Mr. Blackman: I’m very comfortable right here or up there.

Commissioner Dennis: That’s fine.

Mr. Blackman: Thank you, Jennifer, and commissioners. Thanks for having me out. I’ll speak for ten minutes or so. I’ll keep it brief, and then any evaluations.
questions you have.

 Again, I'm Parker Blackman. You can call me Peter if you like. I get called that all the time. Must be the Peter Parker thing. It's my dad's name, so it doesn't bother me at all.

 It is a real pleasure for me to be here. The LA Partnership For Early Childhood Investment is something I've been involved with as executive director just here in the near term for the last seven or eight months, but I really have been involved off and on since the inception about a decade ago as well. So it's a real pleasure for me to be here and to talk a little bit about it.

 I don't know if the clicker is on it's way. So I'm just going to -- perfect.

 I don't know if the clicker is on it's way. So I can -- I think I can move forward without this first slide and just say that the mission of the partnership -- thank you so much. There we go.

 The partnership really originally came together, as Jennifer said, was a space for private funders in Los Angeles to come together with public agencies to learn about early childhood health, development, education, and the impact that investing at the beginning of life in those earliest years could have since many of the funders who were at the table don't have program areas in which they prioritize early childhood. So thinking about how they could invest in the beginning that could have positive outcomes on the things that they do prioritize in funding, whether it's the arts, juvenile justice, foster care, et cetera, later in life. So really the mission originally was about coming together to learn about the importance of investing in the beginning.

 So the members of the partnership currently -- there are more than 30 members, and includes family and private foundations here in Los Angeles, the county agencies, CEO's office, the Department of Public Health, DCFS, Mental Health. So it really is a unique space for funders to come together to learn and also to learn and hear from the public agencies who are delivering services to children and families here in LA county about the approaches, what's working in the system, where the challenges are, and then be thinking about how could additional private investment in the systems make a difference for better, more efficient, more effective delivery of services to the most vulnerable children and their families here in LA county.

 We're also really pleased to have the chamber at the table as well to be thinking about it from the business community, how can the business sector play a role in this as well.

 So how do we do that? As I said, the partnership or really aims to foster effective and lasting relationships, not only among the funders but between the funders and the private sector to create a learning environment, a safe space as Jennifer said, for folks to really ask questions and learn more about early childhood.

 But over time, what's really developed is a greater focus by the partnership on, how do we coordinate additional private sector funding to have a greater impact on children and families in LA county. So coordinating funding and policy opportunities for partnership participants as well as, how could we measurably increase private sector dollars and investments in early childhood to advance policy, particularly prenatal to five here in LA county.

 So what grew out of those conversations is the First 5 LA, a matching fund of a million dollars that helped to create the Baby Futures Fund. And that one-to-one match really capitalized -- the contract with First 5 LA capitalized the Baby Futures Fund, and we have over four years -- that's the life of the contract -- as a jump start to really get other funders to not only match that million dollars, but to see it as the opportunity for members of the partnership and potentially, hopefully, other funders to put money into this pool fund as a place to accomplish a variety of things, which I want to talk about here in a moment.

 But if you look at this -- so, it was capitalized and today, less than four years later, we are just $7,000 shy of meeting that match. So we have until June of 2015 to meet the match. And I'm very pleased to say that the enthusiastic response from the partnership is such that we're going to meet that match. I feel pretty comfortable we're going to get the next $7,000 between now and not only June of 2015 but between now and --

 MS. BELSHE: John will write you a check.

 MR. BLACKMAN: Kim, I think that was really nice of you to volunteer John to write that check. He seemed to be clamoring for that opportunity.

 Thank you, John.

 You have that on the record? Thank you. That's perfect.
Now, we're really pleased. The members of the partnership are excited about the fact that we're not only going to meet that -- that match early, but folks are asking the question, where do we go from here, what is beyond the match. So it really has served the purpose of catalyzing the members of partnership to make those contributions and to ask the questions, where do we go from here. So it's really been terrific.

The goals of the fund really then are to look at not only ways to increase philanthropic funding and support in early childhood in general, but specifically where could the dollars that we're raising be leveraged for better systemic solutions for -- on policy and for children in families zero to five here in LA county.

How can we leverage and strengthen public/private partnerships here in the county? Are there innovative approaches that maybe are not systemic in the education or in the health systems that could be elevated as best practices and then shared with the systems to become stronger set of solutions and become best practices countywide? And then how do we take what we learn from our investments and share that, not just with our partnership, but with the nonprofit sector, with the public sector, with other funders, with the business community throughout the county.

Just a quick snapshot of our funders who have contributed to the Baby Futures Fund. This is a handful of the endowment. The Annenberg Foundation, the Alice Family Foundation and others really not the only ones, but just to give you a snapshot of folks who have contributed. As I mentioned, we are on track to meet this a full year ahead of schedule.

And just a quick overview on a few of the projects that we've funded to date. So working with the Pew Center on the states, we are funding a LA Home Visiting campaign where we're really working to support what has now become the LA Home Visiting Consortium, a group of not only folks from the county but also service providers who are providing home visiting services to different communities around the county to look at how can we create a data system where we are inputting all of our data that helps us understand countywide the kind of services we're providing, how we're doing countywide, and then lessons learned that could then be spit back out to the entire sector across the county to provide lessons learned, create best practices for folks to follow, as well as then a policy -- set of policies countywide for how we deliver home visiting. So working with First 5 LA, working the Pew Center, working with Children Now, create that -- created that consortium, and that consortium over the last year is -- we're moving that forward with some real leadership from Suzanne Bostwick and the county Department of Public Health, are well on our way to developing that data system and then really, I think, next year looking more at what would that policy looked like.

We're also supporting some work here in LA county, specifically around the Local Controlled Funding Formula and the opportunity that that legislation presents to include early learning programs in the school districts, and so supporting the Advancement Project and Children Now to advocate that LAUSD and other districts in LA county do include early learning programs in the plans that they put together this year for the first time under this new legislation and, with Children Now, also providing technical assistance to all of those local organizations that are advocating that early childhood be included in those plans that are presented to the State later this year in June.

And then finally, some communications work that we've been doing supporting Deepa Fernandez, who many of you may know and have talked to or heard her story. She had one this morning on KPCC, specifically to focus on early childhood learning, development, and health. That's been really successful from our perspective. She's done over a hundred stories in the last 18 months on early childhood. She is one of the most widely followed reporters on social media in terms of the number of comments on her stories, the number of shares on Facebook and on Twitter, and she's won an award for her work. Last year she won an award on her series on bilingual education and early childhood. So that's been a real -- that's just a snapshot, but that's been really successful.

So one of the things that that has led us to think about, more specifically the last piece of communications with KPCC, is to say, well, that's been really successful, but it's also been very discrete, just funding one reporter to do work at one outlet. And that led us to step back and think, how could we create a more robust, integrated communications operation that we could support that really creates a ripple effect because Deepa's work is terrific, but it's only one outlet. And if you didn't happen to be driving somewhere to hear her on the radio this morning, you might miss it and might not have known that she had that story.

So we have been looking at how do we build on that and elevate it. So what we have been looking closely with, the folks here at Community Investment, and some of our other members of the partnership on is creating an integrated communications operation to really elevate and move the needle -- to use communications to elevate issues...
and move the needle on issues zero to five here in LA county.

I'll just move quickly here so that I don't abuse my time.

So the real rational for this is that, if we had an independent communications operation, it could be something that really serves as a rising tide to lift all boats. So it's about coordinating with all of the experts, whether it's academics, public agencies, nonprofit agencies, policymakers on early childhood here in LA county to be that rising tide that lifts all boats. And if it's an independent operation, it allows you to provide communications expertise, focus, an efficient and effective operation that could jump on opportunities that come up, but also provide a drum beat over time to really take important issues and move them in front of policymakers, in front of the business community, in front of the general public, in front of particular groups of parents that are identified by the sectors as really important to communicate with for changing policy as well as helping the general public and parents understand why certain policies or behavior changes could really benefit their children zero five.

So those are the audiences I mention that we -- that this operation would be focusing on. We really think about it as two different strategies. First this first strategy here would be that it's about networking. So as I was just mentioning, if we're effectively networking with movement leaders, this operation could find and share new research, best practices, policy developments with those key audiences, and it could help to bring speakers together at the right time to inform policymakers at critical junctures, to help parents understand the benefits, for example, of reading to their kids even before those children really understand the words, and then we can align movement. So there are other communications operations that are happening right now around the country.

Folks may be familiar with the Too Small to Fail Campaign that has been launched nationally around the country by Center for the Next Generation and that Secretary Hillary Clinton is a big proponent of that, spokesperson for it. In the Bay area, The Bay Area Council has launched a campaign called Talk Read Sing to really focus on getting parents to engage with their children right from the very beginning. That's right in line with what First 5 California is doing around Talk Read Sing. So we would be looking at how can we align whatever communications we do here in LA county with things that may be happening in the state as well as around the country.

The other piece of it then is to use the news media and social media to create that kind of ripple effect and buzz so that it creates the drum beat in people here, messages over and over and over again, which we know from experience really helps to lay the ground work for policy change as well as behavior change.

So the second key strategy would be, by looking for discrete particular opportunities with different campaigns, organizations, initiatives to provide additional communications expertise and horsepower where that could really help to move the needle on that campaign's overall goal. So just as one example, the Annie Casey's Campaign for Grade Level Reading is about to launch here in Los Angeles; Families in School, the LA Chamber, First 5 LA, and many other organizations in the community are coming together to launch that. There are so many great assets coming to the table for that campaign. But when I dug in and talked to them about it, one of the things that is missing a little bit is communications, both capacity and expertise.

So this operation could, basically, function as an arm in coordination with that campaign to provide that additional capacity and expertise on communications.

Final quick thoughts. I just want to re-emphasis that this really would be a rising tide that lifts all boats. It's not trying to take the place of what folks are doing, but really to enhance and coordinate the efforts that folks here in LA county are doing on communications in early childhood.

We are in the midst of developing a three-year plan and building a budget. We basically have what we believe through the Baby Futures Fund, the funding to launch this at scale for the first year, this year, and then half the resources we need for years two and three, and are confident that through our membership and others, we could raise the additional dollars to do it at full capacity for years two and three.

How would we measure success on this? I think we're really, just for example, would want to do some understanding of where different audiences are at the beginning, at the outset of this campaign on specific early childhood issues, and then do some ongoing public opinion research to see where and how we're moving the needle, and also engage with the sector on how effective is an operation like this in terms of the capacity and technical expertise it provides, and continue to have that as an ongoing conversation with the sector to see, are we moving the needle from their perspective as well.

So I want to just end by saying, thanks to First
Multiple levels. And it seems like the partnership’s
focus right now is wanting to make sort of broad
countywide macroinfluence versus something that I would --
I would actually call more of the localized neighborhood
community approach.

And so it brings up -- some of my concerns is
that one of the key target population you have here are
the parents. And you know that, given LA county, the
vastness of LA county, the diversity of LA county,
socioeconomically as well as culturally and ethnically as
well as the generational issue, whether they're first
immigrants to this -- to this country, to this
neighborhood, to the community versus those that have been
here over time that it -- it will be a challenge to make
the kinds of impact you're talking about, to draw their
attention to say, gee, you know, we really need to focus
in on supporting our children as early as we can so that
they will optimize their potential.

So have you -- I'm not sure if the partnership
has had a long-term vision of moving in that direction or
in what way are you going to address that?

Mr. Blackman: First of all, excellent question.
The answer is absolutely.

So when I was just sort of briefly touching on
the different strategies that we think can be most
effective for us to meet our mission, that point about
innovative approaches, ones that are not necessarily
easiest to -- where you wouldn't start at the systemic
level because systems have a lot going on and it's hard to
sort of move on a dime and to try new things. That's
something that we are acutely aware of and think that the
partnership can actually be a place to try things in
specific communities that could engage parents or an
entire community, and then figure out are, there lessons
that have been learned there that could be shared more
broadly to help other communities around LA county so
that, hopefully, it has a dual function of helping the
parents and families in that particular community, full
stop, but then also, are there ways to then share those
learnings that could then have a ripple affect; and then,
third, are there ways to then share those with public
systems in ways where they could adopt some of the
learnings that could have a broader, more sustained
systemic set of benefits to the broader LA community.

We haven't made an investment yet that -- that
meets the need that you articulated, but that is
definitely something that we are looking for and exploring
currently.

Ms. Belshe: If I may, I would also note that I
think, if this integrated communications operation were to
be more fully developed and go forward, which I hope it
does, it could serve as a very important mechanism for our
public parent-specific education in context of Best Start.
So that would be a really good example of us not wanting
to just operate in a silo in the context of our Building
Stronger Families Framework and parent messaging and
engagement, but bringing that into a broader set of
partnerships that is envisioned as a part of this --

MR. BLACKMAN: That's a great example. Another
very quick one is the Campaign for Grade Level Reading.
Families and schools have said, one of the strategies that
they want to employ is to go deeply into five communities
around several important issues, engaging parents and
families in reading to their children. So that's a place
where we would then think about how do we from the
communications standpoint work with families and schools
to make sure that we are helping them to provide the most
culturally appropriate and sensitive communication
materials that are going to meet those families and
communities where they're at and help to move the needle
on the early learning that we all know is so important.
And then those lessons, whatever we learn in those five
communities, could be shared with Best Start communities,
it could be shared with the rest of the early childhood
community around LA county.

Does that answer your question?
COMMISSIONER AU: In some ways. At least it
responds to the conversation that's occurring within your
thinking and your -- your group's thinking that it -- even
though the goal is to impact on the broad scale, that it
really means to having to focus in on a community-level
approach.

So that's -- and I think that First 5 LA could
truly look at sharing what we've been learning through our
Best Start place-based approach and sort of begin to, not
only within your organization's experience, really build
upon the experiences that First 5 LA is having as well.

MR. BLACKMAN: So just two quick points on that.
Hundred percent agree. And I had the benefit of actually
working with the First 5 team for a couple of years on
Best Start in my previous incarnation, so I'm really
familiar with it.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.
MR. BLACKMAN: And secondly, just to
re-emphasize. Not only Kim but Theresa and Jennifer and
Jennifer Cowen, the community investments team, we work
really closely together. We have a monthly call
scheduled. We talk in between those calls just about the
approach, the strategies as you all are looking forward
your strategic plan, and then how can we look for those
opportunities to learn from and coordinate on things like
Best Start. And then just the broader vision of where
First 5 LA is going over the next few years, how can we be
a good partner with you all.

I'm hopeful that -- and my experience so far is
that those kinds of relationships that we have is going to
allow us to look for the opportunities that you're
descriving.

COMMISSIONER AU: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Deanne.
COMMISSIONER TILON: Communication, television,
First 5 California has been running back to back amazing
public service announcements on early learning and bonding
with your baby.

How accessible are those? Do they share those?
Can we utilize those in any way or -- how can we
incorporate those into our --

MR. BLACKMAN: I think it's a very good question
and I think it's something that we're just beginning those
conversations with First 5 California. That's something
that we want to do in concert with the public affairs
office here at First 5 LA since there's obviously a very
direct line and we could participate in that on a dotted
line kind of way just in terms of coordinating and
understanding what could we be doing with our
communications operation that would build on and amplify
what First 5 California is already doing with their
broadcast and other marketing that they may be doing over
the course of the next period of time.

So yes.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions?
I have a couple. When you go to the projects
funded to date and you talk about like the LCFF, what are
the measures to determine whether or not that's a
successful piece? Is it -- is it a number of schools who
will now include in their funding strategy ECE? I mean --
and the same thing with KPCC and Deepa and the Home
Visitation, what are the -- what are the success metrics
which can come back to this commission and say, hey, this
is well worth our while as far as investment?

MR. BLACKMAN: Sure. Specifically on LCFF, we
were very targeted on this one, working with Advancement
Project and Children Now to see if we could collectively
-- and with First 5 -- get LAUSD in particular to include
in their LCAP, their plan that they submit to the State
for this first time early childhood learning programs,
funding specifically for early childhood learning.

So that's something that we knew as a partnership
was in some ways kind of a heavy lift because early
childhood is not necessarily embedded into the LAUSD
K-through-12 system as an ongoing part of the structure. It's not core to it. But we wanted to make sure that we swung for the fences on this one. And our hope is that the work that the agencies are doing collectively is going to end up with early childhood education as part of that plan and funding dedicated to early learning programs. So that's the first one.

The second one on home visiting, it really gets back to what I described as the goal here. And success for us is that the consortium develops a data system that all of the service providers in the county are putting their information into so there's a coordinated data system in the county on home visiting and, secondly, that there is ultimately a very clear policy around what the best practices are on home visiting here for LA county. So that's the second one.

And then on KPCC, I think it was a little more nebulous. It was more about volume, like who we, by investing in KPCC basically raise the profile of early childhood education development and health issues for the general public here in LA, measuring that by the number of stories Deepa is doing, the listenerhip, the kind of feedback that they get there.

To me, it's more outpush than outcomes, frankly, on that one to this point, but we feel like we've learned a lot from it in the sense that it has helped us realize that the opportunity and the need for this more integrated communications operation is there. So I think that, in some ways, has been one of the best things that we've learned from the partnerships' perspective what we've learned from that investment in KPCC.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And I think this from a staff perspective, it would be helpful, Jennifer and (inaudible) that we have periodical reports on those success criteria and what are we doing with regards to our investment.

And then lastly, you -- in the projects funded, you have Pew, KPCC, and the Local Control Funding formula as being grantees. And for the communities' information, how do people become grantees? Is it a selection process through the Baby Future? Is there a competitive bidding process? I'm just not sure. I know how we do it, but I'm not sure how you do it.

MR. BLACKMAN: That's a very good question. So for anybody who's wondering, investinkidsla.org is the website for -- for the partnership, investinkidsla.org.

And so we have developed a set of criteria for the kinds of projects that we evaluate. We haven't to date been all that aggressive in sort of publicly broadcasting we're open for business kind of thing for grants, but that's in part really just because we've been -- it's fairly new, the partnership making these kinds of grants. I mean, the three that we've made here is a good indication of how new it is.

