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COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We have a pretty comprehensive agenda this afternoon.

MS. BELSHE: You need to be somewhere?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: (Inaudible)

MS. BELSHE: Don't say it. I know there's so many different day cares.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Anyway, the first order of business is roll call. I'm Duane Dennis, and I'm a commissioner, and I chair this heavenly body.

MS. BELSHE: Heavenly body.

COMMISSIONER AU: Nancy Au, Commissioner. One of the angels.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Susan Bostwick, Department of Public Health.

MR. STEELE: Craig Steele, legal counsel.

MS. VAKITA: Alice Vakita, director of program development.

MS. RAMSON: Kim Taylor Ramson, advancement project.

MS. RIVAS: Carolyn Rivas, advancement project.

MS. MUNOZ: Maybelle Munoz, program development, First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: (Inaudible) First 5 LA.
MS. GOODS: Kelly Goods, research and evaluation, First 5 LA.

SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

MR. HILDEBRAND: Alex Hildebrand, Learning for Action.

MR. LAFRANCE: Steven LaFrance, Learning for Action

MS. MERRICK: Beth (inaudible) Merrick, First 5 LA.

MS. NUNO: Teresa Nuno, program and planning, First 5 LA.

MS. ANDREWS: Antoinette Andrews, Best Start communities, First 5 LA.

MR. WAGNER: John Wagner, COO First 5 LA.

MR. LAU: James Lau, First 5 LA.

MR. JOSEPH: Joseph (inaudible) Los Angeles County Office of Education.

MS. BELSHE: Kim Belshe, First 5 LA.

UNKNOWN FEMALE 3: (Inaudible) First 5 LA.

UNKNOWN FEMALE 4: (Inaudible) First 5 LA.

MS. AMY: Amy (inaudible) First 5 LA.

MR. KIMBALL: John Kimball, the (inaudible) Project.

MS. LEE: (Inaudible) Lee, First 5 LA.

MR. JIMENEZ: Armando Jimenez First 5 LA,
research and evaluation.

MS. KIMBERLY: Kimberly (inaudible), First 5 LA.

UNKNOWN FEMALE 5: (Inaudible) First 5 LA.

MR. HARRIS: John Harris (inaudible)

UNKNOWN MALE 1: (Inaudible) First 5 LA.

(bg)

UNKNOWN FEMALE 6: Good afternoon, (inaudible)

MS. SHRINER: Kathy Shriner, Best Start (inaudible) city of (inaudible)

MS. SUI: Susana Sui, Los Angeles County Department of (inaudible)

MS. HOPKINS: Kelly Hopkins, SCCC.

UNKNOWN FEMALE 7: (Inaudible)

MS. VO: Linda Vo, First 5 LA.

MS. GOMEZ: Judith Gomez, First 5 LA.

COMMISSION DENNIS: We can introduce folks who just came in. You want to introduce yourselves?

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Marv Southard, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. I think we've gotten everybody. Did folks get a chance to review the minutes? Any corrections, additions or deletions? Not hearing none, we'll submit and file.

James, we've got a policy update?

MR. LAU: I'm just going to do a quick policy
update from here.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah. Right on my side.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Do you want to introduce yourself?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I'm Deanne Tilton.

MR. LAU: So, the goal for this presentation is just to provide a quick update on some major policy developments and then talk about some advocacy and next steps.

As you're probably tired of hearing me saying the Commission did approve way back a policy priorities around EC and home visiting, so on those we're looking at sustainability around those two issues. Home visiting, it's more right now around education and trying to inform policymakers about the issue and ECE its actually doing some work to try to find some sustainability on that. So, some activities that we talked about previously on trying to inform or educate policymakers around home visiting was to do a home visiting legislative briefing, which you know we had back in I think February or March of this past year. Had a great turn out, just wanted to highlight that.

This was, you know, it did attract a number of people from legislative offices and policymakers hosted by
someone named Richard Patt (phonetic) and also by Senator Carol Lu. And briefly on -- you know to celebrate the 15-year anniversary of First 5 LA, we had a -- throughout this day other First 5 counties coming to Sacramento doing visits with legislators, talking about the programs and services that -- that we've been doing and then also have a reception with other policymakers.

I think one of the highlights of the trip was the nature of our conversation with -- with policymakers? I think one of the positive things was that this shift from legislators viewing us as this place where they wanted to try to get -- get First 5 funding and more seeing us as partners and, you know, through the 15 years I think the collective message was around, you know, our -- what are our experiences and lessons learned through our investments.

I think a big thing was around the ECE, specifically around transitional kindergarten. Many legislators and just not with First 5 LA, but other counties, you know, hearing back from legislators that this year many not be a realistic year to have the universal transitional kindergarten program, but what is it that -- that early childhood advocates want and how do we begin to -- begin to fund that throughout the years. So this led us to create a, what we're calling, a pathways
document. So I want to talk through some of the -- we see some sustainability actions on policy and advocacy.

So this pathways document was something that the legislators have been asking about what they see us as wanting for the next, you know, this budget year and the next budget year. So we put together a, you know, along with First 5 Association and First 5 California and others, brought together early childhood advocates, including advancement project and LAUP to talk about what it is that the community wants.

So this conversation led to this development and Number 1 priority was and is around reimbursement rates. Increase them to the current regional market rates and to unify the current system. Then talking about trying to expand the number of services that kids have. And to look at, in the future years, tying that to quality -- quality improvements. Another -- another -- I want to say, another sustainability effort that we've talked about here is around our mobile vision program. I think there's been conversation around that looking at how we -- how we sustain that and one of the things in convening other -- other multi-vision providers is looking at the barriers to getting reimbursement through Medi-Cal and this, you know, through the conversations with them, led to a proposal that we shopped with the Department of Health Care
Services and really through, you know, through Kim's connections with the secretary, Diane Dooley, you know, getting this onto the governor's -- governor's radar.

So we do have a proposal out that not only touches on reimbursement for mobile vision services, but also for -- for oral health. (inaudible) on local control funding formula, you know, we're -- we've been through children now and advancement project and working to disseminate a tool kit to local school districts and have disseminated over a hundred tool kits to school board members supporting advancement projects proposal to -- to fund -- fund early childhood programs through -- through a resolution at the LAUS -- USD.

So that's going through and June is when the school districts will be voting upon the local control accountability plan as well as the budget associated with that. So, we're continuing to work around that trying to -- to (inaudible) gain support on the advancement projects proposal around funding early childhood programs. The last thing, I know since Commissioner Alice (phonetic) had brought it up last -- at the last commission (inaudible) increase -- increasing fees.

This is something that we are working on with other counties and the First 5 Association. You know, every year even though our revenues are diminishing, the
point of equalization continues to increase their administration fees and this not only covers their administrative cost, but also their enforcement and licensing program.

What we understand too is that, you know, the tens of millions of dollars they're also saying that they see our share of how much this costs of increasing too because, you know, of the cigarette taxes that are out there, there's four. You know, the first 5 -- the prop ten accounts for 57 -- about 57 percent of it.

Right now, we're only covering about 50 percent of it. So, (inaudible) equalization sees that our share of the administrative enforcement costs kind of rise as the years go by to be closer to about 58 percent. So, this is something that's going to be affecting -- affecting us, so it's going to be more and more administrative costs. The BOE is going to be charging to us. So we're looking at and working with budget -- the chair of the budget subcommittee to -- to cap that. And tell us to look at the different sources of funding that the Board of Equalization use instead of proposition ten dollars.

So this -- this measure or the chair will be introducing a measure on Wednesday to hopefully begin to -- to stabilize that and also look at different sources
that the Proposition Ten or Board of Equalization can tap into. So really quick moving on to May -- May revise. So because of -- so, as I mentioned this proposal around mobile vision through -- through Kim's conversations with Secretary Diane Dooley.

We did get in a -- some form of proposal in the governor's May revise, that included two million dollars for global demonstration project for project LA county to utilize mobile vision services in that. So the specific language is still being worked out, but we're going to continue to work with administration to hopefully get closer aligned to the proposal that we have in itself.

And then lastly, just around the ECE disappointingly that there wasn't really much in the May revise around ECE, so that's -- that's a huge concern to us. And last -- on the legislative agenda, I just want to say that the First 5 LA's legislative agenda continues to move forward.

Many of the bills that do have fiscal impact will -- and have been heard in Appropriations Committee and it's on suspense file right now. So suspense file is any -- any bill that has over I think a quarter of a million dollars cost associated with that. It gets put into -- on the side until the full picture of the financial -- or fiscal implications to the whole entire state will be and
then they'll look at what are the priorities for the state
and bills will be released based upon that.

SBA 37 was also heard today in Appropriations
Committee and that was put on suspense file. There's
still going to be a budget play that's going to be
associated with that. So (inaudible) is going to continue
to push for that and continue to push for -- for it to be
in this year's budget. So, you know, I think from now
until July, well really until the middle of June, we're
going to be focusing heavily on doing a -- a budget play.
So looking at the pathways document trying to increase the
regional market rate. You're going to find that.

Also looking at make being sure the mobile vision
proposal gets in there. And to also get the Board of
Equalization administrative fees level -- level and -- and
hopefully have a conversation of where the funding is
going to come from in the future years. So, with that,
I'm going to end and ask for any questions.

MS. BELSHE: Who's that?

MR. LAU: That's my daughter, Clementine.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you. Thank you, James. One
thing I want to maybe elaborate on just briefly in terms
of the Division (inaudible) Proposal. Secretary has been
very responsive to comments in terms of given the
governor's interest in this issue, very open to additional
ideas and approaches to facilitating access for young children to oral and vision services. So with that kind of support, we did invest some resources through California Strategies with -- we've talked about this before, bringing some, what I call the super smarty pants, the Title 19 or Medicaid funding experts.

The former Child Director for the state, Stan Rosenstein (phonetic) worked with us as well as vision to learn to develop a proposal, which we then did submit to the secretary and the director of the department, which was the focus of a state holder conversation and we believe is representative by what the governor put in the May revise.

So there was no -- no background, I know you weren't suggesting that, but I just want to underscore, the Secretary was very open to new ideas and we took advantage of that as an opportunity and, you know, we're going to continue to be pressing that to really build out what, right now, is a fairly modest proposal by the Administration, but it chose, I think a good step forward in terms of the approach we had -- we had suggested.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: So I had a question. And maybe this one is as much for you Kim as it is for James; I was at a post partum depression and perinatal depression screening conference awhile back and the co-presenter was
someone from Kaiser who was - Kaiser Northern California and she was talking about the difficulty and then the success.

The difficulty in implementing and the success when they did of a regular screening for depression among women who have about to give birth and who have given birth and they made that a routine part, they got great outcomes, they studied it, and so forth. So the question is with the prevention funding through ACA, is that a standard that exists or should exist or could exist that we would hope to have for -- in the -- in the system that those depression screenings take place on a regular basis.

MS. BELSHE: You know, I -- I -- I -- it's something we'll look up, Marv. I -- I -- I would -- I'm reluctant to assert it is, but there are some very specific preventative services as you know that are incorporated in the ACA For Women. So let us -- let us take that back and report back.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Okay. And then the second question is I raised this -- this at an earlier time and at that time there was no possibility of it. But E-cigarettes have become less popular than they were a little while ago. And so I was wondering if there's any chance of extending our taxing opportunities to E-cigarette?.
MS. BELSHE: Is there any legislation pending on that -- that topic yet, James?

MR. LAU: No, there isn't.

MS. BELSHE: Okay. The public health community and maybe Susanne can speak to this, is still kind of robustly debating the relative upsides and downsides of -- of E-cigarettes. So, it's something we've been watching very carefully Jonathan as the County Public Health Director has taken a strong stand along with other leading health officials and (inaudible) grads, LA city counsel passed a ban. So it's something we're watching very closely the number of (inaudible). Susanne, anything you want to add to that?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Not anything more to add on the legislative part, but only because sometimes you go to different cities and it's surprising some people that will take a different stance on it. And they'll say, "Well, it's helping with people stopping to smoke." So you -- they get some mixed reaction and I know Dr. Paul Simons has really been working on that a lot lately. So, we'll keep you updated on that, though.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: I -- I had a quick question going back to the -- to the demo project for the dental and vision. So they're putting up two million
dollars, which you said is not a lot of money, but it's a sum of money to --

MS. BELSHE: Right now it's specific to LAUSD.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: To LAUSD. Okay. And the -- one of the purposes is to find that the client who come take advantage of these services may or may not be insured. Correct?

MS. BELSHE: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Because you've -- first of all, you want to make sure that these -- these services that should be covered by Medi-Cal are covered.

MS. BELSHE: Right.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: The second thing is that you're still relying on the particular client that's in there to find out if they're currently covered or not. If they're covered, then you have a billing source, which is great, but if they're uncovered and they're not eligible for Medi-Cal, then is this pilot or this project really going to pull out for the weeds what --

MS. BELSHE: Yeah. The pilot actually Susanne and we can circulate James the -- the paper it's like a three or four page overview. It's -- it's an approach model on a previously successfully employed approach with the Healthy Families Program. Early in it's -- what I like to call the program formerly known as Healthy
Families.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Right.

MS. BELSHE: That early in its tenure was having a hard time connecting kids to dental services. And so, they created this -- this special pilot approach that basically allowed services to be provided regardless of insurance status.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Right.

MS. BELSHE: So there's an agreed upon estimated percentage of kids who would not otherwise be eligible and then those dollars are backed out. So there's no need for the kids or the parents of the children receiving services to provide that type of information.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Great.

MS. BELSHE: So it's all about reducing the barriers associated with eligibility.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Makes perfect sense.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Thanks.

COMMISSIONER AU: Can I ask a quick --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- back to the Board of Equalization. What is the level of transparency can we expect from them when they say that we are still not at parity in terms of covering administrative costs. Do we
just take their word for it or is there going to be some level of detailing.