So we are now in a better position even than we were a year ago to be able to handle incoming requests. And so we are getting ready over the summer to do more of an updated overhaul to the website to be able to push out our information more publicly, to invite folks in, and then just as staff, myself and the other two folks who work for the partnership, have been aggressive in the last six months in particular to really begin to reach out to partners in the community to introduce ourselves, understand what folks are working on, so that we can build those relationships, have the networks, and have people begin to come to us to propose ideas which we are open to, and that's starting to happen.

MS. PIPPARD: I just want to add two quick things to that: One is, under Parker's leadership one of the sort of more aggressive elements this year was the adoption of the protective factors, which very much aligns with what we are doing here at First 5 LA. The other pieces, there's an evaluator for the Baby Fund that will be coming on that will give us some more robust information that we can use.

My third point actually goes to -- sorry to dump this, but is what Nancy was saying. So the partner for us includes business leaders, philanthropic leaders, trustees. And we consider each one of them, their foundation as a tentacle to their grantees. So in terms of communications, all of their grantees are included in us delivering a joint message. And then the reason I'm saying family foundation leaders and trustees is because they are influential people and we have talked a lot about how they can help us and support us moving our policy agenda forward.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I mean, in response to the grant making process, it may be helpful that as you, you know, draw this out, that it will be linked to the First 5 website as well so somebody going to First 5 can also get connected to what's happening, you know, with the partnership. And I think that would be extremely helpful as far as the community is concerned.

MR. BLACKMAN: Ditto. Sounds great.

MS. BELSHE: Final word, Teresa. She said it.

She said it.

MS. NUNO: Jennifer did an excellent job, but one thing that I think common interest and that Parker touched on is the other measure potentially, is that there is quite an extensive mobilization of parents in all of this
in the work of the advancement project and around the local control funding formula. So that's another measure, and that's really key to a lot of hard work here. COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you very much, sir. I enjoyed your time and effort. We'll see you in the future. Okay.

MS. BELSHE: We have James, who's going to do a quick update on Phase 2 of the development of the First 5 LA legislative agenda.

MR. LAU: Just a quick very quick update.

MS. BELSHE: And I think we have a couple of slides that someone is helping.

MR. LAU: So while she's doing that -- so as you recall last month at the last commission meeting, we presented for your approval the legislative review criteria that we used that the legislation goes through to how we select the legislation as it's going to appear on our legislative agenda. And then you all also approved the legislative agenda one. So in this one, as Kim mentioned, I'll just be presenting a quick update on the bills that made it onto the legislative agenda too. So that's the goals.

This is just to highlight the process that we went through, a timeline. As I mentioned last meeting, there are over 700 bills that we looked at. So we used that criteria that you all approved to winnow it down to an agenda. And because many of the bills that were introduced are still spot language, many of those bills are still on our watch list.

So what we have today are four bills that we're presenting to you for -- that's going to be included on the legislative agenda. So we have AB-1805 by Skinner, which intends to bolster provider participation in Medi-Cal as the State implements the rollout of health care reform. We have AB-1902, which eliminates the family fees for California state preschool, SB-1000, which requires labeling on sugar sweetened beverages and other places where beverages are sold, and then one addition that -- because the presentation for those that are looking on the paper, one addition that got included in this because the paper one got developed two weeks ago is also SB-1002, which strengthens the alignment of Medi-Cal and CalFresh reporting periods to strengthen benefit delivery and insure access to federally-funded nutrition health if it's for low-income families in California.

So those are the four bills that are going to be included as part of a legislative agenda that will be brought to the commission next month for approval. And then we also have, as I mentioned, about 36, 37 bills that are on our watch list. So the bills that are on the watch list, they're still in spot language form or there's still some questions about it so they didn't necessarily align to a hundred percent -- or align to our -- our legislative criteria.

So we're continuing to monitor it, to work with the author's office. And any changes that are made to that could potentially be included onto the legislative agenda. So those that are placed on the legislative agenda, I'll be bringing that back to providing regular updates to you all so that you know which bills are included on the legislative agenda.

So in terms of next steps, the -- as I said, presenting the -- those bills to the commission for approval and then providing continued updates on any changes to the legislative agenda and our policy work.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any questions of James from the commissioners?

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: James, on AB-1902, is that a hard -- I'm familiar with that. Is that -- does that include funding -- a funding source to offset the costs that a local agency might incur because of the elimination of fees?

MR. LAU: I believe -- are you asking if that would -- if the fees appearance paid to a preschool provider, does that help to support their -- their funds, their general funds?

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: If the families currently are required to pay a fee, which I understand, and this eliminates that fee, how does the agency sustain their costs? Does the State come in and provide a funding sources for them?

MR. LAU: I don't -- just looking at general fund.

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: So the State is going to allocate a certain amount of money. Do we know if it's for a certain amount of time, for the next two years, five years, whatever? Do we know.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Our understanding is forever.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I can give you a little history here. This is kind of my bailiwick.

There was a time they never would have -- for state preschool. This happened over maybe the last couple of years. As a result, many low-income families were unable to put their children in state preschool due to these fees. And over the last, you know, year and a half or so, there has been a lot of lobbying against these fees because what we were finding, low-income parents had to take their children out of care as a result of the fees. So this has been a very big issue from an advocacy standpoint in the child care community realizing that this
was a prohibitive factor and families could not go into state preschool. That was never the intent.

So to your question, Art, this — this does have fiscal note associated to it, and it is something that I think the authorize realizes that there will be State general funds used to offset these fees and it would not be the responsibility of Layco or any other provider with regard to the child care.

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: My question stems more from the impact it might have on Prop 98. So if there's going to be some money taken for this, where is it going to come from, is it general fund. You know, you can't formulate into Prop 98 or reduction there to make room for this. That's where my question comes from.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And I don't know the answer to that question.

Yes, sir.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: In response to that question, commissioner, there would be implications for Prop 98. In the proposed budget for the Governor was 590—two million more than last year. So moving forward, something new happens (inaudible) see how this one plays out with budget.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions?

Thoughts?

Thank you, sir. You got off the hook easy this time. Okay.

Expiring grants, Item 5. We got a presentation from Tara.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yup.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Right on. Let's go. And with this item, we have six folks from the community who wish to speak. We will do that after the presentations, questions and answers, and then we'll have the folks from the community come up and talk to us.

MS. BELSHE: And Armando is also going to be part of this presentation, giving some observations and findings regarding impact.

MS. FICEK: All right. So before we move into reviewing each of the expiring investments, we wanted to first set the stage and establish some context for today's presentation.

As you will recall at the February 2014 commission meeting, the board approved a five-year, long-term financial projection that indicates First 5 LA must adjust its rate of future spending in the face of continued declining revenues. The long-term financial projections highlighted that, over the long term, our current rate of spending is unsustainable. This is primarily driven by the fact that First 5 LA spending has outpaced revenues since fiscal year 2008 and 2009 requiring us to depend on our existing fund balance to cover the difference. The long-term financial projections solidified that it is now time to begin making critical strategic decisions that will determine the future direction of First 5 LA.

Moving into March, we have initiated the strategic planning process which will continue over the next eight months. The 2015-2020 strategic plan will serve as a decision-making document that will create a clear path for First 5 LA's future focus. And, finally, at the most recent board meeting, just a few weeks ago, the board approved the governance guidelines to promote greater focus, consistency, transparency, and accountability in First 5 LA decision making.

The governance guidelines clearly express the belief that First 5 LA funding cannot be a permanent source for funding for our grantees and contractors. Today, we will focus on governance guideline number seven, which specifically states each First 5 LA contracting grant has an expiration date, multiyear services related investments will end pursuant to the time stated in their original allocation or their grant award. And First 5 LA staff will report to the commission on expiring grants each spring. The long-term financial projections, the strategic plan, and governance guidelines are three important milestones of 2014 that all support greater discipline and accountability for commission decision making and establish the expectation that contractors and grantees not rely on First 5 LA as a permanent source of funding.

In light of First 5 LA's declining revenue and the development of our new strategic plan, the following two areas now represent critical considerations and establishing annual program funding. Those are impact and sustainability.

For impact we looked at the ability of programs to demonstrate positive outcomes on both a participant and population level. We're defining population level impact as an observable change in a set of desired program outcomes within a specified geographic region. That could be a school catchment area, the county, a service planning area, or within an identified target group, such as teen moms, foster kids, child care providers.

Achieving population level impact is necessary now in order to meet the tremendous need and attempt to reduce the significant disparities that exist. No population level findings were demonstrated for any of the investments that we're going to be reviewing today. And as a result of that, the presentation is going to focus on...
participant level outcomes.

For sustainability, we looked at the ability of these programs to identify and secure opportunities for sustainability beyond First 5 LA funds. Of the investments presented today, Partnerships For Families is the one that has a clear, viable sustainability plan in place. For the remaining expiring grants, sustainable options do vary. Staff has found common themes across some of these programs such as enhanced organizational capacity, some that have secured alternative funding sources and leveraging opportunities, others shifts in policy in the federal landscape that have now and may continue to benefit the programs in the future. But all of these will be explored in greater detail throughout the presentation.

So it's important to note that while these expiring grants that are going to be reviewed today were not designed or required to demonstrate population level outcomes or to be sustainable, such considerations are now critical to inform First 5 LA's investments moving forward.

So presentation goals. Today's presentation is going to serve as the annual board update on expiring grants as noted and required in the governance guidelines. Staff is going to be reviewing multiyear service-related investments that are expiring in 13/14. And as noted in the board memo, we're not going to be presenting on grants that are ending that were limited term, one-time investments that were in the capacity building policy change or capital improvement. We're also not going to be reporting on contracts that are funded on an annual zero-based budget platform, which are considered part of First 5 LA's annual budget process.

So for each of these expiring programmatic investments, staff is going to provide a program description, which it's going to include its purpose. We're going to walk you through First 5 LA's funding history with the investment, noting whether or not they have received multiple commission extensions, and then we're going to go through some program stats, such as annual number served. In addition, as noted previously, we'll pay attention to population level impact and sustainability.

Starting with Partnerships For Families, or PFF as it's often referred, this is a child abuse and neglect prevention program. It was designed to fill in gaps in the current child welfare system. PFF was developed as a five-year investment back in 2006 and it has been renewed annually since 2011. As you may recall, the board decided to extend PFF last year to allow DCFS more time to secure and confirm receipt of funding sources, specifically the Title 4 funds to support the program. Fiscal year 12/13 statistics are represented here identifying both children and families served.

I should have noted I'm going to be doing a light touch for each of these investments and going through them quickly to get to the rest of the presentation.

Early Head Start targets low-income toddler -- infants, toddlers, and pregnant woman providing child development and family support services. As for First 5 LA funding history, you may recall the three Early Head Start grantees funded as part of this investment were originally a part of First 5 school readiness program. That was an eight-year investment that began in 2003 and ended this last December in 2013. Also, last year the board authorized a one-year extension of these three Early Head Start programs for fiscal year 13/14 to allow them more time to identify non-First 5 LA funding that could be used to meet their Early Head Start federal match requirement. Program statistics are included here.

Family Friends and Neighbors, FFN, is a program focused on improving the skill set of licensed exempt child care providers while also strengthening their social connectedness. FFN was initially funded as a three-year investment that was to end in 2010; however, two two-year extensions were approved by the board in both 2010 and then again in 2012.

Program statistics for this last fiscal year demonstrate about 216 providers were served. And we wanted to note that, on average, each of those providers serves approximately two children.

Family Literacy focuses on both parent and child aiming to improve parenting skills while strengthening a family's economic situation. Funding history: Family Literacy was initially funded as a three-year investment. It was then expanded and funded for an additional five years through 2010, and since then has been extended on an annual basis.

As you may recall, last year the commission decided to continue funding 12 of the 19 Family Literacy grantees that were located in or serving a Best Start community. The commission decision also confirmed funding of these programs until Best Start community plans were contracted. Since that decision, however, the implementation plan for Best Start has changed due to the approval of the Building Stronger Families Framework and the concept that the community plans would become contracted has been eliminated. Program statistics for 12-13 are included here noting both children and parents served.
Oral Health and Nutrition’s primary focus was directed at increasing children’s access to oral health services, both preventative and treatment. OHN was a three-year, one-time investment due to end this year in 2014, and it has no history of extensions by the board. Program stats include children, parents, and providers since many of the OHN projects included a provider training component.

Safe Sleeping campaign supported the development of informational materials for public education campaign to promote safe sleeping practices. First 5 LA funding history for the Safe Sleeping public education campaign is similar to Oral Health and Nutrition that it was a one-time investment with no history of board extensions. Program statistics include parents that were engaged by focus groups and forums and providers that were served by outreach.

211 developmental screening and care coordination project provides a telephone-based screen to identify at-risk children throughout the county and then connect them to necessary services and interventions. First 5 LA funding history: As you may recall, this investment began in 2012 as a one-year match grant. 211 received funding at that time from Robert Woods Johnson Foundation to support this project, and First 5 LA funds were used at that point as a match. In 2013, last year, the commission directed staff to continue funding for an additional year covering the full cost of the program. Programs statistics are represented here for both the full 12-month period, which is the column that’s identified as 12/13, and then a six-month period, which is the column identified as 13/14.

So there's a lot going on on this slide, so just to help you focus, the important takeaways are really that, of the 10,000, which is the first row that’s highlighted yellow -- of the 10,767 children that were -- parents that were with a child that were offered a screening in 12/13, and of the 5,769 for 13/14, the following yellow highlighted sections below that represent the number and the percentage of children that were then connected to early intervention services but are pending a confirmation that the services were received, or the very last row which identifies the number of children in percentage that were connected and confirmed receiving an early intervention service.

So you can see if we just want to focus on 13/14, just to keep it a little bit easier to manage, of the 5,769 kids that parents were offered a screening, 373 of them were connected to an early intervention service but are pending confirmation from that service provider that it was received; or the 330 of the 5,769 received an early intervention service and it was confirmed that that service was received.

Now, we’re going to move on to Armando Jimenez, our director of research and evaluation who is going to walk you through the participant level findings for each of these investments.

MR. JIMENEZ: Good afternoon. I've been asked to make a cameo appearance here. So I'll do my best to make it short and succinct.

Before I begin, I just wanted to reiterate a couple of things that Tara mentioned. One, that these initiatives -- many of the initiatives were designed as demonstration projects, not to actually achieve population level impact. But the important thing is the consideration moving forward. As Tara mentioned, the long-term financial picture of the declining revenues and our need to focus more and our need to think around broad strategies, but also related to the impact that's needed.

And that's important because the needs are still large, the disparities are still large.

One example from 2002 to 2012, third grade reading proficiency improved ten percent, which is great, but it improved ten percent from 33 percent to 44. So that really means that there is still a significant number of children that are not reading at third grade levels.

For the poorest children, that number is even lower and the gains made were much lower. Now, again, that's not necessarily a role that the schools only can consume.

It's a much broader community prospective.

So the other example here is something that we're doing moving forward, and that is our Welcome Baby Initiative, which aspires to have population level impact and the potential is there considering the number of births that we will address and the number of families that we will engage through the 14 communities and the hospitals associated with them in addition to the impacts or effects that the work that the Best Start programs will be implementing, which covers about 20 percent of the children zero to five in LA county. So the potential to move the needle is there.

The other issue related to the Welcome Baby is the aggressive approach that First 5 is taking on the policy advocacy level and the work that James and his team are doing to highlight the efforts at the federal and state level to address and potentially think about sustainable revenue for home visiting.

Again, the other issue I would like to bring forward as we look at these evaluations -- not all of these evaluations were done the same way. The evaluations varied in intensity and in focus and length and duration.
We also found that the licensed informal care providers offered a viable forum to implement specialized programs. And we actually implemented a pilot program within FFN called, the Sesame Street Healthy Habits for life, which was actually found to be very effective and improving the care giver's nutritional efforts within the environment as well as their own physical activity.

Family Literacy. We found, as a result of -- and again, it's the combination of the four components as Family Literacy was constructed to deal with not only the early care instructional through preschool, but also adult education at parent/child giver (sic) interactions -- or parent/child interactions. And so this is kind of a combined effect. And we found that there was improvements -- significant improvements in child level language and literacy skills. We also found that there was improvements in the parents' literacy skills. This is the added dimension that Family Literacy brings. We found that there was improvements in parent engagement and involvement in their child's education or learning environment. Building a home-based or nonschool learning environment is critical to development and development outcomes.

One of the other things that we found is that, by looking long term longitudinally, we found that Family Literacy participants actually attended school at greater rates than comparable programs. So this is important. I mean, the schools are funded through average daily attendance. And so having an intervention that actually can make sure that children are attending at higher rates is critical.

The things that characteristic that I think I'd like to highlight is our effort to do a long-term assessment of the effects of Family Literacy. We actually linked program participation with test scores and found significant differences in school achievement from second to fifth grade compared to participants in other similar programs.

Very briefly the issues around Oral Health Nutrition and the Safe Seating Campaign, they're really around the process or performance measure elements. Those are actually much better highlighted in the one-page materials that you have, so I won't go into detail there.

And the 211 Developmental Screening, our collaborators are here. Folks in evaluation are going to bring a report that we hope to complete in May of 2014, which will tell us a little bit more about the story around 211 Developmental Screening.

The last thing I want to do is, I wanted to leave some take-aways that are important to consider about our future discussions. And one thing is that we found no...
The second issue is more of an issue around us at First 5 LA about how we can actually make our interventions and initiatives work better together. It's the concept of the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. But we found limited evidence that the program initiative interacted or coordinated with each other and any other First 5 LA effort. And I think this is an important lesson for us moving forward about how we better structure our initiatives to work together.

The other thing I wanted to mention is that those outcome interaction exists. So the degree to which programs participants did participate, the greater the outcome. So an issue for us is that diluting the intervention in the sense will also potentially dilute the outcome. So that's an important consideration.

The last thing is implementing programs to fidelity and a high-quality matters for program outcomes. And this is not just for those initiatives, but it's initiatives moving forward.

MS. FICEK: Thank you, Armando.

The next section of the presentation is going to focus on opportunities for sustainability for each of the seven investments starting with Partnerships For Families.