MR. LAU: Yeah. That's -- that's been a -- therein a difficulty we've been having and I think that's the nature of the conversations we've been having for -- I mean I think some of the -- some of the participants have been on this for the past three or four years because transparency has been very obtuse. And we're getting more and more information, but it's still lacking so I think we're -- what's clear is that their program is just very expensive and I think it's just looking at -- at -- I mean I think the big issue is that -- that in the initiative. I don't think people or the voters had -- or were under the impression that it was going to cover the enforcement.

MS. BELSHE: And costs.

MR. LAU: And unfortunately, licensing is something that's -- that was -- that was -- that took place after Proposition Ten passed. So that's the part that's -- that's starting to rise even more and more because Board of Equalization is having a very sophisticated and best programs in the whole entire country around enforcement.

MS. BELSHE: Which arguably -- which arguably enters to our benefit because if you have strong
enforcement, then they're ensuring that revenues being collected on tobacco products that's might otherwise be sold underground. So it's -- it is not a transparent issue at all, Nancy, and it's one of the issues why, as James noted, we have frankly reached the end of our rope as it relates to working administratively. And so, whether it be through a legislative solution or finding a way for an audit to occur to shine some light. You know, we need to pay our fair share. But it's not entirely clear if we are, in fact, paying our fair share or paying a lot more.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes, and that's the question to me.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AU: So anyway, thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Anybody else? I just want to draw out the -- the ECE stuff because I think that's, you know, really important so whereas the Governor did not place any additional funds for early childhood education, there's a lot going on in Sacramento, not only with the Woman's Caucus, but with Sebastian's built (phonetic) around convergence of the standard reimbursement rate and the RMR with -- with -- with hopes of raising compensation for childcare providers. So I expect a lot -- a lot's going to happen between now and the end of June and to the
degree that we could let the community know as a First 5 as to where things are and how community folks can perhaps advocate, write letters of support throughout maybe our Monday morning bulletin or whatever we do. I think that -- that could be helpful because it's a long time between now and our next commission meeting. So we really need to let folks know how they can advocate on behalf of provider compensation and increasing rates, you know, for child care providers so I would hope that First 5 has -- has a place in that space.

MR. LAU: Yeah, and just to -- to note at that, in the -- one of the, I think, two weeks ago the MMR did include First 5 in there about the -- but not in the budget itself.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah. But with May revise just having coming out, that's a good time to do it.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: So again, it's going to be a lot of activity between now and the end of June. Okay. Going on. Thank you, James. ECE landscape, Liz, Kim, (inaudible) in that order.

MS. IIDA: And mine, I'll be very brief. So I'd like to welcome back the members of the Advancement Project here to provide us an update on the ECE landscape. You might recall last month, we were -- we had two presenters John Kim, who's now sitting in the audience,
and then, we had Kim and Patola (phonetic) Brownson who talked and shared some of their findings and data about the quality of types of ECE services and programs throughout the county. And today, our focus is more on professionals who are serving our young children throughout the county, as well as quality of programs and services that's the young children are receiving. So, I'm going to turn it over to Kim, but I'd also like to mention that we have a very packed agenda today so for this item, we have allotted 30 minutes. Twenty minutes will be with Kim and Caroline, we'll be sharing their data and information. And then, we'll leave about ten minutes at the end for question and answer.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thank you, Liz.
Hello, Kim.

MS. BROWNSON: Hi. So I'm actually putting us on a stopwatch and if I do not do my job, feel free to let me know. So, I want to actually start by thanking Kim and Liz and Maybelle and Young for the opportunity to give this interim, sort of update on where we are in terms of this project. You'll probably recall at the April commission meeting, we brought a number of maps about the access gaps here in the ECE landscape and LA county and we're coming back today to give an overview of some of the findings that we have in terms of workforce
and quality and quality improvement.

I want to underscore really that this is a snapshot really of 2014 data. And the full report, which will be released in June, is about 200 pages so you'll have an opportunity to dive much deeper, there's a number of data tables and maps that will be forthcoming that will also help flesh this out. So I'm going to just turn it over to Caroline first, and then, I'll continue later on quality.

MS. RIVAS: Great. Thanks, Kim. So, for our workforce section, really our inquiry around looking at the workforce in LA County and trying to understand the current landscape, was to get a sense of how skillful and knowledgeable the workforce is.

And so what are some of the qualifications and characteristics of the workforce for some of our research questions, as well as what training, both informal and formal were available to the workforce and what opportunities or policies and strategies that were maybe influencing accessibility of those trainings.

We always want to clarify what some of our limitations were, not to discourage you from the information I'm about to tell you, but just to let you know that we did have some limitations. Time is always an issue, so we were not able to do any broad primary data
collection.

We did conduct 15 key informant interviews, talking to program administrators, managers, trainers that are out in the community working in the workforce to improve their education. We also looked at kind of two key administrative data sets. One was looking at the stipend programs, so AB 212 through the office of child care and LAUP's Aspire Cares Plus.

We looked at workforce qualifications and characteristics in those programs that was available, and then, we also looked at LAUP contractors and Head Start and Early Head Start contractors that had data available on their force.

So diving in, one of the first key areas that we looked at were -- does positions differ by education levels. Does it make a difference what your education level is in relation to the job title? And as you'll see from this particular slide, assistant teachers we found that 36 percent held an Associate's Degree or higher, but 64 percent had no degree. When we looked at lead teachers, though, we really didn't see any pattern in terms of education levels really impacting the position title that folks had, while 68 percent held an Associate's Degree or higher that were in lead teacher positions. There were still 311 percent that had no degree that were
in lead teacher positions and this was looking at the AB 212 an Aspire Stipend program participants.

We then wanted to look at does compensation differ by education levels and we are sad to report that it did not appear that one's education level really influenced where they were at in terms of compensation. So, for instance, in looking at center-based folks that were working center-based they were earning -- those earning $17,000 or less in one year, 42 percent of those had an Associate's or higher degree with 50 percent having no degree.

When we looked at family child care, participants that were working with family child care settings, those earning $15,000 or less in one year, 40 percent of those had an Associate's or higher degree. Now, we know in family child care there's different factors, folks are self-employed and setting their own rates and depending on how many number of children they're working with, but it was -- I don't know if it's surprising is the right word, but it was interesting to find that -- that there may be some deterrents there, folks don't feel like improving their education is really going to improve their compensation and we did hear some of those comments in the key informant interviews.

Then we wanted to see, you know, does
compensation differ by number of years in the field, the
longer you're working does your compensation go up and we
did start to see, as most of us that work in our careers,
our compensation goes up as we continue to work longer and
the same was true for those we looked at in the stipend
programs.

We had 51 percent of those that had been in the
field ten or more years were making $30,000 to $75,000.
Now living in LA that's still not necessarily something
easy to get by on, but -- but their compensation was
higher. Family child care participants also had a similar
pattern in terms of 67 percent of those working 10 or more
years were making $35,000 to $60,000 annually. Some of
the demographic characteristics that we were able to look
at for the participants, this is again the stipend program
participants looking at race, you can see that
predominantly the majority were Hispanic, both in
center-based and family child care settings.

There was a question that was asked of those
participants around whether or not they spoke a language
other than English. So we have information on those that
were bilingual speakers, and again, it's 50 percent in
both center and family child care that were bilingual
speakers.

We did not have information on the actual
languages spoken, but one might assume, if you look at the race of the program participants, that the language is probably most likely Spanish. The other area of inquiry was looking at the availability of formal and informal professional development training programs. We did find that there are a number of opportunities out there for folks to access formal and informal trainings.

There's a variety of organizations, the Child Care Alliance, R&R Agencies, the Gateways program is offering informal trainings. Often the centers will have, you know, in-service types of trainings for their workers that they provide and the articulation agreements between two year community colleges and four year universities, CSU is in terms of making sure those courses can transfer to those four-year universities. But there are also barriers to accessing some of this training that's available.

One barrier that was brought up was incompatible scheduling. When thinking about taking courses at universities, folks are working during the day and are there courses available in the evening or on the weekends that folks can access. Are they in languages that folks are most comfortable in terms of taking those courses? Again, kind of individual attitudes, is it going to make a difference if I go and get -- improve my education in
terms of compensation or types of positions I might hold in a setting.

And then, lack of kind of clear information on how to access some of those pathways in terms of moving from two-year to a four-year. And then, even some of the informal trainings, there's no connection between informal training and formal training.

So if we go through a program with informal training sessions and get educated in that way, how does that apply to maybe course credit at a community college or four-year college.

So those are some of the barriers that we heard from folks. There is also a number of existing supports and incentives. We mentioned the stipend programs was one area where we were able to look at the workforce characteristics and that was lifted up as a positive.

One thing that we looked at for the AB 212 participants, we were able to look at trends over time and we found that -- we saw 919 degree changes ranging from an Associate's to a Master's level for those participating two or more years in the AB 212 program.

MS. BELSHE: I'm sorry, Caroline. What does that mean? "919 degree changes"?

MS. BROWNSON: So they either moved from -- individuals either moved from an Associate's to a
Bachelor's, Bachelor's and Master's, and so it was looking at -- I think we looked at six years over time of how many changes happened through that period.

MS. BELSHE: Specific to that one program?

MS. RIVAS: Yes.

MS. BELSHE: That one stipend program?

MS. RIVAS: Yes.

MS. BELSHE: Got it.

MS. RIVAS: We did find that a number of folks needed four or more years in order to move forward. Again, some of the barriers that folks talked about, limited eligibility, in terms of who might be eligible for a stipend program, there's also limited funding in terms of accessing some of the stipend programs.

Another model program that folks talked about that I failed to mention was the Project Vistas in terms of having (inaudible). Folks were able to take course with other -- with peer support and folks from the same culture, same language, getting really specialized, intense, academic advisement to the -- you know, to where that person is calling them as opposed to the individual having to contact them and really pushing folks and helping them move -- move along through that program was seen as a positive support.

Some of the policy influences that we heard and
observed on workforce, we see different teacher qualification standards with some of the requirements and mandates and so that may be influencing on some of the fluctuations that we see in qualifications.

We did see, because we looked at Head Start qualifications and those mandates around Head Start teachers having Bachelor's degrees. We saw close to 90 percent that had a Bachelor's degree, and so, we can see how mandates can influence education levels, but there's also funding support to help folks achieve -- improve their education.

Compensation was an issue as was mentioned AB 2125 might be an avenue to help increase compensation, and then, public perception. Public perception, around is it just child care or is it child development and education in terms of getting folks and policymakers to think about it differently.

Some of our broad conclusions, there's certainly -- this is, you know, in terms of looking at data that was (inaudible) on the workforce, it was a small sub set that we were able to look at, but that's because there's not a lot of data out there in one place or even in multiple places that lines up in terms of types of information being collected.

So that could be -- there's definitely a data gap
there in terms of information. The other key thing is we saw that there were two workforces thinking about those that, you know, graduate from high school, kind of go through the traditional path in terms of moving on to a four-year college, getting their degree and going into the ECE field as opposed to those that may be graduated high school, fall into or don't graduate high school, fall into the ECE field, and then, are not really sure about how to access some of those more formal education avenues, and not comfortable doing that.

So we have to think about maybe putting in requirements or mandates. How do you support both of those workforces? Because both of them still need relevant course work and training, it's just when they have different types of support that are necessary to help them along. My ten minutes are up. So I'm going to pass it off to Kim to talk about quality.

MS. BROWNSON: Great. Thank you. So the next (inaudible) is where we would dive back into the conversation around quality, and we had almost a dozen research questions that we were focusing on in terms of quality, but I'm going to actually take us through instead of a smaller subset and highlight some of the key findings.

On this first page, the two key questions that
we're looking at are the saturation rates, which means rates of participation in QRIS programs and then the descriptive profile of providers that are participating in the programs thus far.

On the next slide we're going to be covering more of the characteristics of highly rated QRIS participants, the barriers to participation and quality improvement, and then, I'll briefly touch on the policy landscape, but I believe most of that was actually covered by James's presentation so I don't actually plan to dwell too long there. The quality analysis limitations are very much overlapping with what Caroline already covered.

I'll just highlight the last two bullets, which is to say that in the data that was available from the three QRIS systems in Los Angeles from Race To The Top from LAUP and from Step -- from LA County Office of Child Care, one issue that was particularly thorny is that there's a number of programs participants that have gone -- undergone partial rating, and then, essentially gotten stuck.

And so enable -- in order to compare apples to apples, there was a lot of data that turned out to be unusable and that was even quite old in terms of a program participant who had expressed interest, signed up, and then never got to full rating completion.
The last bullet is around sort of the aging process of data, which is rather rapid and we know, at least for the Race to the Top in LA county, Step Program that much of the data has already been far exceeded from the data collection point that we had essentially been taking up the data earlier this year.

So the first slide here is around saturation rates. And essentially what this is is broken out in terms of centers on the top and family child care homes on the bottom. I want to clarify also that although we're looking at quality what we're looking at here is essentially two very unique windows into quality, so that's QRIS participation and NAEYC accreditation.

We know that quality is happening, we know that quality improvement is happening, but we need to be able to measure it in order to be rigorous and analytic about how we're looking at quality. And so the more sort of impressionistic sort of examples that are -- are a little bit more at the level of anecdote, aren't necessarily going to capture this, but this will give us a better grasp of the data.

So the top lines on saturation essentially are that QRIS is still very much in it's infancy in Los Angeles. The rate of uptake for centers is about nine percent participation and family child care homes, that
works out to about two percent and the total universe that we're looking at is 453 sites between centers and family childcare home that are, in fact, rated out of just a little over 10,000 total homes and centers across the county.