As part of its original design PFF was to be transitioning to DCFS. Staff is recommending First 5 LA provide six months of bridge funding to support the implementation of PFF sustainability plan. This funding could cover the time period of July to December 2014. DCFF would then cover the reminder of that fiscal year. Staff will be bringing this recommendation as an action item to the April commission meeting. And just a little bit of background on that transition and that sustainability plan, in June of 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 DCFF resources which have now been identified for this next year.

Early Head Start grantees continue to research various sources to meet their federal Early Head Start match requirement and, unfortunately, haven't been successful this past year in pulling in those additional dollars. Potential future opportunities for these agencies include restoration of State child care funds, which for these grantees that are also licensed child facilities, could be a potential funding source to help fulfill their match. And then in addition, SB-1123, which is also called the California Strong Start Program, has been introduced and could be another potential source to fulfill their match requirement.

Family Friends and Neighbors, a distinct initiative-wide sustainability plan does not exist for the FFN investment. However, some of the current grantees have highlighted an ability to continue specific activities of the work beyond First 5 LA funding. Some of those include maintaining the social connectedness opportunities that have been created for providers, continuing trainings, and some of the implementation of the ASQ early developmental screening tool, as well as play tangle and then promotion of community events and referrals will also be able to continue to take place past First 5 LA funding.

Family Literacy. Family Literacy as well does not have a sustainability plan for the investment as a whole and, therefore, opportunities to continue vary program to program as highlighted previously within the evaluation. Family Literacy participants have shown higher school attendance rates in subsequent years. Of the current 12 Family Literacy programs in operation, eight of them are run by school districts. The opportunity exists for these programs to advocate for youths of their schools districts ADA funding to then help support future Family Literacy program.

In addition, the local control funding formula provides districts with additional funding along with greater flexibility. Those resources could also be directed to support Family Literacy. And then lastly, some of the Family Literacy programs that ended last June that are referred to earlier have been able to continue part of their family literacy program, often a less intensive or comprehensive model of the program, but some components have been able to be continued.

Oral Health and Nutrition. Of the three Oral Health and Nutrition grantees we are referring to today, many of them will be able to continue components of their program as a result of securing alternative funding sources. In particular one of them has become a DentiCal provider and others have also identified private grant funding.

In addition, ACA’s coverage expansion allows for clinics to receive revenues from a larger number of
children that are now insured, of course, through DentiCal or through other health insurance through Cover California. And some of the programs have also integrated ONH services into their clinic or into their school policies and practices.

The Safe Sleeping campaign. Opportunities exist for ICAN or another entity to license the public education materials created for this investment and, therefore, continue to print and distribute extending the life of the campaign.

211 has been focusing their efforts on qualifying their phone-based screening services for existing federal, state, and county sources and are currently exploring future funding opportunities as a result of the Individuals With Disabilities Act, IDEA, and Medi-Cal reimbursement. 211 is also in conversation with the DCFS related to integrating developmental screening with homeless children and families through the Family Solution Center system and in the children’s court office.

Also, as a part of ACA, developmental screening is now a funded benefit conducted as part of the well child visit, which means more children will be screened and receive early identification, thereby complementing 211’s phone screening program.

To recap and conclude, staff does recommend the six months of bridge funding for PFF because they are the only expiring investment with a clear, viable sustainability plan. This bridge funding would support the implementation of their sustainability plan which includes transitioning the investment to DCFS. This recommendation, again, will be presented at the April board meeting as an action item.

And, finally, to reiterate the two areas of critical consideration now and moving forward in light of our declining revenue, the governance guidelines and the development of our new strategic plan, it is necessary to consider the ability of programs to demonstrate positive outcomes on both participant and a population level and that programs garner opportunities for sustainability beyond First 5 LA funds.

This concludes the presentation, and we can now open it up to questions.

MS. BELSHE: And who's that?

MS. FICER: That's Nathaniel who is the son of our contracts compliance manager, Jennifer Eckhart.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay, folks. Obviously there was a lot presented and I think the best way to deal with it, commissioners. Are there any clarifying questions that we want to -- that we had of staff? Is there anything that was unclear that folks want to deal with?

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: Just so I'm clear. The recommendation is a six-month bridge support of PFF and then the rest would be allowed to expire. Is that the theory?

MS. BELSHE: Consistent with the governance guidelines approved by the commission, yes.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other clarifying questions?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Is there a motion needed?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: No, we don't take action here during this committee meeting. What we do is make recommendations to the whole board. And so at the end of this, that's what we will do, make a recommendation on what has been proposed by staff.

MS. BELSHE: And to be clear, this is a report consistent with direction from the commission for the governance guidelines with one recommendation as it relates to the six-month investment to implement the Partnerships For Families sustainability plan.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Deanne.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I'm really glad we're sustaining partnerships with families an I'm glad DCFS is able to pick up on it after all these years. It's been a really important focus for us to prevent children from being abused in a way that doesn't mandate (inaudible) the system.

My one question is that, the Partnerships For Families was also focusing on high-risk pregnancies and what is the (inaudible)? Has that been a part --

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: That’s been a part of the proposals.

MS. FICER: That’s one of the target populations. It was both families, the parents that received a hotline call, but it was determined the risk wasn't significant to open up a case. Those were referred to be served and supported by PFF, and then high-risk pregnant women that were identified within the community. So both of those populations continued to be served by PFF and then, of course, continue to be served by the bridge funding as far as moving into -- once the initiative is DCFS -- once it’s transitioned to DCFS, it's my understanding it will continue to serve that population as well.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: The reason I ask is, we have the pregnant and parent teen task force. And I asked them what the impact of PFF had been. And it wasn’t as though it wasn’t. The issue is that they weren’t clear how.
So if that is a resource they should know about, I think we should share that information with that individual focusing on (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER AU: I think they're captured in your data in terms of impact data, but it wasn't spelled out specifically in terms of, this is the population, this is the percentage of folks that were not referred into the system. Am I correct?

MR. JIMENEZ: We can look deeply into the subgroup of high-risk pregnant moms and come back and bring some information specific --

COMMISSIONER AU: I think that would be helpful.

I think that's what Deanne is really asking for.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Also, I do want to comment on (inaudible) because what's not reflected here seems to be the higher number -- the higher number of individuals, families, and groups that have actually been part of the community forums, have received information, and certainly have been affected by a change of general thinking even in the population groups that culturally had supported co-sleeping, safe bed sharing, et cetera, and that -- that to me has been kind of a population change as well as I'm happy to report that after running 70 unsafe sleeping deaths for years, we were down to 55. That's 15 less babies dying from unsafe sleeping. And since January 23rd of this year, there has not been a single unsafe sleeping death in this county. And so, to me, that says that there's incredible positive impact and the need to continue this message to bring it out to the childcare facilities.

And I agree we, should license this fantastic information material. I just worry about the gap between now and when we are able to license. There's also a federal grant opportunity I know that is being pursued for a national infant safe sleeping program.

So I guess my question would be, who is going to be the interim -- are we able to support even the basic interim connection from -- to respond to the literally dozens and dozens of requests for presentations on infant safe sleeping to community groups, churches and --

MS. BELSHE: That's something we'll follow up with you on again in terms of what can be done in this interim period as we move forward on the licensing approach we talked with you about.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Say that again.

MS. BELSHE: I said, let's follow up with you when we have Francisco who's developing, along with Larry, the approach to licensing. I just don't have a good picture in terms of how long that's going to take and what types of efforts might exist in the interim.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: One clarifying piece on PFF, you all realized that from --

Commissioner Fielding, welcome.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Welcome. Congratulations.

MS. BELSHE: After your major announcement.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Congratulations. I mean, did you really want to come?

MS. BELSHE: He cares about the kids.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: This one of the most positive parts of my -- when you talk about kids, I'm there.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right. Glad to have you.

Anyway, with regards to PFF, I just want to have some, you know, clarifying overview. We have been providing support in the form of nonorganizations for the past so many years, and this recommendation does support what DCFs has decided as far as ongoing PFF agencies, which will be five as of January 1st.

MS. BELSHE: Pending appeals.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah. And so I just wanted to make note of that. We are not, in essence, planning nor going to in -- as far as commission standpoint move forward with the nine that we had supported over the past number of years. And I just wanted to make that very clear so that everybody's aware of that.

Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: So we're going with the five?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It's the five organizations that DCFs has approved through their PFF that went out some time ago. Now, there is --

MS. BELSHE: There is a pending protest so -- and we're working with Phillip and his team on this bridge plan. But given the time associated with the appeal effort, we don't want to presume what that outcome is going to be. Staff's recommendation is that we would provide bridge support for eight of the nine PFF grantees that are either the five that have been awarded or the four that have offered or have submitted appeals.

Now some of the PFF grantees that have submitted appeals have stopped enrolling new families. So we're going to need to talk to them about what makes the most business sense for them given the status of the appeal.

MS. FICEK: The recommendation will actually be to continue all nine for July through December.

MS. BELSHE: Oh. Okay. I thought it was eight of the nine.

MR. WAGNER: And then the five that were selected
through DCFS. Those would be the ones --

MS. BELSHE: That would transition --

MR. WAGNER: Exactly.

MS. BELSHE: -- and First 5 LA support would end

for the balance.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: So my question to staff a
couple of days ago: If, in fact, any of those that were
-- are -- when they appeal, does that change what we would
do from an organizational standpoint? And so are we of
the position that, regardless of what happens as a result
of appeal, we will still maintain our commitment as is?

MS. FICEK: Through the calendar year. First 5
LA's support of PFF comes to an end at the end of the
calendar year.

MS. FICEK: And the intention is really to
maintain those services in each of the nine PAS until DCFS
has completed their appeals process and (inaudible) fund
who they've identified as the PFF contractors that they're
funding in January.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And that's important
because now what we're doing -- now we're saying we're
going to support all nine until December 30th. And as of
January 1st, we will be out of the PFF business, you know,
for lack of a better term, and it will be taken over by
DCFS. I just want everybody to be clear. We will fund
all nine through December.

MS. BELSHE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I just want to make that
very clear.

Any other? Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: May I ask what the appeal time
frame is? When do you expect to have a final
determination?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Well, I think we have
anticipated that we will have final decisions by the fall
allowing enough time for contractors to come on board or
transition. December was the end of our expectation.

COMMISSIONER AU: I see.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: That was the target date.

COMMISSIONER AU: So sometime end of December,
early October?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: That's when we think
there will be a decision. This is all contingent on the
board approving this. These are recommendations made on
us, and we were -- and we may have to have an offline
classified on some of the funding. It's our
understanding that there was going to be a transition
period that would extent more than just the six months.
So we'll have to talk about that.

COMMISSIONER AU: Oh, okay. Okay. So it seems
like the story is -- has an addendum to it.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Maybe a little footnote.

MS. BELSHE: Well, and we will continue to have
those discussions with Phillip and his team on an approach
that makes sense to both First 5 LA and also a decision to
be made by our commission, our governing board as well as
for the county. I think we share a commitment to
implementation of a sustainability plan for these
important services. And given what DCFS has reported
relative to the timing of their appeals process, it was
our best consideration or best judgment informed by those
discussions that support through the calendar year would
make sense. We'll be coming back with a more refined
proposal for the April commission.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other comments? Trish.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: It's not a question but it's
more of a comment and perhaps a lead-in to our thoughts on
strategic planning that we're going to do, and that is
that -- while I think it's great that the Department of
Children and Family Services is going to pick this up
through 4A waiver, when you look at who the PFF program
and serving, it is not kids that are necessarily in the
system and have been abused and neglected; they are, from
my understanding, you know, families in the community and
young children in the community. And I think that, as we
start looking at how we're going to discontinue grants in
the future and fund grants in the future, that we have to
look at -- I think this is a really telling statement
right here in evaluation things that limited evidence that
these program initiatives interact with or are coordinated
with each other or any other First 5 LA effort. And I
would add to that, or county effort.

In other words, what I'm suggesting is, is that,
if we're not going to be able to continue funding grants,
then I think we need to find a way to work together as a
county, as First 5, as a community, as private foundations
and fund these as -- as a team effort instead of, oh,
good, we found DCFS is going to pick this one up, so We
don't have to do anything else.

How can -- if this is geared towards young
children and babies, how does Welcome Baby fit into this?
And does going down the road, you know, a few years, there
may be cuts in the 4-A funding or funding may not be
available at all. I think we always need to be looking at
not just, well, we found something new, but how are we
going to build and sustain things? How does Best Start
fit in to PFF? How do we work together and pull funding
together to accomplish things we need? And as our grants
continue to expire, you know, how are we going to sustain
them?
very, very grateful for what you're doing and look forward to how things restructure here.

So on behalf of myself and my family and the board of directors, I want to say thank you for your help.

I want to say thank you for the other stakeholders who are here for the great work you're doing in this community because together we're going to get some great things done.

So thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you.

Kathy -- Kathy Shriner.

You don't have to run, Kathy. Your two minutes don't start until you start talking. You don't have to run.

MS. KATHY SHRINER: I'm Kathy Shriner. I'm a member of the guidance body of Best Start Panorama City and Neighbors. I'm not speaking for the guidance body because this issue didn't come to our attention in time to really have a discussion about it. But I feel like it doesn't represent good faith with the Best Start communities that First 5 did not reach out to us to let -- to notify us about the programs that were expiring in our community, and we do know that they were extended. And particularly, I didn't talk to West Valley Caring Services. I'm just speaking about the benefits they provided our community in Family Literacy, and that's a very complex program. As Armando noted, it as level -- you know, influences at all levels. It supports all three family results in the Best Start framework, and it's one of the four of the 12 that is not with the school district. So I don't see how an LCFF solution could impact them for at least another year because we know those plans are even being put together until the summer.

And if we had been asked whether this was a necessary service in our community, we would have said absolutely. And I don't really know about other family literacy workout side of the school districts that's being done. And if you know the Panorama City and Neighbors areas, we have a high immigrant population, a Spanish-speaking. And so the literacy gives the parents not only better ability to support their children's education, but it helps them get jobs.

So in every kind of concrete support or -- and the program has social connections built within it and the parents get educated and the results show the long-term benefit of the program. So I really don't understand how Best Start communities can have some input into these kinds of decisions and to only find out now at the end of March, when the funding ends at the end of June, makes it very hard to address as well.

I know that Best Start cannot initiate any
I also wanted to just mention the 21L program because I attended all the meetings with Margaret (inaudible) consortium that put this together. And that filled a huge gap in terms of families just being able to call and ask questions about taking care of their kids. And I don't see that the sources of funding would really pick up the infrastructure that allows that -- those more general kinds of questions that are not specifically related to the developmental screening, but then the children who have been screened through that program, I don't think there was any other source. And certainly in terms of the Affordable Care Act, that's not going to impact undocumented families. So I believe there's still a need for that as well.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you, Kathy.

Alex and Joseph Martinez. Right in time, Alex.

MR. ALEX MARTINEZ: Hello, board members. My name is Joseph Martinez, and I'm here on behalf of LAUSD board president, Dr. Richard Vladovic. And if he were here today, he would say that he very much supports the program of Family Literacy. It's been great. You know, he has a school in his district, 15th Street Elementary. And we've seen tremendous gains in the students. And the teachers have also seen tremendous gains within the students. And not only are you affecting one child in a family, but sometimes you're affecting two and three children within a family.

And like I said, again, we've seen tremendous gains and we would like to encourage you to extend the program. And with that said, I just wanted to thank you for the funding that you have supported up until this point. And we do understand that you have decisions to make, but, again, we'd like to advocate for the program for the funding to be extended.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you.

Roberto Landerman and Yvette Pineta.

MS. ROBERTO LANDERMAN: Good afternoon. I'm Roberto Landerman, and I am with Long Beach Unified School District. We've been very fortunate over the past 20 years to be able to implement Family Literacy in our community. Since 1992, we've been able to sustain. And Lillian's here from our Central Long Beach Best Start. She was -- we worked together in the Cambodian community over many years ago with this model.

I'm here to speak to the opportunities for sustainability. We surely appreciate you thinking and helping us with that because it's been a challenge for us over the years, but we've been able to do it. The LCFF funding for Long Beach, it's already done. It's -- the schools have already submitted. The process is -- the planning process is over. They're submitting their funds.

So I don't see that as a viable option at least in my community for 14/15. I certainly would look forward to 15/16 school year. I could see where they would might look into an early learning program.

Right now the schools are putting back nursing from one day to two days to three days. Librarians, psychologists, school counselors, they're just trying to get back into their basic needs. So for them to come and fund an early learning program at this point I don't see it for that particular school year.

And I -- we just look forward to more continued support. Certainly, there's lots of great things going on out there for early education. It's a dream come true for me to see all the federal and the public announcements out there.

And I also wanted to let you know that we still are making -- this initiative, Family Literacy initiative, is making impact on a federal level still. Several of us were able to go to Washington to their annual conference, and we had a student speaker in from Long Beach who shared her story. We presented -- we have the teacher of the year and we presented and were asked to do Twitter chats. We're part of a national research publication that came out.

So thank you for starting this intergenerational...
approach that now stand and the Casey foundation is looking at. And we look forward to keeping a partnership. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you very much.

MS. YVETTE PINETA: Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Yvette Pineta. I'm the executive director of North Valley Caring Services. And I would just like to express my gratitude for financial support throughout the years. NVCS is a recipient of two initiatives, Family Literacy and FFN.

Because of your initial and continued investment in our agency and in our family literacy program, you have allowed us to leverage your dollars to further enhance and increase the family supports we provide for families with young children in the San Fernando Valley.

For example, in 2012/2013, NVCS leveraged $70,000 in public funding -- in private funding, I'm sorry, for family literacy. In addition, we have documented that NVCS's community partners provided 64,000 worth of in-kind support by providing key instructional components of the Family Literacy program. It's important to know that FLI grantees have reported that they partner with 17 community organizations and groups on average that helps sustain the family supports and sustain the program.

Lastly, as my board member mentioned, last year we received a new state-of-the-art playground valued at $100,000 for the Family Literacy program and Best Start community.

Unfortunately, without the Family Literacy grant, we most likely will have to close our doors to families in regards to offering a comprehensive family literacy model. Our Family Literacy program aligns with Best Start efforts. Going forward, we will continue do our best to continue with that alignment.

As a family literacy advocate, NVCS looks to the release of the family education model, REFL. It's not as intensive and comprehensive a model as FLI, but at least it will help fill the gaps needed for parents and young children.

I'd also like to thank you for your investment in workforce development through the FFN initiative. Thank you for creating the entrypoint into a workforce and career pathway for individuals with a limited educational background. The FFN program has been a starting point for many license exempt childcare providers who, after the program have enrolled in community college, obtained jobs in the ECZ field, and have become licensed.

I'd also like to say how the two initiatives interact. Our FFN graduates have been hired in our Family Literacy ECZ center. And we also have Family Literacy participants attending the FFN trainings.

And for the record, we would not be able to keep the FFN program without First 5 funding. We would be able to provide community resource information and referrals. We would be happy to share lessons learned with First 5 and we will appreciate anything you can do to help us sustain both programs past June 30th.

Thank you again for your partnership.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Lutia Gonzalez and Rick Overdorf.

MS. LUTIA GONZALEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Lutia Gonzalez. I am here to say thank you. I am -- I have been selected as a Family Literacy partner leader and I am representing our learning community is (inaudible), a Best Start community. We are dual education students have written letters to give you and ask me to deliver them today. For Family Literacy program has created a significant learning community which has helped hundreds and hundreds of families in southeast Los Angeles. We want to celebrate a learning community and we invite you to see us in action as we celebrate women in history. I have flyers to give you.

We hope -- we hope to see you at our event once again. Thank you for your support. We have done good work.

We're a town of -- the area we serve is a town of 13,000 people. We have no industry. It is by documentation the poorest community in Los Angeles county. I am devastated because I can't find the money. I don't know where it is, and I really -- it just hurts me very badly because our families have progressed.

There is nothing more successful than this program that we put on. I'm speaking strictly for our community. We have helped a lot of families. The area has been improved because of our presence. If we close our doors, they will not open again because the staff that I -- my wife and I have accumulated or hired are -- will not be replaced because they work so well together.

I -- I just cant tell you. I'm almost at a loss for words, but the loss of this program will be huge in that community. And if I knew where to get the money, you could be sure I'd be there looking for it. We filed for grants. We've tried everything we can think of. I haven't stood on the corner yet with pencils trying to...
sell them, but there's just not that much money there to get unless I go in. We do not feed into the bigger Palmdale-Lancaster communities. We feed simply into the small poor community of Lake Los Angeles.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you. Kathy Overdorf and Rosie Pike.

Kathy Overdorf.

MS. KATHY OVERDORF: Hi. I'm Kathy Overdorf. I'm currently a faculty -- full-time faculty at Antelope Valley College. And I am here to speak on the loss of the Family Literacy program in the Lake Los Angeles community. I actually was one of the starters, founders, whatever of that program. And I'm here to tell you that we have looked extensively for funding from other sources, and it's just really hard to sustain a program in that community because we're just so isolated out there.

The other big loss is actually the partnership with the college. That is, if not the best, one of the best early childhood programs in all of the Antelope Valley. I teach one of the practicum classes, and we place practicum students because it is such a project-based, excellent program. When that program closes, then that is just another loss to the community college because we don't have another excellent place to place students.

And so I -- I do thank you previously for your funding. It has made a tremendous difference in Lake Los Angeles, and I really hope that you will consider bridging until -- you know, we're out there. We're looking. We're trying to find funding. We have a workforce initiative grant through the college, and we're trying to leverage other funding, but we need some additional time to do that.

Thank you.


MS. ROSIE PIKE: Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Rosie Pike. I'm with the adult division. I'm at central office. And last year I was able to get our executive director behind the cause of family literacy. And, unfortunately, he's not longer with us. He's been replaced. We're forever finding new champions to stand up for what we believe in. We believe you are our champions. And it's exciting to hear that -- to hear it mention that we need to find a way to work together. I'm ecstatic to see our board member representative here. I do believe --

I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for all the work that you've allowed us to do for the last 12, 13 years for family literacy. Families have been truly blessed and have shown outcomes, not just for their children, themselves, they're on their way to getting careers, they're involved in schools, they're leaders. But adult education right now is not funding parent education. Without the Family Literacy grant, we are set to close all our family literacy sites. We have six of them, and probably stop supporting our community-based organizations because there's not funding right now designated for this program.

I'd like to recommend that you consider working with our board members, talking to them about a plan to set in place for the future to not let this close down. We invested a lot of money this last year in new equipment, training for our staff, curriculum. And it's a wonderful program, but I just -- I want to thank you and I want to ask that if you can extend it for one more year, I would suggest that collaborating with our board members, with our -- the people at the top, not people like me. I have no say. I can only go back and say, please, don't cut us. But at this point, the letter has been sent out saying that, without the grant, we will shut down our programs.

Thank you.

MS. KAREN SALAZAR: Hello, everybody. My name is Karen Salazar, and I work in the city of Cudahy, a Best Start community. I have been an active member in the Best Start meetings. I've been asked to attend the small committees and the large committees. And I've had this letter from one of your contractors that I'm going to read to you. It's from SSG.

Ms. Salazar: The research and evaluation unit at Special Services for Groups, SSG, would like to formally thank you for supporting our First 5 LA Best Start survey project. This project had a very ambitious timeline and we were able to complete Southeast LA community capacity assessment surveys because of your efforts.

We are especially thankful for your thoughtful support in collecting surveys in your Family Literacy classes which you have probably over a hundred students' signatures being passed around. We continue to be very impressed with your center for being so welcoming and supportive to the community.

On behalf of our team at SSG, we would like to commend you for your commitment to the Southeast Los Angeles community.

The survey data will be used for Best Start Southeast LA community partnerships to help them make decisions on strategies to improve the health and well-being of young children and their families in this community. Your assistance was a huge help for our team.
and we appreciate you for taking the time to talk to us.
The work that you do is so important and powerful
to the community. We wish you the best in your future endeavors and please continue to do the great work.

This is from one of your contractors that we work with Best Start. I was optimistic that we -- our Best Start, we are doing the work of Best Start and we would be continued and included. Our celebration is April 25.

We've invited Bennett Kaiser and Steve Zimmer, along with council members from Bell and other areas of Southeast Los Angeles. Our collaborative, tri-cities (inaudible) Best Start will be there.

Please come and help us make bridges so that we continue the good work and provide our families the best start. I have a copy if you'd like it.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you, Liz.

MS. LIZ GUERRA: Good afternoon. My name is Liz Guerra, and I'm the project director for the Family Literacy support network at the LA County Office of Ed.

I couldn't sleep tonight if I didn't get up and say something today in front of a public forum. Many of the grantees are here today because they, like you, commissioners, feel that this important. And, yes, we know it's been 12 years. It's been a long time, but we were kind of borned with you, and all we know is that you asked for two recommendations. The grantees have been meeting on their own time after work, on weekends, trying to strategize. The strategy that we decided as a group was that we were going to come in and say thank you.

In our hearts, we really wanted to add two recommendations. So as a person who works with the staff in building their capacity, both for families and parents, the two recommendations that they wanted to share are these: One, is that there is an alignment with Best Start LA. We have -- the picture that they painted for us is that parents have to go to the hospital, have a baby, Welcome Baby comes, steps in, gives them resources. Later they go home, home visitors step in and provide resources and referral. To us it made perfect sense that, on that last visit, when the child turns nine months, that they share with them the options available in the community for school readiness like Family Literacy.

That was recommendation number one, to show that there is an alignment with Best Start. That really came from a parent from Hunting Park on a drive home.

The second recommendation that the grantees wanted to make was that, in your new guidelines, there is also a strategy that says, redirect funding. Back in 2011, there was a funding strand that was approved for family education model. We were all for that initiative because, basically, we felt we were against the wall and we were told, we're not going to do family literacy, come up with something else that might work for us and we'll consider it. They did. They approved the family education model, which is in your budget for the next four years.

The policy language in that governing language is about redirecting funds. So in addition to the two strategies that you have as recommendations for how to sustain these programs, there is also that one of redirecting those family education funds to support a model that you have evaluated with nine different evaluations that national synthesis is showing family education work.

So, again, I do come with a grateful heart to thank you for the partnership. I thank all our stakeholders who are here from public and private and our family members. There were hundreds of other parents who wanted to come. We held them back, but we did bring representation from Huntington Park.

I thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you, Liz.

Okay. That ends public comment. So we have a recommendation from staff and -- so do we need to have any other discussion before we come to consensus with regards to recommendation to the full commission?

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Duane, I just have one question.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Trish.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Just in general on all the initiatives and the grants coming in the future that will (inaudible). I don't know how much work does our staff do in trying to help find ways to sustain or -- I don't know what the process is.

MS. FICEK: I think through the years, it has varied investment by investment. Early on, some of the -- some of the support that was provided was technical assistance. Some of the investments have benefited and participated in specific efforts around focusing directly on sustainability. We implemented the sustainability project for the School Readiness investment, for the Family Literacy investment. Some of the investments have technical assistance and training providers that are a part of the investment whose charge is to help these programs identify future options for funding.

So it does vary in investment by investment. And some of them earlier on, when they were designed, have more of an emphasis on sustainability and was, therefore, placed earlier on in the -- in the design of the program, such as Oral Health. And, as you saw, there's more
success with some of those investments continuing. 
So through the years, it has varied, but there 
has been effort put in to addressing and acknowledging and 
doing what we can to help identify support through 
sustainability moving beyond First 5 LA.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Jonathan.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I'd like to move the 
staff recommendation the -- withhold comments, you know.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Jonathan, you probably need 
the microphone over there. You usually don't need a 
microphone, but since you made that announcement this 
morning, you can't talk loud -- you can't project that.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I can project.

COMMISSIONER AU: You're in a cruising mode.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I move the staff 
recommendation and I -- I -- I do both with a heavy heart 
and with a sense that what we've done is very important 
and very good. And I think it's done -- you know, the 
benefits that we've heard about over time are so real, so 
many, so varied that it's really -- it's nothing to 
ignore. On the contrary, it's something to celebrate.

But on the other hand, we have to make choices. 
And you see that chart. It's almost ever present in my 
vision about revenue versus expenditures. And we have to 
also -- when we started this and several other programs, 
we didn't really talk about sustainability, you know, and 
that was 12 years ago. And the sustainability is very 
clear. It's been us. But we're not the answer. 
We're the catalyst. We're working with these folks and 
others as pioneers. And my hope is that there will be 
other sources of funding, but I think staff made a 
reasoned recommendation. And I don't doubt this is a good 
investment. I just think that it's not the best 
investment given limited resources. It's great for 
individuals who participate. It's relatively expensive. 
And we can't -- it's not scalable. We can't really make 
this a county-wide initiative or even for significant 
parts of the county with the available resources. For all 
those reasons, I reluctantly but clearly make the -- move 
the staff recommendation.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Seconded.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Again, we don't take 
action.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: But you got a motion.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We will have a consensus 
recommendation that this committee will take to the 
commission at the April meeting. And that's what we will 
be doing, taking a census recommendation.

Let me be clear. We do not take action in this 
committee. We will have a consensus recommendation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 90</th>
<th>Page 91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>start over with the organizations? Are we exclusively</td>
<td>sustain some of these programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking for new contracts? Are we trying to look at those</td>
<td>But, yeah, I -- our strategic planning that we're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that have served us well in the past to try to see what we</td>
<td>going to engage in and we're starting to, we really need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can do to support efforts that are already well underway</td>
<td>to -- to look at a different way that we communicate and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and then maybe just a movement is all that's needed? How</td>
<td>partner with our many of our grantees and build from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does that look?</td>
<td>there. It is -- it's tough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think -- I think -- I</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER DENNIS: So anyway, other than those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know if you're asking me the question. Obviously, I</td>
<td>who had testimony, is there any questions, comments, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot answer that question. I think that's a staff</td>
<td>thoughts from those of you in the audience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question. And I don't know to what degree staff is</td>
<td>SPEAKER: Well, I think Family Literacy --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared to answer that because I think what you're saying</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER DENNIS: You had testimony. You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is, are there plans with regards to integration of those</td>
<td>testified. I want to give other people in the audience --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services that would be lost into the communities that are</td>
<td>other people in the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being affected, and -- and I cannot answer that question.</td>
<td>So if there are questions or thoughts or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That will be a staff question.</td>
<td>comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BELSHE: But I think -- if I may, I think</td>
<td>Yes, ma'am. Give your name and say something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are two pieces here. In the near term -- and we're</td>
<td>MS. DIANNA PINTO: My names Dianna Pinto, and I'm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to be hearing more about Best Start community</td>
<td>the executive director for the South Central Lamp. We're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnership work activity in a moment using Central Long</td>
<td>a really small organization, but we do a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach as an example. So we're moving forward with</td>
<td>But what I wanted to share with you is that, when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation in the near term in the Building Stronger</td>
<td>I was little, my mom used to clean houses and she used to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Framework. But what's contemplated there --</td>
<td>take me to clean houses with her. And one day her car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with the framework endorsed by the board and</td>
<td>broke down. And sometimes, when she got to clean two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the implementation plan, what's envisioned there is not</td>
<td>houses, we used to get more money. So there was this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding through the Best Start partnerships direct</td>
<td>woman who was so kind to her and she gave her $5,000 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services. So that's a near term -- that's a key piece of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Every time I think of that woman, I think about the families that we serve, because my mom was one of those families. She knew very little English. She strived very much to make sure that we worked and she expected me to go college. There was no but, if, or and. She just didn't know how to get me there.

So when I think about the families that we serve and the impact that we make, I think about each and every one of those kids that one day, in my view, will become -- will change our community. Because we're in south central Los Angeles, which is one of the hardest communities, as you probably know. And I hope to God that the work that I do and for the moms will one day impact their children as well.

So I share this with you because I love the family literacy model. It's so different than anything I've ever seen. They work with the moms and they work with the children. And more than anything, they give dignity to the women that come to the programs and it makes them seem like -- it tells them that they are important to the children, that we are their first advocate. So I love your Best Start idea. I think that Family Literacy is something that can work with Best Start, mainly because we're doing it already.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you very much.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. JEN RAWLS: Question.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah. What's your question?

MS. JEN RAWLS: This is a clarity question. I'm Jen Rawls. I'm with Para Los Ninos, and I have a PFF question. I was trying to keep my notes straight.

So as I understand it, there's going to be a recommendation to bridge the sustainability plan and bridge all nine programs for six months. Does that change at all by some confusion about -- between DCFS and First 5 about the six months, maybe more than six months.

MS. BELSHE: This is the recommendation we've made to the commission. This is a special meeting of the commission, and we'll continue our conversations with DCFS, but I expect it will be the recommendation we bring to the April board meeting.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right. So hearing no other comments, the recommendation from staff is the recommendation that this committee will take to the full commission at the April meeting. And I will say to the commission that there was consensus by commissioners at P and P that staff recommendation moves forward as an action item on the April docket.

If that's it for Item 5, I think now take a break.

MS. BELSHE: Well, actually -- they always say know your audience, but you are the chair. Just for context, we have one more presentation which we can certainly do after the break on Best Start. And we have some guests who have joined us. And then we were going to take a break, but we can take a second break and get into a strategic planning focus conversation. So whatever you choose.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think we take a break now because a lot of folks who came, came for item five, and they may want to -- this will be a good time to break.

Thank you all very much.

(Brief recess.)

MS. BELSHE: So I'm going to turn it over to Antoinette. This is the last agenda item we have before pivoting into strategic planning, not just update, but work. So let us turn it over to Antoinette Andrews, our still relatively new assistant director of Best Start Communities.


Since our last update at the March 4 commission meeting, we've actually attended a total of 13 community partnership rollout meetings with over 680 individuals who have participated in those meetings as well. These meetings have provided important context for us and it really drives the decisions that we make daily. And so today's presentation is an attempt to bring this context to the commissioners. So what we're going to do today is talk about the selection purpose and plan for the Building Stronger Families Framework indicators. And we have our colleague, Mamatha Mahajan who's here from the R and E department who is going to --

MS. BELSHE: For the first time.

MS. ANDREWS: For the first time, yes. We do great things for the first time in Best Start.

And we also want to acknowledge Lillian Liu, who is representing the Best Start community in central Long Beach are who will also be a part of this presentation.

And finally, we want to acknowledge our colleagues in the public affairs department who's really helped us to bring this story to life.

I'm going to turn it over to Mamatha.

MS. MAHAJAN: So as Antoinette mentioned, we wanted to come here today and describe how we chose our indicators and how we're using them. So in May of 2013, the reviewed the core results that were a part of the...
Building Stronger Families Framework, and we tried to figure out how we could operationalize and measure each of those core results. So during this process, we came up with a list of 49 indicators that addressed each of those results and we made sure that each one of those indicators had data that was available in the Best Start community. And we presented these 49 indicators to the commission at the Best Start commission retreat in June 2013, and the commission approved that list, but they told us it was quite long and we should go back and see if we could reduce the numbers -- the number of indicators. So we did just that.

We worked at the folks with the Advancement Project or Healthy City and tried to figure out how we could reduce these indicators. So we evaluated or rated each one of these indicators on a number of criteria. So we looked to see how valid and reliable those indicators were or data for those indicators were, whether they were measurable or they have high quality and then how actionable each one of those indicators was. So in other words, could the communities actually create change for that indicator.

So in December 2013, we were able to narrow down that list of 49 indicators to 29 by keeping those with the highest scores within each of the six core results. And then we looked at the list again and we noticed that, while some of those indicators rose to the top of the list because of those scores that they had gotten, they were actually overlapping quite a bit with each other. So, for example, we had the percent of parents who report that people in the neighborhood watch out for each others' children. We also had the percent of parents who report that people in their neighborhood could be counted on in times of need. And then we also had the percent of parents who report that people in their neighborhood help each other out. All three of those are quite similar, as you can see. And we didn't need to have all three of them in our list.

So we looked at -- when this was the case, we looked at the list -- we looked at the indicators, we looked to see which one of those was the most relevant, we looked to see if there was one that possible could encompass the rest of the indicators within it, and we looked to see whether there was one indicator that the communities could impact more than another. And so within this example, we ended up choosing the percent of parents who report that people in their neighborhood help each other out.

And so during this process, we were able to narrow down that list of 29 indicators to a list of 22 indicators, and that's where we're at today.

So what are we actually doing with these indicators? There are two ways that we're using them: First, we're tracking data related to each one of those indicators which will allow us to monitor First 5 LA's progress in making changes in the population level in the Best Start communities over time.