The next slide is a sampling of a profile of rated programs that are, in fact, participating. What we see on the pie chart on far left is that it is overwhelmingly centers that are participating in the QRIS process.

The overlapping circles on the right of ages served shows a very heavy skew towards preschool programs. Family child care homes are about 50 percent serving zero to five. So, inclusive of both preschool, as well as infants and toddlers, the rate is much lower for center-based care.

It's about 3 percent of all program participants that are serving full zero to five. Also, to just preview, they're not here and we're not going it go through them right now, but in the full report, we have a lot of the geo cuts available as to what the geographic distribution is in terms of race, demographics and just geographic spread as to where QRIS participants are throughout the county.

The next slide is essentially an overview of the
characteristics of the programs that are rated. As I mentioned, it is very heavily skewed towards centers and that trend holds true for highly rated sites, as well. So in order to qualify to be deemed a highly rated QRIS center, you have to score a four or a five and more than two-thirds of the centers are, in fact -- of the highly rated programs are center-based there.

Of the entire sample, of 453 rated sites, we have about 260 sites that are in fact rated very highly. So, that's 57 percent of the total sample participating and what we know is that the quality picture is quite different.

We know that of the rated sites, it's only three percent of all of the supply available in the county and yet it's 57 percent of program participants in - in the QRIS systems. The next slide is a combination of various participation, as well as quality improvement. This is largely data that was gathered through key informant interviews with statewide organizations, county organizations and program level folks. And on the barriers to actual participation, one of the key things that was listed was that right now for many of the programs, participation is completely voluntary, which means that it requires some knowledge of why it's useful, if you actually want to incentivize participation rather
than making it mandatory, which is the case for LAUP.

There is an ongoing current of a narrative around the lack of funding for expansion of the program, for training, for proper assessment and for harmonizing of assessment tools, and then, there's just a sort of baseline of common misapprehensions and misunderstandings as to how the ratings will be used, whether they would be required to be public depending on which system one participates in.

And then, also questions around design in terms of what recourse there is available if someone disagrees with a rating that has been offered. In terms of quality improvement, some of the -- the barriers that are listed in terms of participation also recur in terms of funding, certainly that's true, but there's also a lot of echoes of the workforce conversation earlier of higher ratings require higher levels of education and overcrowded community colleges and CSU systems that can accommodate the -- the students who actually want to take the classes and also not having p.m. offerings for those courses.

There's also an issue of the accessibility and the understandability of the class scores and the environmental rating skills and of just knowing what quality looks like, of having a living, breathing example to look at.
And then, one thing that I'll note in particular is that as we did interviews with family child care homes, there was a sense that because it's difficult to get a substitute if you actually run a family child care center out of your home, many of the improvement activities are -- seem very much out of reach for family childcare homes. The last slide is on policy influences and I'll actually just defer to James's presentation and say that I think a lot of -- of -- of what he already touched on is covered here. There is certainly a great sense of anticipation as to what is going to be happening in the field with the Steinberg Bill, the Lu (phonetic) Bill, and also the Calderon Bill around licensing.

All of those, as James mentioned, are on suspense in the Appropriations Committee in the Senate or actually the Lu and Steinberg Bill are in appropriations in the Senate and what is exciting though about that is that May 23rd is just around the corner and that's when we should know when they're getting off of suspense, which is exciting and very soon.

So the key conclusions here are essentially that we -- we have a very small window into this universe. This is a small set of data that we have thus far. It's promising. It's promising and we know that there are lots of highly rated sites that are participating, but we also
know that the universe of total sites is much larger.
It's very clear from the outset that infants and toddlers
are largely left out of this analysis, that the extent to
which they come in comes through family childcare homes
and only to the extent that preschoolers are already
there.

One thing that's quite interesting, I -- I had
mentioned at the outset that the two windows into quality
were QRIS and the NAEYC Accreditation Process. On the
maps that you'll see in the full report later, there's a
total geographic mismatch in terms of who gets an NAEYC
accreditation and who gets QRIS rating. NAEYC is out of
your own pocket. It is privately provided for and skews
much more to affluent communities to have that signature
of approval and QRIS is actually a much more democratic,
small D, democratic in the sense of being broadly
distributed and targeted to communities of highest need
and also Best Start communities.

The last thing I'll just say is I think a
recurrent theme throughout is the question really of what
is going to be happening with funding. This partially
points to the conversation around policy. It also points
to the conversation around the Race To The Top pilot
funding from the feds coming to a close in December of
2015. And pretty recurrent threads of conversation around
whether we are building quality to a cliff or whether we are building it to sort of take charge and -- and do something quite exciting to improve outcomes for children -- children and families throughout LA County.

There is definitely a sense of -- of excitement, but also I think of great uncertainty. I think across the board, though, there is a -- a recurring thread of wanting to essentially do more and do it better. And I think we have a couple of minutes for questions.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Questions, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER AU: Just to -- again, to understand some of your data, if I could, when you -- when you talked about the compensation pace what the earnings were, was that based on full-time or part-time status?

MS. RIVAS: It was a pretty complicated calculation, but we had who was working full-time and part-time and we calculated though on a full-time. And the methodology is in the full report.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. And let's see. The other is when you -- when you used -- when you looked at certain projects, programs, Head Start, so on and so forth, you looked at some of those workforce initiatives or programs to facilitate more of -- of these childcare workers or preschool providers to enter into a training program.
Did you factor in First 5 LA's investment as well? Because we had invested in a workforce initiative, as well, I think in 2010, was it?

Duane, I'm looking --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. I think it was 2010.

MS. RIVAS: We did -- when we looked at informal and formal training access, we looked at evaluation reports; so we did have from research and evaluation a number of reports like on the Project Vistas, the Gateways Program and we looked at -- what else did we look at? I'm trying to remember.

MS. BROWNSON: Step.

MS. RIVAS: Well, the Step was through the quality piece. So we weren't able to look at everything. We know there's a number of programs out there, but we -- we did look at some of the First 5 investments as well. And then, in our -- another piece to the project in question, too, we are looking at past rolls and strategies for First 5 around these areas of ECE, so more of that will likely come out in that report, as well.

COMMISSIONER AU: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I just have a question.

The age of the children, were they all -- four-year-olds?
How -- was there a range? Two, three, four, five or all four-year-olds that you looked at?

MS. BROWNSON: For what part of analysis? Sorry. For what part of the analysis? For workforce?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: For any of the analysis.

Were these childcare centers or family centers caring for two, three, four-year-olds or just four-year-olds?

MS. BROWNSON: So there is the overlapping bubbles there are age breaks, essentially, in terms of who participates in the QRIS system. And what you see, essentially, it is -- it is very heavily skewed towards four-year-olds through preschool, that's also because the largest availability of data on QRIS comes from LAUP. They have the largest program participation and, in fact, it's mandatory for LAUP so the numbers for centers of 287 centers that are rated, it's 215 that are LAUP centers. For family childcare homes, it's only 71 that are LAUP that are out of a 166.