And then the second way we're using these indicators is using them as part of the learning by doing process where communities are deciding on one or more of these indicators that are important to them and their neighborhood and the folks in their communities and looking to see what they can do to create impact and change those indicators for their communities.

I do want to mention that, you know, we of course looked at research, we looked at the current data that were available, we looked at other folks who do this kind of work when we were coming up with this list of indicators. We definitely recognize that it's the communities and the partnerships that really know their neighborhoods the best and they know what's important to them and they know what their needs are in their communities.

By the -- through the learning by doing process, we're asking community partnerships to give us feedback on these indicators and to also feel free to propose new ones if there isn't something that's being captured here. And we welcome that feedback. And if they do have any indicators that they are proposing, we will vet them and evaluate them using the same process that we did the other indicators that I just described.

And in addition to doing this work, we are also working on a data development plan so that we can be able -- we will be able to gather information and data related to any new indicators that are proposed as well as indicators that already exist.

I do want to say that it's important to note that the change that we seek within our communities is not something we can expect to see right away. It's not something that's seen in the long -- short term, but it will be seen over time. And there are multiple efforts in place that will lead to this change. So together with the work that we do here at First 5 LA, along with our strategic partners and the work that's happening within the community partnerships due to this learning by doing process, I think can lead to a lot of great impacts in our communities at the population level, but over time.

And this is something that, you know, we've talked to the communities about and they have really embraced this idea of coming up with indicators and coming...
The purposes of Best Start encompass our intercity, the high-risk intercity area, plus there's a little strip that goes out to West Long Beach that has one of the highest gang activities in our city.

Next slide. The population of Long Beach -- of Central Long Beach is approximately 20 percent of the total Long Beach population. As you can see, Central Long Beach is very diverse and has one of the high -- has the highest Asian population of all the Best Start communities, and that is the high-risk Cambodian community. Unfortunately, Central Long Beach also has one of the highest rates of reported cases of child abuse and neglect in the county.

Next. Thank you. Our vision is Central Long Beach is a community where babies, children, and their families are healthy and safe with a passion for learning. This mission statement was accepted by consensus of the entire Central Long Beach partnership. And there's a lot of work that went into this vision statement. It looks very simple, but we had multiple meetings and a lot of discussion. Much like all the decisions that have come out of our partnership, we utilized data and we utilized the community voice in making our decision.

Next slide. Thank you. One of the things is our partnership is very intent on making long-term impact on our -- with our work, which is the reason we embrace data for decision making. We're not looking for short-term fixes. We know this is an opportunity to do something that will be lasting.

First, I have to commend First 5 -- the First 5 LA evaluation team and Harter and Company for moving to infographics. It really has made the data very community friendly, which you will see later in the video.

During our ad hoc meeting, the indicators provided a framework for us to understand where our community stands in relationship to the family core results. During the planning sessions, we used the indicator data, along with a lot of other data that was at our disposal. And some of that other data included the community capacity assessment, which has been done several times, which is a survey that's conducted with the community members in all the Best Start areas. And what they documented or tried to capture was the community members' experiences, the community assets, and the barriers to -- for the community members to access those supports.

We also are lucky in Long Beach because we have our own health department, so we also had access to the very recently put together community health improvement plan. Also the local hospitals got together and just...
recently rolled out their community assessment plan, along with the community clinics that we have. Of course, because we have done agencies in Long Beach, we also utilize a lot of the data that has been collected by the agencies, like our program does a lot of focus groups in the community to collect data.

All these different sources of data assisted as -- in being strategic about the selection of our core result and our indicator choice. In fact, with all the data that was available to us, I think our major -- our longest discussion was, what can we choose that would have the longest and most comprehensive impact on our community. And as we looked at all of this, we realized that some indicators were -- could influence other indicators. And I think that's why they finally chose us to choose the indicator of parents feeling confident in their parenting skills because we felt that, if parents were practicing good parenting skills, they will also be more likely to read to their children and eat regular meals with them, which is two more indicators that have been chosen.

And just to piggy-back on some of the comments that were made earlier, our current expiring -- expiring and inspiring Family Literacy program and Family Friends and Neighbors programs could serve as valuable tools in the development and implementation of any infrastructure changes that need to be made to support this particular change in Long Beach. Since our Long Beach partnership is diverse and ranges from community providers to our diverse communities, I wanted to bring the voice here to the room, and so we have this video.

(Video plays.)

MS. LIU: As you can see by the video, data is very important to us in making our decisions. And so we'll continue to do this, the learning by doing process. And you can also see how diverse we are in this community and we're -- we have so many different perspectives, but, you know, we all came -- I'm proud to say we came to a consensus on the choices, and I think it's because we all share the shame hopes and dreams for Long Beach and its future generations.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you.

MS. ANDREWS: Perhaps we should have just ended there because that was -- however, I do have to come back and say that this is an example. But this is happening across the 14 Best Start communities. As I mentioned earlier, in the community rollouts, we've met with over 680 individuals who are committed to this work. And in fact, right after this, we have to leave because we have the last community rollout in Lancaster starting at 5:00 p.m.

MS. BELSHE: You're going to be late.

MS. ANDREWS: Yes. But just to -- again, you know, the community partnerships are very interested in this, they're really embracing data. And what we know to be true in April is that additional community partnerships will go through a very similar process of reviewing data. And we believe some, like Central Long Beach, will have selected their target population. And then in terms of other next steps, we will present another implementation of data at the commission meeting and at the April P and P talk about results focused actions.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you.

Commissioners, any clarifying questions of staff?

Any comments?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I think it's heartening and also instructive and illustrative. I think this is a good, healthy example of how we can better understand what's going on in those communities. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Anybody else? Suzanne and then Nancy.

SPEAKER SUZANNE: I really appreciate the video. I've been to the Long Beach Best Start, and it's -- it picks up the exact flavor that I got from attending that personally. So thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: I guess I'm -- I really appreciate the fact that there's the community in there and their partnership conversation and then embrace the data focus process. And then again, I'm looking at some of the indicators that have been embraced. I guess I'm trying to sort of connect that partnership process and embracing it with data and the core indicators to how we then facilitate the actual doing within the neighborhoods, within the families and the -- and the community.

You know, how do we promote this notion of early childhood development among parents. And what we're getting at, it's the actual activity or the behavior or the change we want to -- to -- to have with our work with Best Start.

MS. ANDREWS: Right. So -- so what we're presenting today are the first two steps of learning by doing process. And we actually have -- if you want to see the infographics that Long Beach actually used, what they've done is determined, based on all the information and based on the indicators that they have selected, they will then have a conversation about what do we do about this.
the evaluation for an RFQ, request for qualifications, that we would like to submit for an evaluation of the parent/child interaction therapy training program. So we're proposing a four-year evaluation plan. Total budget of approximately exactly $400,000. We have a few mingles I want to really carefully describe the efforts being put forth in this evaluation or the training program to extend the capacity to provide PCIT services and evaluate some preliminary outcomes of that program.

So that's the quick snippet, and I'm happy to elaborate or answer any questions.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Kelly, I had the opportunity, along with other commissioners, to actually go to some of the PCIT sights maybe a few months ago, and that was something that I think staff, you know, put together. And at that time, I remembered talking to the representative from mental health saying that we were low on folks who would actually be willing to sponsor a program.

Where are we with that with regards to having enough vendors to actually do what we need to do and how we -- in -- on that uptake in getting the number of folks to do it?

MS. GOODS: To be honest, I'm probably not going to be able to articulate --

of the community is going to be rolled out by the community, and I have to tell you, we haven't even made that decision yet because we need to get the voice around and figure out what is the best for the Long Beach Best Start, what is best for the Wilmington community. And so I think we're going to find it's probably the plans are going to look different, how they're going to roll it out is different. Each community is at a different level. So I mean, it's going to be exciting, but I think -- I'm really happy that there's going to be a lot of evaluation done. Some will be better than others, or maybe the lessons learned that we can see some commonality and things to spread to other communities.

MS. BELSHE: And the fuller picture, Nancy, at our next P and P meeting will be on the broader, more complete learning by doing activity.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions?

Thank you. Thank you very much.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you for joining us.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Item 7, PCIT. Kelly, you're going to talk about it.

MS. BELSHE: Yes, this can be a receive and file. Kelly, if you can give a very little brief snippets so board members know what's in the packet.

MS. GOODS: So what is in the packet is a summary
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: And maybe to reiterate, just given what we've gone through earlier is, do we have a firm agreement with Department of Mental Health that they are going to maintain and sustain what we're investing in in terms of continuing this work?

MS. GOODS: So --

MS. BELSHE: And, again, that -- I'm going to step on in here, Kelly.

So PCIT is one of many county-wide augmentations that is multiyear in nature. And consistent with the governance guidelines, absent seven of nine voting member vote, it would come to an end when it is slated to come to an end, which is when, Liz?

SPEAKER LIZ: Five years.

MS. BELSHE: Actually, I'm fairly confident it's sooner than that since we're about --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It's 2017, right?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: They're training 20 providers a year I think. UC Davis is doing it. And they didn't see any problem or didn't say anything yesterday about having any lack of vendors or potential providers that were interested.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay.

MS. BELSHE: And then there is sustainability opportunities through Title 19 in terms of Medicaid funding for at least some, if not all, of the PCIT model. So, you know, we have a little bit of time to continue to work with DMH and DCFS and others. But it's an exciting project and we'll learn a lot through the evaluation project that Kelly just outlined. And that, no doubt, will help inform other ideas that perhaps we haven't thought of relative to sustainability.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right. Anything else?

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Just along with the question about sustainability --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Trish, you got to talk up so those folks back there can hear you.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: One of the other things to look at might be the MHSA prevention and early intervention dollars, and DMH is putting together the three-year plan right now as we speak. So we always, I think, have to be looking ahead for funding and sustainability.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Right.

MS. BELSHE: So this is a quote/unquote receive and file. This will be on the consent -- is that right, John?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Yes.
For Action.

MR. LaFRANCE: Wonderful. Thank you, Jessica.

Good afternoon, commissioners and staff, members of the public.

It's a very exciting and momentous occasion to be launching this work together with you.

As Jessica indicated, we were hoping to share with you a little more in depth about what the planning process will look like so we can engage in more discussion. We did share this at the last commission meeting very briefly and at a high level, but today's an opportunity to really dig in a little bit more about what the process will look like, ask questions, provide your input and recommendations regarding the process.

And so we're -- we're starting here revisiting the overview graphic that we've developed about our work plan and timeline. Just note of interest, certainly, to this -- to the Programming and Planning committee, but also to commissioners -- other commissioners present that, along the bottom of the timeline graphic, we note each month what the nature of involvement for the P and P committee and for the commission will be. Essentially, as we are getting started at this point in the process, as Jessica indicated, there have been interviews in the key choices meeting with the Drucker team that happened yesterday. We'll be discussing that -- some of the -- what came out of that with you today.

But along a parallel track, our team has really been mining all of the reports and materials and documents from the L-3 process, and your -- all of your extensive research and evaluation efforts and other data collection work to synthesize it with a lens for understanding where your investments and focus has been to date and what the implications are of a shifting environment and policy context and needs in the community for your focus moving forward. And we will use that to pull together what we're calling first kind of a -- a planning framework.

So we'll be putting together and we'll discuss in fact today a very early draft of the types of decisions and some criteria that may be used to make those decisions as well as beginning to develop what we're calling a framework for impact. So that is where we will be thinking about what your future goals, pathways for achieving those goals, and target populations for the focus of the work may be moving forward.

As we work on that kind of framework for impact, we will also be coming back to the question of the mission and vision for First 5 LA. And I want to just underscore that this is an opportunity where we will have an extended conversation with Program and Planning committee. As you see across the timeline, you will be having time with us in this conversation at each of your meetings every month over the course of the year. You'll see us in April about the planning framework, more detail on decision making criteria, et cetera. But in May is when we'll have an extended conversation as we get into, as I said, looking more specifically at an actual framework for impact, what the directions may be looking like that we're moving towards with respect to goals, pathways for achieving those goal and target populations.

That also has implications, as I mentioned, for mission and vision. It may be that we get into mission and vision more in June as if we were having more of an extended conversation about kind of what's emerging in May.

One of the other notes that I want to call attention to is that you don't see on this graphic, but it is part of our scope of work, to engage in some type of community input early on in the process, likely in the May or June time frame. It's likely to be a survey. It's the -- it's an opportunity where we would engage a broad range of stakeholders, including constituency groups from the Best Start communities, but beyond. And it's a -- it's really, as I said, an opportunity for community and public input into the -- the future direction of First 5 early on in the process.

MS. BELSHE: And we actually, if I may, talked to us this morning about the idea of doing, within like the next week to ten days, a webinar of all -- for all contractors and grantees to kind of do a quick check-in on where we are at First 5 relative to the long-term financial planning, governance guidelines and now the strategic plan to provide our contractors and grantees some context for where we are, what we're looking to accomplish in 2014, and also to highlight some of the specific input opportunities that we anticipate as a part of the strategic planning process.

MR. LaFRANCE: As we have an emerging direction in the summer timeframe, we'll be mapping your existing investments and commitments to that emerging framework and, you know, do some kind of a high-level financial analysis of what the kind of implications are or, you know, how current investments and commitments map on to, again, what is -- what is likely to be an emerging framework for impact.

From there, we'll begin to do -- you know, develop strategy quote/unquote. Obviously, we're doing that all along, but what we mean specifically by that box in the July/August timeframe is specifying what the objectives will be to achieve the goal or goals in this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 122</th>
<th>Page 123</th>
<th>Page 124</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 strategic plan. And at that point, as we've developed</td>
<td>1 input into the development of those goals. And I would</td>
<td>1 suggest that you can glean a certain amount of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 that level of detail about the strategic plan, we will</td>
<td>2 suggest that you can glean a certain amount of information</td>
<td>2 from surveys, but if you like want to do a gap analysis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 then go into a more interactive dialogue community input</td>
<td>3 you're not going to find that via a survey. So there may</td>
<td>4 you're not going to find that via a survey. So there may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 process, which is what you see on the timeframe in kind of</td>
<td>5 be some thoughtful, strategic focus groups you have with</td>
<td>6 those areas that we normally cover that you probably could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 the August/September months of the year.</td>
<td>6 communities and there are existing groups with regards to</td>
<td>7 go to as far as getting some information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Those input events will -- at that point in the</td>
<td>7 So that's a piece that I would suggest that you</td>
<td>8 consider as to being like an intermediary point between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 process will largely be to engage the community on</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9 surveys and getting input from the communities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 questions of, given the emerging direction or what</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 September, October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 direction the First 5 LA is moving towards, what input and</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 advice does the community have on how that implementation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 of that in communities can look most effectively. It's an</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 opportunity for dialogue, to build buy-in. It may inform</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 some refinements to the strategy as well, but it's not</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 envisioned that that would be a moment where there would</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 be broad sweeping changes to the strategy based on</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 community input. It's more of a refinement, advice to how</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 to set it up as for success and to begin the dialogue to</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 understand that direction.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 We refine strategy, do some financial modeling</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 about the implications future investments. And then in</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 October and November, get into the reviewing drafts around</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 drafts of the plan, moving towards a goal of having a</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 draft -- I'm sorry -- a recommended plan for full</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 commission approval in November.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 As I mentioned, you can note along the bottom of</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 the timeline how we will engage the program and planning</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 committee along the way. This is, to the best of our</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 knowledge, given what we understand -- envision the</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 process to look like right now. But I just wanted to say</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 that our commitment is to be flexible and adaptive in the</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 process along the way. We know what milestones we need to</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 hit over the course of the year so that we stay on track</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 to have a plan for approval in November, but we're</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 certainly responsive to the input and recommendations this</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 committee may have on how some of the details of the</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 process and approach may look.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 And so maybe I'll just stop there for a moment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 and see if there are any questions or comments about the</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 process as it's outlined here.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Questions comments?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 I do have one. The community input process seems</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 to be somewhat of a gap, because the way you explained it,</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Steven, your first engagement is probably about May or</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 June in the form of a -- a survey, and then your second</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 interconnect is around September, October. That's after</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 you've gotten some draft goals and you're going to find</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 out where communities are with those goals.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Seems to me, in between that, there probably</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 needs to be some focus groups to inform those goals so you</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 have not only staff, commissioners, but you have community</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 input into the development of those goals. And I would</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 suggest that you can glean a certain amount of information</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 from surveys, but if you like want to do a gap analysis,</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 you're not going to find that via a survey. So there may</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 be some thoughtful, strategic focus groups you have with</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 communities and there are existing groups with regards to</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 those areas that we normally cover that you probably could</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 go to as far as getting some information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 So that's a piece that I would suggest that you</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 consider as to being like an intermediary point between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 surveys and getting input from the communities in</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 September, October.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 MR. LaFRANCE: It's an excellent point. And, in</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 fact, in the steering meeting that we had this morning,</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 that very idea came up and we did agree that there would</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 be some targeted focus group-type conversations that we</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 will have along the way and it's -- it's simply a matter</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 of not knowing today what those groups will look like, but</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 that we completely agree and intend to build into the</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 process between -- between May and October, targeted like</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 as-indicated kind of groups about -- for community input</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 giving the direction that we're moving in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 COMMISSIONER AU: I do know that there is going</td>
<td>75 to be the synthesizing of the L-3 process and the data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 collected. And I shouldn't really assume that embedded in</td>
<td>76 of that conversation or reporting out of -- or the analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 that conversation or reporting out of -- or the analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 of that data, would there be at least some lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 that data, would there be at least some lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 that we as -- as an organization -- there are some sort of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 historical lessons learned that the staff as well as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 historical lessons learned that the staff as well as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 commissioners that have been on the commission for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 number of years have experienced and that may not even be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 reflected in what John and Kim may have -- have heard in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 their outreach to community at large.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 So I -- since I'm not really seeing that data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 report or the compilations of those lessons learned, would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 there be an opportunity for that kind of input because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 there have been some obvious missteps that we've done over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 time. We have had to adjust and -- and incorporate. And</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 some we have not and we continue to have certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 MR. LaFRANCE: Two aspects to responding to your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 question: The first is that, in the April P and P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 meeting, we will be bringing our synthesis of the -- the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 written materials. Now -- but -- to augment that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 written materials. Now -- but -- to augment that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 synthesis, but that's to underscore that this committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 will have the chance to see what we've put together there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 But to augment that, we are planning to do both a set of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 staff interviews and potentially commissioner interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 as well to round out what may not be on those pages. We</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And so it would be through interview -- one-on-one interview, conversations that we would expect to kind of be able to pull that out from -- from staff and commissioner experiences.

COMMISSIONER AU: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions before Steven moves on? And this on the framework --

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Yeah, I have a question about the community input. Will you have a list pretty soon of those entities or individual that you think would be part of the survey or part of the focus groups?

MR. LaFRANCE: It depends on your definition of soon, but we are -- we’re going to be having a full day detailed planning session with staff next Tuesday, and that’s the type of detailed kind of matter that we’ll be getting into at that point. So -- so, again, soon to start that development on Tuesday, yes.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That’s pretty soon.

MR. LaFRANCE: It won’t be done by the end of the day Tuesday, but we’ll have the groups of folks that we intended to engage and start putting it together.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions from commissioners?

MR. LaFRANCE: So then moving through the impossible-to-read fonts up on the screens, but if you have a printout, we just wanted to take a moment to go through the types of -- or levels of involvement of different groups of folks that we’ll be working with to develop and improve the strategic plan.

So I mentioned earlier that this morning we have a steering committee meeting. That steering committee is a small subset of the First 5 LA staff that is really providing internal leadership and coordination, process direction and focus, and they are working with us to develop materials along the way, insure that we’re engaging the board and committee and broader First 5 staff over the course of the -- of the project. And that -- that group can really be seen as sort of our direct liaison, and they’re -- you know, it’s the smallest group to -- as is nimble as is necessary for keeping this work moving forward.

There is then a larger group of First 5 LA staff that’s the work group. That group is really more of a representative group both representative in terms of First 5 LA departments, but also positions within departments, and they’re kind of our ambassadors and liaisons to the broader staff. They also and actually more explicitly have as their charge to provide input and recommendation on broader staff engagement over the course of the planning work, but they also will represent specific content areas of First 5 LA’s work and, you know, provide substantive input and information related to the decisions that will be deliberating on. And as you can perhaps start to envision, there’s kind of a smaller group in the steering committee that we consider what we want to bring to the slightly larger group, which is the work group.

That group helps us to deliberate and consider what to bring to the committee, you all, which is the group that then makes -- approves what is recommended to the full board.

The full board will receive regular updates along the way on progress, but there are three kind of official approval points that the full board will have. Again, the committee will make the recommendations about what’s brought before the full board. First, it’s the planning framework: What are the decision making criteria for goals, path ways, and target populations. We’ll talk more about that in a moment. Recommendations regarding the mission and vision and -- to the -- to the full board, and then recommendations about the strategic plan that will go to the board for approval.
and policies work and trying to figure out how we can be
struggling with a lot is balancing this direct services
planning, I think one of the things that we've been
terms of, if you're asking for challenges for strategic
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I have a few things in
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Carla, first.
COMMISSIONER BROWNING: It was primarily
what he just said about the current investments and how
they fit into the strategic plan going forward.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Suzanne.
COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: I just appreciate that
the beginning work is going to be done with First 5 staff
just kind of putting their heads together to begin with
because I know how much -- how really it's a lot harder to
initially draft something than it is to make comments on a
-- on an existing draft. So I appreciate all the leg work
you've done ahead of time so that we can go ahead and put
comments into it.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Nancy.
COMMISSIONER AU: I think the process you've
outlined is pretty comprehensive, and I think it's
relatively thorough. And I think, as you go along,
probably you'll note, being that you're the professional
consultants here, that there may need to be some tweaking
of the process, and so to be open to that.
But I also see us -- since we really operate in a
very political arena and we have two major elections on
the schedule this year, which will bring on board two new
supervisors, and I'm not sure at what point they're going
really strategic about the direct services we're offering
and that they're actually helpful to the policy work that
we're doing and how we started thinking about that and
balancing that.
The other thing, a few of us were at a
legislative business a week or week and a half ago --
COMMISSIONER HOWELL: Was it just last week?
COMMISSIONER HOWELL: One of the questions that
was asked was, what do you mean by early care and
education. And it was really embarrassing because there
isn't just this bite-size type of information we can give.
And when we talk about early care and education and First
5 LA, we're using these four different things. But I
think just having these clear ideas of what we, First 5
LA, means by those terms that we throw out -- and it means
something different to everyone we're talking about, and
that's a huge challenge in just terms of just having the
conversation.
And then, in terms of our big overarching, what
is First 5 going to do, what is our legacy going to be.
In a way, we've had lots of discussions about being a
catalyst for change, but if we can't take into
consideration -- a lot of the time we ask people to come
to First 5 LA and what it is
that we're doing. And since the way we are structured in
terms of our governance, each one of them will at some
day in time be a chair.
So I -- I guess it's an alert to sort of let Kim
and John know that, as soon as an opportunity arises, we
really need to engage with those offices and to let them
know that this conversation and this planning process is
occurring because, if any one entity can derail us, you
know, those are the guys.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: You're talking about Nick's
boss like that. What up?
COMMISSIONER AU: But that's the reality. And so
I just want us to -- to be aware of it and to anticipate
that. So that would be a challenge.
MR. LaFRANCE: Yes. Excellent.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Phillip.
COMMISSIONER BROWNING: No, I don't have
anything.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Carla, first.
COMMISSIONER HOWELL: I have a few things in
terms of, if you're asking for challenges for strategic
planning, I think one of the things that we've been
struggling with a lot is balancing this direct services
and policies work and trying to figure out how we can be
really strategic about the direct services we're offering
and that they're actually helpful to the policy work that
we're doing and how we started thinking about that and
balancing that.
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you know, the determination, what is our unique place in this environment. And to go about doing that, you know, how do we do a really true gap analysis really understanding what other folks are doing. And if their mission and vision are similar to ours, how do we compliment and developed partnership to expand?

And similar to what Nancy said, you know, making sure that we have public and political will to stay the course and how can you help us in making some of that happen. It hasn't been easy over at least the last five years I've been on this commission. And so how do we develop that? And how do we develop space for external crises, which always occur in this environment. And do we have -- do we have time and effort for those crises that will occur? They've occurred, you know, since I've -- since I've been on this commission.

And then, fourthly, commission and staff capacity to align more strategy because all too often we just talk about whether or not our staff can deal with the strategy. But I think it's just as important that we have commission capability and sophistication around embracing the goals and moving the agenda forward.

And then, finally, something I said during the commission meeting, how do we determine success and developing metrics around that success. And then another question out of that, if we can't develop performance standards, do we do it. And I think that's just a philosophical discussion that perhaps you need to engage us in because there are probably differing opinions around this table about how that very issue should be dealt with.

So that's my stuff.

MR. LaFRANCE: Excellent points and considerations.

If I may just respond to a few. The -- in providing the overview of the process, we've left out some of the finer details. But it's worth mentioning, given the challenges that you all have raised in consideration for us, that, well, for one, we are going to be developing a glossary of terms. Their innovation systems, systems change, capacity building, we need -- and you mentioned the early childhood education, early -- ECE itself.

So we know that these are terms that a lot of us have different understandings or we mean different things when we say them. So that's part of what's on our short list of next steps.

Later in the process, when we get to the point of having a sense of direction or maybe even earlier, we will do some partner interviews -- or potential partner interviews. So it gets to I think the point that Commissioner Dennis was bringing up about, are there some unusual suspects in a way that we might need to reach out to have conversations with because we need to be thinking differently about how First 5 LA gets its work done and with whom partners to do so. And the reason why my initial inclination is that it will likely be two-thirds into the process or something along those lines is because it's often helpful to have -- of course, you need to have done the gap analysis. There's a lot of existing data out there that we can do that with. But as you get a sense of what direction you're moving in, then you can have more of a grounded conversation with potential partners about what their role and your role could be, what the partnership can look like. And, again, it gives you opportunity to sort of cocreate in a way that -- yes, that's right, exactly -- and refine.

And I just wanted to put a point on when we talk about developing strategy looks like getting specific about what the objectives are to achieve, the direction established, I -- I personally tend to default to external example about impact out there in the community, but there will also be a set of internal objectives about staff capacity. I very much appreciate the introduction of being thoughtful about commission capacity as well. And so that's a really helpful flag for us to -- to have raised for us to be mindful of even at this point in the process.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I'm talking about us.

MR. LaFRANCE: That's right. That's right.

We've got to look in the mirror, too.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We've got to get smarter as well.

MR. LaFRANCE: So thank you very much. With that, I think we'll move to a discussion that -- that Kim will introduce.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Steven. And I want to introduced the second segment of our strategic planning conversation today and then turn it over to Alex.

Just by way of context --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Excuse me. Alex had some comment over the last piece. I'm sorry.

SPEAKER: Thank you for just letting me answer. Since just the last few hours we've been working the whole time First 5, how do you transition programming. It seems like it's part of your input process. Can going to the philanthropic community, I think we were all discouraged when United Way and other foundations that said well, we're not going to emphasize early years because First 5 is doing it. And as you're trying to anticipate the hand-offs, getting them involved and then we're just wrestling here with, will the DCFS pick this
up. And so it seems like two specially words to seek out would be the potential recipients of the hand-outs and see how we get the vision in line to allow that portion or hand-off delivered.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That's a good point on that. I'm sorry that we went on without acknowledging you, and you don't have to beat me up after this.

MS. BELSHE: All right. Thank you. So we knew that the contract for our consultant strategic planning consultant team would be coming to the board in March, and we did not want to let grass grow under our feet. So we had an initial outreach to some of the -- as you've heard me use the term super smarty pants, a couple -- a gentleman from the Claremont Graduate Drucker's School of Management -- there's a lot of schools there -- to help us -- help staff do an initial what we call a jump start workshop. And given a number of reasons, that actually ended up occurring yesterday. So our vision was that it would happen in February, but it ultimately happened a month later. But actually it was very serendipitous because it enabled our LFA colleagues to join.

And the intent of this jump start effort was for our internal planning team -- and we identified some internal smarty pants who represented each of the departments as well as different levels within the organization -- to participate in a day-long workshop session. And LFA, as I said, was there as well. And informed by interviews that Drucker undertook. Bernie Jaworski and Rafael Swarez. He spoke to four commissioners, spoke to a small number of staff. They -- they identified some of the key strategic choices and options with an eye towards really priming the pump, if you will.

And it was a really, really good conversation. And Alex is going to provide an overview of some of the relationship between critical choices broadly and what we identified as a starting point to some of the big mega issues. So that's what we want to talk to you about this afternoon and get your feedback.

And a couple of points I want to emphasize, is that this was, just as I said, an internal conversation informed by a couple of board member interviews as well as a number of staff interview, but it was really focused on how do we identify and frame what we all know to be true, which is this organization faces a lot of really hard questions.

And so identifying the big five issues was enormously helpful. There are were also like 19 subissues, secondary issues. Notwithstanding the mega nature and number of issues, it was really interesting to go through a process and really lift up and surface some of the common perspectives as it relates to themes, as it relates to key issues in terms of patterns, in terms of what additional work is required, so this issue of glossary, for example. One of the reasons we're going to talk at a high level about -- about yesterday is, you know, one of our big take aways is, we absolutely need to develop a glossary. We all use words like systems change and we nod our heads and say, yes, we are for that. And everyone probably has a slightly different definition of what that means. So we've got some work -- it was enormously edifying, both from a strategic choices perspective but also from a process perspective in terms of where more research is required, where we need to develop a glossary of terms, but also ultimately very positive because this is hard work and these are hard choices, but I think our take away was, this is work we can do within this time frame.

We have a lot of learning under our belts from L-3, Best Start, and other inputs. And with strong facilitation and focus informed by our work that we've been going over this afternoon, you know, we're going to be able to get this done. It's not going to be easy, but we're going to be able to get it done.

So let me turn it to Alex to talk about and provide kind of an overview of those what we call cascading choices and then an overview of what we identified as these big mega issues and use that as a jump start for this conversation.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Thanks, Kim.

And, you know, certainly what we want to do is give you all enough of a sense of what happened yesterday, but also provide you all a little bit of an opportunity to participate on your own in some ways in a similar exercise that staff did yesterday.

So you have a slide in your handout. And it's up on the board. Again, the text is painfully small. And I'm going to talk through this a little bit because this is, essentially, the framework for strategy that the Drucker team brought to this conversation. That's their typical framework anyway, but I think what First 5 recognized and we affirmed is we talked about, you know, the trade-offs of trying to meld these two pieces of the process together as -- you know, is this a framework that's compatible and appropriate for where we are right now. And I think we found out yesterday resoundingly that, yes, it was.

And I think the -- the key aspect of that is that, you know, Drucker's definition of strategy along with ours really keys in on the questions of choices.
So this model right here is called, strategies is a cascade of interrelated choices. And, you know, the frame for the conversation yesterday, and we will be putting in front of you in a few moments, is about choices. And I -- again, our -- the way that we think about strategy inherently in any situation is what choices does an organization need to make to -- moving forward to make sure it's most effective.

And in the -- for First 5 LA in the context of the, you know, the financial projections that are looming behind us all at all times, is that those choices have become much more paramount and much more -- you know, we have much less latitude in some of these choices that we will have to make given the impending fiscal situation and, basically, being in an environment of declining resources. So to look at things through a frame of choices is really appropriate and really useful.

So just to talk through this model for a moment, this is basically a description of the order in which you -- it makes sense to look at choices. And the theory here is that, as you move down this ladder, answers to one set of choices set up another set of choices that can't really be answered until you address the first set of choices. So it is a hierarchy and it is set up with a kind of arrows that are going both ways. It's something that you don't just go one way down and you have all your answers by the time you get to the end. At each stage, you kind of have to go back and revisit and say, given, you know, what we just discussed, does our previous conversation still make sense.

So what the Drucker team did is, basically, in the course of those interviews -- anyone who participated will kind of recognize this -- essentially, asked First 5 LA commissioners and staff to reflect on these questions. And they actually created and ordered the choices then as they emerged from those questions according to these categories. And that's kind of how the activity was set up yesterday, is that we -- the Drucker team, again, put -- fed back to the group what they saw to be the key choices emerging in each of these areas and then had -- essentially, had the group take them on.

I want to say something about how this graphic relates to the process of what we're going to be going through. And, again, fortunately, this was very well thought out before we got into this. There's a lot of alignment, despite the fact that we're king of throwing a different model at you here between what we're -- what we have set up before this came upon us to do with you all. And, essentially, if you just flash back to the visual that we showed you of our timeline, the answers to the first three questions around what are our goals, what is our role, and what are our offerings is, basically, the theme and the stuff of the -- what I would encourage us to think of as the first half of the strategic planning process, which is what Steven referred to as developing a framework for impact.

And what I want to take a moment here and just emphasize that the -- while what happens after that is going to be critically important as far as mapping the pathway, figuring out how we activate this framework for impact, the real important and critical choices that this organization and this commission will have to make are highly concentrated in the first part of this process around redesigning First 5 LA's framework for impact. And that is because this framework for impact is going to answer some of these really big questions around what is our role today given everything we've learned, given where we are in our organizational life cycle, given what we're looking at in terms of financial projections, and a bit about how we articulate that role and get a little bit more detail.

But this is the stuff of the big questions yesterday that we'll put in front of you in a moment. And this is the stuff that we, essentially, intend to answer by the time we're putting in front of the commission proposed framework for impact because, essentially, it will be reflecting on making -- making some decisions before we decide on the strategies that will appear in the plan about what First 5 LA will focus on in terms of goals moving forward. It's got four stated goals right now answering the questions, are these the right goals for us to continue to hold in front of us and -- in the sense of what Kim has been referring to as our north star, or are they something different. And that's a really big conversation and really big decision.

And, similarly, what are -- what do we offer as an organization in pursuit of those goals, which really answered the question of, what is our unique position and offering as an organization, what do we have to offer that others don't, again, in light also of our -- of our projected declining revenues, rethinking and reflecting on what First 5 LA has been doing to date in terms of offerings, what it funds, how it funds it, how it tries to add value and, potentially, coming out on the other end of that interrogation with a different set of activities and offerings than it has now. So that's all to be answered. We don't know the answers to those yet, but that's the big conversation we'll be having.

When we get to the end of this cascade though, what capabilities do we have to have in place. That's...
something that we're going to be -- is going to be a little bit of a boomerang conversation because we need to think very carefully about the capabilities that are in place right now and what is realistic to aspire to doing based on the capabilities, but we also don't want to completely limit ourselves by what and who is in place at First 5 LA right now.

There are -- depending on the answers to the previous questions and the scope of work and the emphasis of that work moving forward, there are -- that will set up some questions around capabilities and some -- you know, and that's kind of what will feed the strategy development process. We will decide whether the organization, you know, needs to development new capabilities, essentially, moving forward and what does that look like over the five-year period of the plan.

So with that, I will ask you to flip on to the next slide, but I want to just take a moment to describe where these -- these five choices or questions came from. And the short answer is that Drucker -- the Drucker team produced, essentially, 20 -- about 24 choices that they saw as being key or important coming out of the interview process. And as they were approaching the session and maybe -- they actually shared with us usually, they said, usually, you know, we do this exercise with organizations, we get about seven or maybe even ten choices, y'all are more than we're bargaining for. So we don't want to overwhelm the group and kind of confuse the group by putting all these choices out in front of folks. We think there's kind of an ordering of those.

MS. BELSHE: They actually said we were the single most complex organization they've ever worked with in 30 years.

MR. HILDERBRAND: I think they used it in a very complementary way.

MS. BELSHE: It seemed very factual and objective as far as our governance being part of the county but independent, having multiple goals, multiple -- many, many, many programs. It -- it wasn't a criticism. It was just an observation. It says a lot about some of the hard choices we have.

MR. HILDERBRAND: So, essentially, they ordered these and said, we think that there are -- you know, these happen to be further up the ladder, the cascade. Some questions that are more important for us to put in front of us and which will determine some of our answers to the other questions that are down the ladder.