So the family childcare homes definitely have more of an age sampling and that bears out in the green overlapping circles showing that about half of family childcare homes are in fact zero to five. Sorry. It's a little hard to see over there. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Thank you. I guess I'm thinking that there's more and more research about
children's ability to learn at a very early age and it
would be very interesting for us to know how effective we
could be with two-year-olds and three-year-olds when we
have -- tend to focus on just four-year-olds.

MS. BROWNSON: And oh actually, the last slide,
which I did not go through, is a timeline of upcoming
activities. So actually this Friday, we're turning in the
report on question two, which is the question of past
rolls played by both First 5 LA as well as other county
commissions and other funders of ECE, and so we'll be
benchmarking some activities and investments undertaken by
other funders that have focused more on the zero to three
sort of area. Coming to a theater near you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Kim, noteworthy is the
absence in -- in defining workforce license exempt care.
It's not part of -- of -- of this particular report. And
their must be a reason why.

MS. BROWNSON: For QRIS, the sort of -- the cost
of entry is essentially being a licensed program. So none
of either Race To The Top, LAUP or Step will include
programs that have not gone through the licensing
programs. That's not terribly unusual for QRIS pilots or
even fully blown existing systems at other places around
the country.

San Francisco, and you'll see this more in the
question two report, actually has done quite a bit of work around creating a pipeline to get license exempt providers through the process of getting licensing and then to participate in their QRIS system, but it's not something that has had an incredible of attraction here in LA, thus far. I don't know if you want to talk about it.

MS. RIVAS: Yeah. For workforce it was really we were not able to identify a data source looking at center, you know, for understanding what some of those qualifications might be a centralized data source, it was difficult enough for those licensed centers in terms of finding that information. And so we made the decision to focus on the licensed centers for what we could find.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Any other thoughts? Comments? Questions?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Just a quick one.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Susanne.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: I like the idea that you really were realizing or you're acknowledging that people enter into the workforce by different pathways and so you have different people that are coming in not traditionally through school, but they ended up in childcare.

And to able to offer them different types of training when you're also saying that there's incompatible scheduling. Will one of your recommendations center
around the possibility of offering some of these trainings at nontraditional times or nontraditional places for this type of staff to be able to take advantage of that?

MS. BROWNSON: We definitely raise that up as something that should be considered and looked at.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: If you're doing it out of your and how are you -- as you acknowledge, trying to get something to replace you when you're not there. It's very difficult. So putting more and more barriers on somebody to try to get out there at that time to be able to get paid would be great.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And -- and -- and you brushed on the whole idea of tying compensation to quality. I mean, and -- and saw -- perhaps in your final report you'll speak more to that and -- and -- and look at some of that which we've taken up as a commission and how we can help, perhaps, you know, aide into the discussion around tiered reimbursement and quality connected to compensation.

MS. BROWNSON: Definitely. And there's also some elements that are already happening with the LAUP QRIS project so that compensation is, in fact, tied or additive compensation is, in fact, tied to having the higher levels of quality. So that's already happening and LA, which is quite exciting.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. Any other thoughts? Questions?

COMMISSIONER AU: i do. And I think what is glaring for me, you know, just given your report, I guess I focused in on some of your listing of limitations. And I think I expanded it even further because when we think about the whole universe of children being born in LA County, and how many of them actually are -- are cared for by childcare providers, whether they're licensed, unlicensed, informal, formal, whatever else, we're seeing again the numbers getting smaller.

And then, when we -- when we talk about center-based and those that are -- are logging into the QRIS, and versus the ones that are family based, I mean there's a distinction, as well. So we keep -- I keep seeing this narrowing of the numbers. And so, I -- I think for me, I find it very useful to keep that in perspective because when we are saddled with wanting to -- to do something about -- or leave the vision as a major challenge that we may potentially have an impact on -- on reducing.

I have to always think in perspective of we're really talking about a really small number of children that's going to be benefiting from whatever -- whatever initiative we may think of doing.
So I think we -- you know, for me, it's helpful to keep things in perspective. And I don't know if we'll ever be able to overcome this notion of keeping our conversation in -- in the context of the fact that we're talking about a limited number of children versus the universe of children here in LA County. So I -- I -- I -- anyway, for me, it's helpful.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay.

MS. BROWNSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other thoughts? Comments? Not hearing none, we look forward to the next phase. Thank you all very much.

Now we have to move to LAUP contract performance matrix and -- and budget. I must abstain from this discussion; so, Marv, could you chair this item?

COMMISSIONER SOUTHERD: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And I'll return on Item 6. You'll come get me?

MS. BELSHE: Okay.

MS. MUNOZ: Okay. I don't -- oh, everybody can hear me. I don't need a mike.

So good afternoon, Commissioners. Today, I'm going to share a very high level overview of LAUP's contract as an information item and we'll come back in June to the Full Commission for approval.
Before we get started, I wanted to share with you some of the context and assumptions that we used to develop and negotiate the draft performance matrix and budget that you are will see today.

So we know that there are two years remaining in the master agreement with LAUP. We also know that LAUP strategic and business plans are to be completed by June 30th of this year and they will be submitted to First 5 LA by July 31st of this year.

So we wanted to account for the submittal of those documents in the preparation of the performance matrix and budget. Then we considered First 5 LAs newly adopted governance (inaudible), which you're all very familiar with, specifically Number 7, which calls for grants to end at their scheduled end date.

And we are very mindful of LAUP's master agreement end date of June 30th of 2016, which is why we wanted to provide flexibility that can help support LAUP's transition into their new strategic direction.

So a little bit about the contract. As you are aware, we have the master agreement, which ends in June 30th of 2016. And the exhibits are the ones that's change every year. Today we'll be going over the proposed performance matrix and proposed budget fiscal year 14-15, which are the two exhibits that really guide the work for
LAUP in -- in a given year.

So first let's review the performance matrix; I'll walk you over some of the handouts, which are included in the commission packet. Bolded items are new areas that LAUP and First 5 LA staff will work towards and the yellow areas are areas of flexibility, which will be updated after the LAUP -- after LAUP completes their business and strategic plans.

So first of all, we included a new outcome in the performance matrix. It's the first row. And it's really meant to provide a timeline to revise the contract exhibits after the strategic and business plans are complete so that we can incorporate -- so that we can incorporate them into our thinking and our strategy.

So as I mentioned before, LAUP will submit their strategy and business plans on July 31st -- by July 31st, and at that time First 5 LA staff and LAUP staff will revise all contract exhibits hopefully by mid-September and bring back -- bring back the full contract to the Commission by October of this year. It's our hope and intent that we will bring forth a contract performance -- with performance matrix and budget that is inclusive of the last two years of LAUP's master agreement.

For outcome Number 1, we've highlighted the target of 10,760 seats to allow for attrition. As stated
before, this flexibility was granted to LAUP to begin pivoting to their new direction of focusing on quality versus direct services. And currently natural attrition is defined as providers lost -- from the LAUP contracted provider network due to either self-termination or noncompliance. However, LAUP does have the flexibility to also define natural attrition at the (inaudible) or individual seat level.