So they put these -- this was basically the first half of our day yesterday. They put these questions in front of the group and have us do some reflection and work on them. They -- they did ask the group to also entertain the additional choices, but they did something fairly nifty in my mind from a facilitation standpoint, which is they actually asked all of the participants in the meeting to essentially develop some scenarios which they call archetypes based on their answers -- each individual's answers to these questions.

And what ended up emerging from that is that there were four kind of different scenarios identified collectively across staff. And they weren't wildly different. There were some very notable and important differences but there were four 4 distinction scenarios based on answers to these questions that emerged.

So the afternoon exercise was about the group of about 18 staff broke into four small groups and played these scenarios out by answering all of the additional 19 question -- 19 choices and by addressing or identifying challenges that this scenario, kind of as a way of moving forward, presented, as well as some reflections on what this might mean for what we will no longer be doing if we were to play this out.

So that was the -- that was the afternoon exercise. And we have largely, because of the language issues that emerged and also there's a -- as you can imagine, just sort of a richness of nuance and kind of detail that accompanied each of those scenarios that where this session having ended less than 24 hours ago right here in this room -- are still kind of sifting through and trying to make sense of. So we will circle back to this committee probably at the next meeting with some more detail around the output and what those scenarios looked like and some more thoughtful presentation of some of the implications for the strategy process as we see them.

But now, I do want to direct folks to these -- and in case you haven't had a chance to look through these before, maybe just give folks about 60 seconds to look at the next two pages and just digest a little bit what these questions kind of mean and also just give a quick qualifying statement that the blue boxes here, which represent some of the options for all these questions were merely what came out of the interview process and are not intended to be exhaustive or comprehensive as far as all the choices that are actually represented in terms of addressing these questions.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL: Can I just ask a really quick clarifying question?

The question number one, what are our goals and aspirations, is that completely focused on the board to answer these questions? So was there -- did we answer question number one yesterday?
MR. HILDEBRAND: We did not answer that question yesterday. And it was kind of interesting because that explicit question, not having (inaudible) interview process per se and what Drucker -- they didn't pull something out around that. Those identified early on in the conversation. Folks kind of said, what about our actual written goals and how does that fit in.

That ended up being inserted into the 19 subquestions and dealt with there, but I think more than anything, they realized that we needed kind of a different form and cover design to address that question.

So you don't -- you don't see that question appearing here. And thanks for pointing that out because it is kind of a glaring omission in a way and we're making plans right now for how to answer that question.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any questions?

MR. LaFRANCE: I think at this point, it would be really helpful to hear any reactions the committee may have about these mega -- the five or what we call the mega choices as Alex indicated, the five got pulled up above the other 19. But we wanted to hear if you felt like these resonate and if anything was missing, and then we can talk about the options as well. But I would just love to hear commissioner reactions and input on the choices themselves.

MS. BELSHE: And at kind of the meta level -- in other words, are these the five big questions in your mind or are there other questions in your mind show up here outside of the kind of clarifying goals.

SPEAKER: I just had a quick question about the route to impact. In the discussions you had yesterday, did it really just boil down to what is our impact direct or indirect? It seems to be pretty much straightest forward answer.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Yeah.

SPEAKER: To the questions --

MR. HILDEBRAND: Yes. So Drucker -- the Drucker team was pretty adamant about trying to force choice. So there are a lot of artificial kind of barriers between these things and lack of, you know, ways to think about these together and interact with each other.

The short answer is that was the language, this kind of, you know, dualistic way of looking at it and mutually exclusive way of looking at it was the language that was used yesterday. And there was a lot of kind of finding ways to talk around that or acknowledge that there might be one primary or secondary vehicle, but it did not necessarily make sense to put it as a --

SPEAKER: Just an observation, but it just seems like that's really been a lot of sources of conversation, controversy to a certain extent what is our road to impact: Direct services, direct approaches, or indirect approaches. That really spelled it out --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: This is not relating to that, but I think Nick brought up a good point. But perhaps missing in this and perhaps in the file is, who do we serve. And I don't know if that was dealt to, you know, your meeting yesterday. Obviously, you define yourself in this type of business by, who do you serve. And we've had -- I know, when Drucker interview me, I talked about that to some degree. So I that maybe more --

MS. BELSHE: That's a good example of what in the process yesterday was identified and agreed to as -- as a secondary issue under role. That's not to -- there's no science to this. And lifting it up is like a six meta issue may be the right thing to do in the context of our work, but it absolutely is something we spent a lot time talking about.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It's noticeably missing, but I can't believe that you didn't discuss it. You had to discuss it.

MR. HILDEBRAND: So what I'll say is, most of the discussion around that had to do with to what extent do we prioritize service at-risk kids. That was a big conversation under who we serve. But I'm wonder if you have -- if that's the question --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: My only question is that it was missing and you were talking about these mega issues. And, obviously, I knew that at some level you had to discuss it and it didn't hit the five major questions. But like for me and my organization, who do I serve defines who I am and then how I strategize and what do I do and all of that. It's like really being clear about, you know, the folks that I try to touch.

MR. LaFRANCE: One point that I'll make which kind of bridges the Drucker process with the rest of the planning process, and it actually addresses both points that Nick and Commissioner Dennis have brought up, and that is that you will see in a very early draft of decision making criteria that you we have for you to take a look at today, that we've framed the primary decision types as being about goals, pathways, and target population and that in the -- in those conversations will be embedded not a binary choice between direct or indirect, but what is the balance or -- and as we think about the kind of impact we want to achieve among different kinds of populations, when do we choose to -- for our route to impact to be a direct one versus an indirect one. And as we think about target population,
again, it's not do we -- are we for all kids or are we for
at-risk kids. It's not, again, either or; it's what is
the balance and how do we think about integrating our
approach to impact with target population as you say.
So just wanted to bridge. It's one of those
slightly awkward aspects of having done this one process
that's feeding into another process. But we will be, you
know, meshing the two together. So regardless of whether
target population gets raised as a sixth mega choice, it's
absolutely something we're going to be getting to in the
work we're doing, our framework from impact development.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That answers my question.
Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: I guess what I'm struggling
with is not so much the mega questions that you have here.
I think they are quite appropriate. But my struggle is
that, when we're engaged in a planning process and you
have a diversity of perspectives around a tabling, that
just to facilitate the progress of the conversation
oftentimes as a consultant facilitator, you tend to them
begin to sort of narrow the conversation and -- and -- and
I -- I'm feeling rather uncomfortable because, by virtue
of exercising that facilitation process, you can begin to
manipulate or manage -- manipulate is a very loaded word,
but --

MR. LaFRANCE: In the literal sense of it.
COMMISSIONER AU: You know what I'm saying. A
literal sense in terms of limiting the choices, or even
imposing a sort of a framework on what the choices are
going to be and what the options are. And that's what I'm
sort of struggling with right now just looking at -- and I
take it from your presentation, Alex, that these options
that you sort of highlighted here are not really the total
package of what you had heard from the Drucker report, but
something that you elicited. But just by virtue of you
exercising that sort of presented to me a particular
framework, and that -- that I'm feeling rather
uncomfortable with.

So I guess my question to you is, how -- how do
we guard against not really engaging in a really -- in one
of the words here innovative approaches because, when you
talk of innovation, it's sometimes ideas that come out of
left field. And so for me, the process can often means
-- can often lend itself better to -- to staying with what it
is we want to accomplish, you know, what are the goals.
And then you talk about target population. In
some ways that's already been dictated from my perspective
by the Prop 10 initiative itself which said these dollars
are going to be utilized to -- to impact in a positive way
the outcomes for children zero to five. And that in
itself for me is a targeting concept.

So I guess, do you see where I'm going with this?
MR. LaFRANCE: Very much so. First of all, I
want to acknowledge the dynamic that you're raising in
these processes, and it absolutely is a fine balance to
strike from -- to know when and for how long to stay in
the generative space before you go to a narrowing or
selecting or filtering kind of exercise.

And so I just want to reassure you that I'm
really sensitive to the dynamic that you're describing. I
think this is -- this is a moment right now that we're in
-- I mean, literally, this second -- of wanting to not say
these are the choices and options, necessarily. If the
committee were to raise other choices and options, that
should be put on the table. In fact, as we were preparing
for this afternoon's meeting this morning, we ourselves
looked the options. It's not unlike Nick's observation
that there is so much that is packed into direct versus
indirect. But if you were to look also at the, what do we
do question on slide 8, I -- in the white space, I drew a
new box myself and I wrote in, public education,
convening. There are other roles that you may play which
represent other options here.

So -- so I don't feel we are yet at the point of
understanding what all the options are myself and -- but
--

and I do very much trust that the committee will be our
partners in helping to strike that balance between staying
in the generous space and getting to more of the filtering
and narrowing. So I just appreciate it you naming it
because it's -- it's a delicate aspect of this kind of a
process.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think part of the
situation is that the little I know about Drucker, they do
a lot in the for-profit business world, one. And, two, to
engage them in this process, this probably should have
been precursor to you coming on board. So to have this
going on at the same time, it can get a little mushy now.
But I'm confident it will all -- it will all work out --
work out all right.

So, I mean, the work that they should have
informed but not create a paradigm. So that's what I'm
suggesting.

And to that end, I'll just shut up.

MR. LaFRANCE: Well, I mean, I would love to hear
if -- if committee members have -- and commission have
thoughts about additional options. Again, at the risk of
stealing an opportunity for one of you to comment, I --
when I look at the question of at what level should our
impact be aimed, I don't see systems here and I -- and I
think that is another option that -- that we have been
talking about that's not yet represented. So maybe it
depends on how you define community capacity building
outcomes.

But that said, I think systems are a meaningful
level at which we have been having conversation with First
5 LA about where would you like to be targeting impact.
But if, in your view of this, you see other options that
are not just glaringly but on any level seen missing, it
would be really, really helpful to hear those reactions.
And I would provide -- and Alex said earlier to
underscore, this isn't your last chance either to engage
with this because we will go into more detail in the next
P and P meeting.

Mr. Hildebrand: We will. I also want to
acknowledge and appreciate Commissioner Dennis' comment
that this framework right here was intended to and will
have limited lifetime in this strategy process. So we are
going to kind of round it out, but it will then be kind of
translated into the new process. So this is -- the
purpose of this is not to get people too hung up on this
framework or this way of acting thing. We happen to think
we can pull a lot from this into the -- you know, the big
part A of the strategy process, which is developing the
framework for impact. Incidentally, the framework for
impact addresses many of the questions that are put here
but they're not articulated in the same way.

So I do want to point out that we don't -- we
don't want to get too hung up on this right here.

Commissioner Dennis: Thank you. Trish.

Commissioner Curry: Duane, could you clarify for
me a little bit under the, what do we do: Enhance
workforces and enhance neighborhoods and enhance -- I
mean, what does the word "enhance" mean to you? I mean,
we've talked a little bit about different words mean
different things to different people, and I'm not sure I'm
clear on what you mean by --

Mr. Hildebrand: So just to be clear, this wasn't
our language, so we can't go into too much in that regard,
but my translation or interpretation maybe a better word
would resonate exactly with you all more is,
but my translation or interpretation maybe a better word

Ms. Belshe: Regarding the distinction between
First 5 LA's offerings, activities, investments in terms
of focusing, whether it be on services, whether it be
focusing on community, whether it be focusing on more
systems-oriented changes. So "enhance" is kind of a
nebulous term, but I think it's just trying to draw a
distinction between the different types of activities and
investments we could take. And, frankly, right now, we --
we do all of these things and more, but the balance is,
there's not a balance. We fund and provide a lot of
services, for example. We're increasingly advocating and
working to influence policy. Best Start is an effort to
enhance neighborhoods.

So did that --

Commissioner Curry: But what you're saying is
really more in our vocabulary, strengthening might be a
better word than enhancing?

Speaker: I would say that that is more, you
know, equivalent. It's a word that we use
interchangeably: A strengthening, enhancing. But I would
just reinforce what Alex and Steven are saying, is that
this is indeed an effort by the Drucker group to jump
start a conversation. Within that context, you know, it's
a way to start the conversation.

Commissioner Ah: Maybe you could help me.

Commissioner Dennis: Who me?

Commissioner Ah: Yeah, all of you. All of you
could help me, because what I'm trying to do -- as you all
know, I always try to connect what I call esoteric
conversation on sort of these broad sort of terms to
something that's very concrete for me. And for me, what
is very concrete is our adoption of the Best Start
framework theory of change that said we are about
strengthening families and building strong families.

So how would this particular theory of change or
framework fit into this conversation we're going to have
in this planning process?

Ms. Belshe: Well, a couple of things to be
clear, Best Start has two strands, right? Our place-based
work has two strands. One is a direct services component
focusing on family strengthening through Welcome Baby Home
Visitation; and secondly is our investment in community
capacity building working in partnership with communities
to strengthen families and improve outcomes. So they're
two complimentary but distinction investment strategies.

I think what I'm eager to have as a conversation
with the commission is to bring greater clarity and
transparency and consistency to some of these big issues
about our role, for example. In our current strategic
plan, we identify like six different roles and we kind of
all, here we're doing that and, here, we're doing that.
To bring more of a coherent, consistent definition to some
of these key issues. And we're building upon a lot of --
and this is something we're going to talk about shortly in
terms of decision making criteria to help inform some of
these big issues -- questions around goals, pathways,
target population. But one of the key criteria is building upon our own strengths, building upon our own experience. And the work we have done across the board, including Best Start, is a good example of that.

MR. LaFRANCE: And how I think about the question you're posing, Commissioner Au, is that, what is not necessarily -- well, no. I'll put it this way.

That through this process what we would be looking to become crystal clear about is the answer to the question of to what end for every strand of work that First 5 LA is engaging in. So explicitly thinking about Best Start that, as Kim and -- reminds us that the two strands of direct services and community capacity building. What are the -- the larger sort of systemic intents for both of those strands so with the community capacity building work, you are learning from the -- from the community what strategies they suggest may work to affect particular indicators, and there's the learning by doing process. And my assumption coming into this and viewing the work and thinking about it, is that it's, of course, for the purpose of benefiting those families who are reached through that work, but it is also a learning exercise that then that knowledge, because you have also the companion research and evaluation component, it becomes a driver for informing policy and systems change and work that can affect families beyond those who are reached directly with the interventions that are derived through the learning-by-doing approach.

So that's -- that's kind of how -- you know, I feel that's where the dots need to be connected all the way through to, how are the -- how is the work in the Best Start communities informing work at a systemic policy sort of level so that there is something that's institutionalized in those communities that last beyond your -- your investments.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

MR. HILDEBRAND: And we will -- we accept the challenge of --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We will and we will accept. I like that.

COMMISSIONER AU: You will and you will accept the challenge. That's good.

MR. HILDEBRAND: You know, I have been -- I've got a puzzle that's not sorted out in my mind about how to integrate. Because I think one challenge is, you've got a theory of change for Best Start and you have a theory of change for the rest of the organization. How does it all fit together. So that's what we hope to bring you when we bring you our framework for impact, something that knits that stuff together, does it in a kind of concrete and a clear way. So we accept that challenge.

COMMISSIONER AU: Very good.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Smartly or not smartly.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Deanne, did you have something?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Yeah. It kind of ties into what Nancy was saying, but (inaudible) worked in communities, we worked with issues related to what gets in the way of healthy families or -- and healthy communities. I think it is important to do what you just said, separate out Best Start from the rest of what we're doing because everything, if it focuses just on Best Start, then let's say that's what we're doing.

But on the other hand, I am trying to think of the family, the child that we're focusing on, which is why we're here, pre -- well, actually conception to five. And I'm suddenly thinking of hospitals and law enforcement and mental health facilities and neighbors who don't want to go next door because they're afraid to or because they don't like their neighbors or there's poverty, there's domestic violence. There's all of these issues that I relate to in terms of looking at a community and wanting to help strength it. And there are ways of addressing some of these issues that people back away from. People don't like to say child abuse, for example. They don't --
the key theme in our work together is going to be about
choices, about difficult choices. And that was my biggest
take away from the day-long meeting yesterday, was good
strategy requires difficult choices. And these were
presented as options. And one of our challenges as an
organization is that we -- we try to do everything.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: No. I don't want to make
it choices because I do think that's where we get in
trouble is when we think that these issues I pointed out
are not connected because they are connected, and you make
an overall choice that will make a difference for multiple
issues that you have in your head. So if, in fact, we're
talking about something as basic as transportation, in a
community, a choice, you know, people can't get to the
hospital, the doctor; they can't -- the kid can't get to
school, whatever it is, we could make a general -- we can
make an overall decision that we're going to try to
respond to these, but not individually, but in a way that
will make it possible for -- for many issues to be
resolved.

MS. BELSHE: So that's a good exam of this -- the
set of choices involved with the, what do we do, how do we
engage, what type of activity do we undertake or support;
is it an individual participant level, is it a more

COMMISSIONER AU: We're a policy --

MS. BELSHE: Policy engagement to effect change
that effects -- so that's a really good example of a
choice.

MR. LAFRANCE: I think this actually provides us
with a great segue to talking about the decision making
criteria and how we'll work our way through some of these
choices and options. So I would --

MS. NUNO: So one of the key lessons that we
learned yesterday was about, in order for an organization
to make impact and to develop a strategy that will help
that organization make impact in a very unique way, you do
have to make those tough choices as Kim was saying, and
you have to identify what you're not going to do because
there may be ways that you can partner and link up to
folks who have, you know, a more impactful role and
responsibility in accomplishing that goal.

So I think, as we move forward in using the
framework that LFA will be taking us through, that those
are the choices that we're going to be looking at. And
how do we uniquely contribute to these very complex
problems that children and families face in LA county. We
-- we can make a unique contribution and play a very
strategic role in making sure that kids overall will

benefit, so --

COMMISSIONER TILTON: The language is there, but
let me just --

MS. NUNO: And this was just -- it was a tool to
help us start thinking about and building our capacity as
staff and that we hope as commissioners to begin to think
about how to make choices. You know, we have to be
looking at, you know, our resources, financial, you know,
staff capabilities, you know. As Duane mentioned, the
commission's capabilities, where are our strengths that
will allow us to make choices that will see the type of
impact that we want for kids across LA county.