So next is Outcome 3, and if -- if you guys are following, I'm talking about the performance matrix, which is included in the packet. It's --

MS. BELSHE: Attachment A.

MS. MUNOZ: Attachment A. Thank you.

So the next outcome, which we made changes to, is Outcome Number 3, which I want to connect to Outcome Number 5.

So Outcome Number 3 specifically the child outcomes and parent engagement targets are highlighted in yellow, again, to emphasize flexibility. The RNE Teams, Valley Up and First 5 LA will utilize LAUP's newly strategic -- new strategic and business plans and First 5 LA's ECE landscape, which you just heard from, develop a joint research agenda that will support both organizations policy efforts, as well as advance the knowledge in the ECE sector overall.
What's important to note is that we will continue to measure outcomes -- child outcomes through the Longitudinal Outcome Study, which is already underway. And the child impairment and -- child outcomes and parent engagement outcomes might still be a focus to both of the organizations through the research agenda moving forward.

So the change in this outcome is really to from matrix to more of a tool to help both organizations support policy efforts and advance the ECE knowledge overall. Important to also note is that LAUP is reaching all of the targets currently listed in the matrix and because they're not changing their model or their service delivery, it's expected that the same outcomes will be reached, even though we might not be measuring them.

So on Outcome Number 5, you'll see the newly added process milestone that we will have a newly revised research -- joint research agenda done by July 31st, which will determine what is included in Outcome Number 3.

For Outcome Number 4, you'll see more flexibility around the budgetary controls. This Outcome was really rewritten to be consistent with the change in Outcome Number 1, which is to account for natural attrition.

Outcome Number 5 -- I've already touched upon, it's to advise the joint research agenda.

And there are no changes to Outcome Number 6,
which is related to the funding match targets.

And Outcome Number 7, the aligned policy agenda except to say that they're both highlighted in yellow to indicate that there's flexibility here to support LAUP's transition.

So we will know more after LAUP's strategic and business plans are complete.

So moving on to the budget; the proposed budget fairly constant from the previous year, so we are not proposing any changes from what you all familiar with. So as you may recall, last year First 5 LA requested an increase of $4.9 million to cover a one time and ongoing expenses, such as communications, policy, business development, provider payments due to higher ratings, and shift in subsidized spaces.

But next -- next year's budget has been restored to previous fiscal year 12-13 level. So all of the one-time costs were actually reversed to what they were before. So with that said, we feel it's a little premature to adjust LAUP's budget until both parties have agreed to a revised performance -- performance matrix, which will come in September. So for now, I'll give you a high-level view of where -- where it currently stands.

So LAUP's proposed budget for next year is comprised of five major sources of funds; $27.5 million
from First 5 LA, $23.2 million from the Sustainability Fund, $9.81 million from First 5 California Child Signature Program, $3.6 million for the district demonstrations projects and $750,000 in fund raising, which is LAUP's responsibility. So the -- because the one time costs were reversed to previous levels, the cash advance forecast is actually $1.5 million lower than last year, which is -- well this year is $60.5 million.

However, the overall budget is just slightly over $126,000 more than last year and this is mainly due to the increase in spending in the district demonstration projects.

So as you can see on this slide, the major cost areas are preschool grants, program support, and administrative support consistent with -- with this current year. And considering LAUP's full expenditures, LAUP will have approximately $15.1 million in the sustainability fund balance at the end of June -- June 30th of 2016.

So for the next steps, we will bring this item back to the entire commission on June 12th for your approval. On July 31st, LAUP will submit their strategic and business plans and we hope to have the revised contract exhibits by mid-September and we hope to come back to the commission late October/early November for
your approval of the entire LAUP contract.

So before we open it up for questions, I really wanted to thank and recognize our internal team of finance, contracts, policy, R and E, and public affairs, for all of their contributions to the documents and the overall negotiation process, as well as LAUP's staff.

And last but not least, I wanted to thank Amy Loya Owens, who is (inaudible) for letting me borrow her beautiful baby girl for the picture up there, Delia.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Thank you, Maybelle. That was clear and concise.

Do we have any questions or comments? Go for it, Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: It's a scary picture. I -- I -- anyway. There's -- I've said it all. It's a scary picture. And -- 2016, it's not going to be pretty at all; so I'm hoping that the new business plan that LAUP is going to submit -- it's not -- I -- I guess there's a part of me that's says it's not going to be a miracle document and that's going to ease the impact, but hopefully it will be a whole lot better than the cliff I'm seeing, dramatic cliff.

And it's something that was anticipated so long ago and it's really unfortunate even with all the forethought and forewarning that the -- the suggestion to
ease it downward was not taken. So I'm -- I'm very, very sad. Very sad.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Any other questions or comments?

MS. BELSHE: Do you want to see if LAUP wants to offer any thoughts?

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Would LAUP want to offer any reflections?

UNKNOWN: Sure. Thank you for the opportunity and you're right. This is the last thing we want to do is end something that is doing so much good for so many kids and families and as we have been sharing with you, we have been looking for alternate funding sources and we will continue to do that, and I know that, you know, it's not one trick or one miracle there's a lot of things that need to go on.

We expect that when we submit our business plan, it's going to be some of the things that you have thought of and some of the things that you haven't thought of, but the fact that we do have contractual agreements to serve some children has been the most difficult in terms of the -- what has been referred to as the cliff.

But it is in terms of a contract that has been due to expire in 2016. We're fortunate, and pleased that actually we've extended it from '09 to '16 and that we've
served so many thousand of children more.

So we're looking forward to the opportunity to have a dialogue in terms of what can be continued to be done for LAUP in terms of an organization, but more importantly for the children.

And as has been presented by the advancement project, what are the priorities in terms of needs that you as an organization that other organizations see as well in terms of the quality, the workforce, and the access and where do we come together in terms of moving forward. So we're very hopeful.

We are also being realistic in terms of some of the things that can and cannot be continued beyond 2016, but we do believe that we have some ideas that we can put in place and some of the things we as an organization are beginning to put in place not July 1st of 2016, but July 1st of 2014 to really look at some of the things that we're looking at.

What we've been presenting all along to you, we're grateful that Elizabeth and Maybelle have been part of our strategic planning process, but what I presented to you on February the 24th, if you recall, I turned 60 then, is a lot of the same issues we need to continue to work in terms of a joint advocacy agenda.

And some of the things that are on our strategic
plan -- or our strategic plan is in terms of what we would like to see. We know that we cannot commit the commission -- we cannot commit anyone other than what we are going to take in terms of our steps moving forward, but look forward to continuing to work with you after 2020 when I'm retired, and I can come and visit at the commission meetings, but we look forward to great things happening in LA County because I truly believe that everybody is now more in sync in terms of the needs of children zero to five and what a difference it will make when we prioritize them and get them healthy and thriving to start school, ready to succeed.