So this not an exhaustive list. This is just --
we wanted to share this with you today so you can see how
we're beginning to think about the types of options and
choices ahead of us. And if there's anything else that's
missing here that we need to take back, I think, Duane,
your point about, you know, the target population or who
we serve is a very good question that we need to think
about how to incorporate. If there are other mega -- or
meta was another term that was thrown around yesterday --
meta questions that we want to answer as we go through
this process. That's what we were hoping that you could
provide some input into.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All right. So we're going
to move on to -- somebody else. Trish, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: That's okay. I'm struggling
with this a little bit and I guess I -- what I'm not
feeling from these options and choices are the real
serious problem that we have and the real serious problem
we have is that we have children zero to five that are
victims of child abuse and neglect or fatalities because
of some of that abuse and neglect, and there's a real need
in LA to help make kids safe, especially at that age
group. And it's not just in LA. I mean, the statewide
report from CSS talks about that 35 percent of the kids
in foster care statewide are children zero to five.

That's -- that's a big number. Now, that's the statewide.
And you look at the children who are in the foster care
system because of abuse and neglect, the biggest growth
has been in the zero-to-five age group. And they now
represent somewhere in the neighborhood in DCFS of 40
percent when you look at the kids under 18.

So I think somewhere in this, I don't get the
urgency or the seriousness of the dilemma that children --
not dilemma, but the safety issue for children zero to
five. And I think that's what kind of is missing for me
somewhere, that this is not just, you know, a minor
problem. This is a major problem.

And we now have, you know, reports from Harvard
about the trauma to young children that abuse and neglect causes and the lifelong effects of that trauma. We have the Hilton report that talks about child birth in LA county, specifically in the data, and who are having children and in great numbers, is those who have been in foster care system. So we have the foster care system raising kids, you know. We now multiple generations that are being raised in foster care.

And what I don't see in here is that as a county, if we want to strength families and help families, one of the ways to strengthen and help them is to work with them before they get into the foster care system. And so I guess -- I don't see that in there and I don't -- I don't know exactly how to put the wording in here to make that -- I mean, enhancing neighborhoods or strengthening neighborhoods is fine, but we have a serious problem.

Mr. LaFRANCE: Well, I think where the conversation is going suggests that we move to talking about the decision making criteria because this notion of, how do we make the decisions and how are we taking into account the gravity of the need of the situation is articulated in those. So if I may, I want to move us to --

Ms. BELSHE: If I could, I think what Trish is raising is potentially an important meta/mega choice related to -- and, Trish, you didn't see any issues in this, right?

Commissioner CURRY: Right.

Ms. BELSHE: This is really about, what is our role. So whether you take the issue of child abuse and neglect or obesity or health, it's like, what is our role and what do we do, you know, in terms of what -- bringing clarity to -- greater clarity consistent to our role, bringing more clarity. So given our role, how do we make a contribution with some targeted issues. I think that's what we're grappling with and what you're raising -- just so I can finish.

What you're raising I think is a good question about, you know, use the term downstream. This -- whether it's a funding criteria or an engagement criteria, being more explicit about, so should we be putting -- putting our thumb on the scale more of prevention and early intervention. That's what I'm hearing you say.

It's like a funding -- an engagement choice.

Because we could be an organization that says, you know, we're really about kids in crisis, you know, we're really about dealing with kids who are falling through the cracks. That's an example of a choice. As opposed to saying, you know, we're going to invest more and engage more at the front end, whether it be through services,
course of this meeting, I've decided probably needs to be
called the framework for impact and sustainability. But
that said, we've proposed for discussion purposes today
that, when we think about goals, we -- it will be useful
we offer to think about, with respect to a given goal, how
well is First 5 LA uniquely positioned to advance work
towards that goal, as one criteria. As a second, does the
goal address a significant need for children in the county
or where a trend is of serious concern to First 5 LA,
which I think -- that's where I was making the connect as
well with Commissioner Curry's comments, the uniquely
positioned criterion getting to the discussion that we
were having regarding how are we going to make some of
these decisions. And the third, and is it a goal that we
believe First 5 LA can make sustainable progress towards
achieving over time.

These goals need to be operationalized. I'm
sorry. These criteria need to be operationalized, what
does it mean in practice when we say uniquely positioned,
significant need, sustainable progress. That's something
that we would flesh out.

But what we're sharing with you today is our
initial thinking on what some principles might be on which
we make decisions about in this case goals.

In the -- and in the case of pathways to achieve
certain goals, we may think about what the level of evidence
is behind that particular pathway. We might think about
whether it's leverages other efforts in the community or
resources or players, partners, and whether First 5 LA has
the infrastructure or capacity to deliver, whether First 5
LA can build that capacity.

Again, I think importantly this criterion of, is
it an upstream investment or a downstream investment, and
how can we be thoughtful about the balance of -- of First
5's -- how First 5's resources are directed on that
continuum.

Just to complete the sort of outline, my verbal
outline of what's here, and then we can open it up for
discussion, on the either second or backside of page of
what you have there also is, as I mentioned, decisions
regarding target population. And as we've said earlier
today, of course, when the legislation was passed, it is
clearly with the intention of improving outcomes for all
children zero to five, but how you improve outcomes for
children zero to five can look differently for different
children at different levels of need or risk given, you
know, the barriers or challenges or circumstances that
they encounter.

You know, First 5 LA in the past has made
decisions about targeting some level of resource toward
children who are higher risk, have a greater level of
need. But as we're having these conversations about how
-- how can First 5 LA do its work in a way that
demonstrates what works can be scaled to a broader level
to reach more than the children who are directly served
through programs you may fund. How do we -- how do we
balance that approach to the work with also funding direct
services.

So we -- we envision that there will be criteria
and principles that emerge from this work that may
articulate something along the lines of, within the
overall pool of resources that we have to invest, there --
we express an intention to invest some proportion of those
resources to children in higher risk situations or
relatively greater need than the county as a whole. But I
think we want to be approaching your work in a way that,
even when you are funding services that reach high-need
children, it also is selling us something about how
systems and policies in LA county should be gearing and
directing and designing their work to reach more than the
kids served by the directly funded programs.

So let me let me stop there and engage you in
more discussion. I was just feeling that, as we were
getting to the conversation, the -- there was a missing
piece to the puzzle, which was that these criteria bring

to the conversation things we need to be thinking about,
like need, First 5 LA's unique role, what is sustainable
over time, et cetera. It's a lot.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Commissioners?
Nancy.
COMMISSIONER AU: As I was listening to you and
in the context of targeted population, and -- and the fact
that we have narrowed in terms of our focus over time to
-- to children and families that are considered of higher
need and at higher risk. And -- and what is oftentimes
baffling for me is that resources that have been by
policy, whether it's on the federal level or the state
level and even the county level, have pretty much narrowed
their resourcing as well to the same population. So by
virtue of that, then I ask the question, why is it that
we're still continually being confronted with the
continual suffering of these children and families, and is
First 5 LA's role really to continue -- just continuing to
get involved in that process or do we take another step
back and say, what is the critical factors that are still
existing that is impeding the effectiveness of this
investment by -- by the government, whether it's federal,
state, or county.

And so for me, the role that First 5 LA can also
play is to facilitate that -- that very conversation and
And, you know, I'm looking at Arturo, and I know that he has the foster care children's education right in his lap. I mean, that is one of your major challenges. And so the question becomes, if -- given the resources, you know, what is still making it extremely difficult for his organization to truly get to the meat of the challenge? And could First 5 LA's eyes help to facilitate that. And then looking to DCFS and also in terms of Deanne and baby's still being killed, you know, and you having to go to death reviews because of this that.

Do you see what I'm getting at?

MS. BELSHE: I think you're raising a really good example of the discussion we had yesterday about, in the context of our long-term financial plan, among other -- in the context of our learning in recent years, what is our role going forward. And to the extent First 5 LA has been a significant funder of services, as Karla mentioned as well, not sure that's compatible with -- on a go-forward basis with those projections. So it kind of begs this question of, okay, given our interest about improving outcomes for kids and being a part of that ecosystem, because we're not going to do it alone, what is the role -- maybe one or two roles where we can most effectively make a contribution.

So what you're speaking to, Nancy, is one example of the discussion we had yesterday about, in the role of being a catalyst, a convener focused on systems change, not so much funding services, but focusing on systems change.

So I think that's -- you're calling out one of those really important meta strategic choices that we're going to be wrestling with.

MR. LaFRANCE: I heard exactly the same thing in your comments, which is -- and the way that I make it concrete in my mind is that, what often happens is that the way that the policies are written and then implemented by departments and systems, there are, you know, deadends or roadblocks or potholes that children and families run into along the way. And it is -- it's a function of how -- what happens either in how the policy was written or how the implementation happened that you don't have the health system articulating with the education system as it should, or the foster care system articulating with the health system as it should and can.

And by identifying where those deadends and roadblocks and potholes are that you can have a much broader effect for children countywide. And -- and so that's kind of how -- how I play it out in my mind that, by focusing on more catalyzing systems change can make it so that you're -- you know, making it so that systems articulate with each other so that parents and families and children have better access, better quality, and therefore better outcomes through the -- the services that they -- that they get.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Trish.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: I agree with you and Nancy. We don't -- we can't make more money, but the only way we can have more money to do some of these things that Nancy talked about and you're talking about is by working with other people who have money. And so if we want to continue to help with services and direct services -- not direct services necessarily, but -- but services for families that are at risk, then what we need to do is partner with people who have money. Some of those are private partners and some of those are public partners. And so if that's what we choose one of our choices we want to do, is to continue seeing programs and services exist and we can't -- we don't have the money to do that, then it sort of puts in there the necessity that we have to work with others or we have to find something else we want to do.

And there are a number of ways to work with other entities, be they public or private. One is to help identify, like Nancy was saying, the roadblocks and how we can get through those roadblocks. Some of the other ways we can do it is by facilitating, bringing them all together. So there's a lot of ways we can do that. If that's what we want to do, but we can't make more money, but we can create a situation where we have more money to do so.

One of the things that bothers me from earlier today and all of the people that showed up for the agenda item about ending the grants -- and I totally get ending the grants. I'm not fighting that or anything. But for me, it -- it seems a shame that we spent for some of those grants were around for 12, apparently, years and they built up a infrastructure in some communities that, you know, doesn't exist once those structures are gone. And again, I'm not trying to be critical of the staff because I think they do a great job, but I just wonder, because I really don't know, so I'm -- I but -- I wonder if, as we go forward, because this is not going to be the first meeting where we talk about ending grants, I assume.

It's going to keep coming up as a theme over the next five years.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Every March and April, this
what we mean by sustainability. Layco, for example, was
the largest Head Start provider forever and ever, for 35
years. And then suddenly we got cut by 47 percent. So
are we sustainable? I don't know what -- those people
that got laid off would tell that you we weren't.

So I'd like to maybe put it down a little bit,
get a little bit more definition of what we mean by that.
If you look at our chart back there, you get the
impression that First 5 is not sustainable either because
our funds are going down every year.

And so I want to just keep us a little bit into
the original notion of what Prop 10 was about, and it's
because I'm looking at these five components -- these five
major areas. And as I looked it up online, there were
five -- there were actually five areas that were the
primary purpose of what these dollars are supposed to be
used for. And my only concern is that we would get, like
many organizations do once they've been together for so
long and they have a strategic plans that get entered
into, is we move further and further away from what the
original intent of those dollars were about.

So we ought to -- I would suggest that, as we
discuss this further down the road, that we look at those
five again and just look at them afresh because it talks
about child immunization, vision, hearing tests. Those
are not things that we're going to provide. It's not
necessarily a systems issue that we're really looking at
here. It talks about prenatal and postnatal maternal and
infant nutrition services. The third one is domestic
violence intervention, prevention, and treatment --
treatment for children suffering from problems related to
drug and alcohol abuse, child care health care and social
services not provided by existing programs.

So that is our charge with the dollars that the
taxpayer is giving us. It's not our money. It's somebody
else's money. So we have to at least pay attention to
what the original purpose of what those monies were about
and then springboard off that and, say, okay, how do we
now pack this down and funnel it to the point where we're
not chasing every white rabbit that comes around and
suddenly we have no money to really give to any of these.
But we ought to be careful that we're not leaving any of
those out. We're pack it down so tightly that now we've
left out one of the original intents of those tax dollars
that don't belong to us. We're serving here because this
law went into effect and we don't want to just become
another governing body that starts to -- sole purpose is
just to remain existing.

And so let's look for other dollars for
ourselves, let's go looking for other parties because we
will be the discussion.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Right. Right.

MS. BELSHE: The system with the board approved
guidelines.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: There's going to be
discussions.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: So with that in mind, I
wonder where -- and I don't know where this fits in on the
chart, but how many months in advance do we identify
grants that are ending and then how much of a role should
we or could we play in introducing -- like some of the
people that were here today talked about, you know, they
come from smaller communities. They don't have access or
knowledge of foundations and people at a high level. And
if they call a foundation looking for some funding to help
them continue the program that we started and worked, you
know, for them to have for 12 years, but maybe we have
contacts with foundations at a high level, you know, could
part of our role be to facilitate bringing them together
with the foundations. If they call, they may not even
make it to the first -- first base. But if we called and
brought them together, maybe they would.

And so I don't know where it fits in all of this.

MS. BELSHE: Actually, it fits really well in the
context of the governance guidelines that the board
approved at the last next meeting because on a go-forward
basis in context of new investments, there's a requirement
for a sustainability plan, requirement for leveraging
provisions. So we're in the process now of developing how
to best implement the board approved guidelines. But as
the board discussed in multiple meetings, those guidelines
are stating very clearly an expectation by First 5 LA that
at the front end, sustainability and leveraging are going
to be built into the design, as opposed to an afterthought
years down the road.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: And I guess what I'm asking,
there's small steps in sustainability that we could take
or there's bigger steps we could take, and somewhere along
that line --

MS. BELSHE: And it's probably going to vary.
It's probably going to vary.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Art.

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: Yeah. Just a few things
that have come to mind as I've been hearing the
discussion. The whole notion of sustainability kind of
bothers me, just the notion of it. If you really look at
it, nothing is -- how long? How long do we have to
sustain. To me, that's really vague. Nothing is
sustainable forever and forever.

So I kind of would like to see some definition,
want to increase what we're about.

No, I mean, I personally would not like to see
that happen. We're in trouble if you look at that chart
back there. But within the guidelines of that chart, we
ought to not lose sight of these five areas and say, even
if it's a smidgen of this, a smidgen of that, all five of
them are covered and we're going to concentrate fully on
these areas.

MS. BELSHE: It's a good reminder of the
underlying initiative that's our foundation and that's
something we'll make sure that we are including in our
board and committee packets just as a reminder for all of
us.

Just a quick comment or two are drawn on
sustainability. That chart does tell us we're not
sustainable. So if you look -- to your point of, if you
look at that chart and you think we're not sustainable,
you're absolutely right. Even if First 5 LA stops
supporting all of our contracts that are slated to come to
an end, we still would be spending more money than we're
taking in. So that's one of the reasons why
sustainability has been put forward and defined -- and
defined in the governance guidelines as maintaining
programming and its impact on the well-being of children
and families. So it's not sustaining an organization or

sustaining First 5 LA. It's wanting to enter into
partnerships with organizations and others who together we
agree has approached to try to maintain the impact that we
seek through our investments beyond the expiration of our
dollars.

So I -- I think one of the points you're making
7 of does represent one of those big choice that was
included, which is, what should be our sources of revenue.
And I'm hearing Arturo say, we need to figure out a way to
live within our means, recognizing those means are going
down and there's an initiative that identifies five areas.
Alternatively, we've heard commissioners say, you know, we
need to be entrepreneurial and we need to find ways to
bring additional revenues in. That's another example of a
important strategic choice.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: A couple of things. One is,
if you were referring to me -- and I don't know if you
are, but I'm not saying necessarily bring more money in,
but work with people who have money.

MS. BELSHE: No, I'm just saying, there's choices
about revenues.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: But, Arturo, to your point
about the five areas, I think that we need to also take
into account that, when those five areas were put
together, we didn't have the Affordable Care Act and we
didn't have vision and dental and all of those areas for
children zero to five that we have today. So I think we
have to take into account the changes that have taken
place in the last 15 years in terms of different funding.

COMMISSIONER DELGADO: So that being true, then
we -- that helps free us to concentrate on some of those
other areas but give an explanation as to how those others
are actually going to be sustained through other programs.

Because I don't think it's charging us to create new
programs; it's charging to us look at existing programs,
where the services are being provided. And if they're
there, that's good for us because that just allows us to
say that area is covered, so we can pack down now and go
and concentrate more on other areas.

MS. BELSHE: Although vision and dental is a
really good example of one of the critical strategic
choices we face. So the initiative, as the commissioner
reminds us, calls out explicitly vision and dental. First
5 LA is meeting the requirements that direction by funding
direct services, direct vision and dental services, which
as we've discussed in a number of board meetings for as
long as I've been here now, are services that are covered
through the Medicaid program.

So as I -- you've heard me say before, I think it
calls out for us a really interesting and important
question: What is our role. Is it to fund services for
which in this case there actually is another funding
sources? Or is our role -- and/or is our role to work in
the context of research and policy and advocacy to try to
better understand what are the barriers that make it
difficult for Medi-Cal families to get their young
children connected to vision and dental and try to get
policy change so that those kids whose families have a
Medi-Cal card in their pocket get the services that
Medi-Cal's already paying for.

In my mind, that's a really good example of, we
can be a funder of service or we can be involved in policy
and advocacy, but to the same goal, which is consistent
with the intent of Prop 10 that Art reminds us of.

MR. LaFRANCE: That's great.

MS. NUÑO: Commissioners, I'm mindful of the time
and I just want to make sure, if there's any additional
input into the decision making criteria -- I appreciate
this the first time you're seeing it. And as Steven said,
this is not going to be the last time we're going to be
talking about it, but we do want to make sure that, you
know, we're respectful of any additional input you have
into criteria that we can add or consider.

MS. BELSHE: Jessica, would you suggest, given
that commissioners are seeing this for the first time and
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type of impact that we seek to achieve and the organization that we aspire to achieve that impact.

So those are the upcoming updates and engagement points with you all. So we look forward to that. And thank you for your time today.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you, Jessica, and thank you guys for coming.

Meeting adjourned.

(At 5:02 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

---
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