So unless have you any other questions, we will be back to make sure that we share with you what our board has agreed upon in terms of our strategic and business plans moving forward.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHDARD: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments?

Do you want to get Dennis?

MS. BELSHE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHDARD: It's time to bring Duane back.

MS. BELSHE: Okay. (inaudible) is what we've been trying to do the past couple of meetings for R and E updates that and help me out if I get this wrong, Armando.
Exceed hundred thousand dollars per our board approved policy, we present information and invite board member feedback to help inform a final solicitation before it goes out the door, so the background material was presented to the commissioners on two pending evaluations that are poised to go out the door and we just want to see if there's any questions or comments or considerations commissioners had. Otherwise, we would move on to Item 7.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any questions? Item 7 is Best Start. Rafael? Antoinette?

MR. GONZALEZ: We like it up here, thank you very much.

Good afternoon, Commissioners. Good afternoon, community.

Anyway, it's good to be here as we update you all in terms of where we are with our outcomes, but I do want to just summarize that earlier this month we provided the commission an update on the Building Stronger Families implementation plan in terms of the foundational elements that are relating to results of sustainability. Also provided folks a short video, I think you ought to remember we focused on three communities south El Monte -- El Monte, East LA, and Compton/East Compton. Strategic alliances that we developed over the last couple of months and really great opportunities in terms of moving Best
Start communities forward.

And I just want to reiterate -- well, iterate that from a -- from a capacity point of view, these three points that I just illustrated show how Best Start has been able to move forward with it's implementation plan both internally and in regards to our partnership and that's going to be related to today's presentation.

I do remember coming on board a little over three months ago and hitting the ground running with our Best Start communities team, beginning my tenure with First 5 LA by going out to the 14 community partnerships talking and actually sharing the learning-by-doing process. Also being able to review the framework, which you all had approved a little less than a year ago.

Now, what I've seen so far is a continued growth of our community partnerships and their focus to make a difference in the lives of children and families throughout the Los Angeles. And it was made very clear to me last week when we hosted a Best Start learning community, which was made up of representatives from the various communities and this leadership this very articulated committed leadership came together for purposes of peer to peer learning.

That's the vision behind Best Start communities and I know the basis of a lot of conversations that you
all have had as a commission and for me this was an
opportunity for these communities to share their best
practices and where they are in terms of the
learning-by-doing process, which we've shared with you
over the last couple of months.

But for me, it was being able to see these
communities for the communities to see themselves not just
as part of one of 14 community partnerships, but to see
themselves part of a larger effort throughout Los Angeles
in terms of addressing these issues that have such a big
impact on our children and our families. That, to me, was
profound. You know, the fact that these are grass roots
leaders and these are grass roots leaders who are the
change -- who are the faces of the communities and systems
change that we talked about.

And so while we're pleased at the foundation we
continue to build upon, we know that there's still a lot
of work that's left for us. And everyday is a learning
opportunity for us. I can rest assure you that we are on
the right path here and I'm proud of the LAUP staff for
moving this important work forward.

I'm also especially proud of the fact that -- of
the members and leadership of our 14 Best Start
communities partnerships who are with us and continue to
be part of the makers of community change.
And so for purposes of today's presentation, we're going to provide a progress update on the Best Start six-month outcome areas for January and April of 2014. We'll then discuss next steps in terms of implementing the best of Building Stronger Families framework, but I also do want to give kudos to our partners and colleagues and research and evaluation, you know, who are an integral part of putting this piece together and it's always a pleasure working with all my colleagues here at First 5 LA.

So without any further ado, I'm going to introduce my colleague, Antoinette Andrews, who will guide us through this presentation and beginning with the (inaudible) of Building Stronger Families framework outcome areas.

MS. ANDREWS: Thank you. As Rafael mentioned -- as mentioned, as a part of the November approval of the Building Stronger Families framework, there were six components, six cost areas and these are the six cost areas making sure there was internal alignment and capacity to actually do this work. Partnership capacity building, partnership administration, and here you'll notice in documents moving forward we're talking about Community convenings and we changed the name of that to -- to more clearly reflect what's actually happening in the
communities.

We also have cost associated with resident engagement, results focused actions and assessing progress. And so we're going to go through each of these components.

So under internal alignment and capacity, the objective here was around strengthening the capacity of contractors and grantees, as well as the staff and the board. And so, what we've done up to this point are a series of staff trainings around the learning-by-doing process.

Also around results-based accountability, developments and evaluations and messaging and communications. These we felt were very foundational to move this work forward in the communities.

In addition to that, we have had several presentations two most notable ones are from Jack Shonecaugh from Harvard University, as well as Bob Sagee and at the last commission meeting we talked about one of the national strategic alliances that we are -- have been working on with Bob saying and he's actually through Boston Medical School and not Harvard. So that is a typo there.

In addition to these kinds of opportunities to engage with national experts, we've also been thinking a
lot about the long term business model and working with Sweet Lividity (phonetic) and Diana Marie Lee to determine what does it look like in the end. You know, what are -- we're talking about building community capacity, but what does that really mean and what does it look like? And therefore, how do we need to then, do our work and structure ourselves to make that happen.

So we'll bring more information to you about that in July. One of the other things that has been happening is coordination with other First 5 LA activities, and so, what you'll see here is that there a number of communities that are already starting to make those connections alive and well within the community, not just in terms of conversations in this -- in this building.

And so you'll see that Welcome Baby, which is an integral part of Best Start, has been connecting with the community side of Best Start through presentations and ways to engage the community to determine, you know, how to best move forward with Welcome Baby.

So for example, in some of the roll outs that we attended, what we heard from the communities to the providers was, we want to know what is happening. You know, if you're going to serve families in our community, we want you to report back to us what's happening in those -- with those families.
And so this kind of coordination is starting to happen in the communities. Under partnership capacity building, this was about providing technical assistance and really building the capacity of the partnerships and what's so important here is to note is the developmental trajectory that we've talked about the last program and planning committee meeting in addition to the last commission meeting where we talked about, you know, it takes a good three years to get to the point where we've got a solid community partnership and it's taken us about four because of the Best Start pause.

But what we've been doing from 2010 to now and what we continue to do is really build capacity and we feel that we're in a good place because of the work that has been done up to this point.

So what has happened here is we have conducted a collective assessment, so each year the community partnerships will be looking at their ability to be results focused. And so some of the things that they'll be doing is looking at their ability to use data on an ongoing basis to make decisions where they have the right stakeholders at the table, what are they doing around governments, are they participating in activity that's lead to sustainability.

So they will be assessing themselves every year
to -- to determine that. So we do have that baseline data from February of this year. Training and technical assistance has also been provided to the community partnerships via the learning- by-doing process. But what you'll see here is a learning moment and that is in the November implementation plan, we have the plan to have a series of trainings, formal trainings, for the partnerships and what we realized is that's not how it works in communities.

It's a much more organic process. And so the training and technical assistance has actually been happening in real time on the ground and not as a separate stand alone type of training. Now, that doesn't mean that these things haven't happened, it's just that we've learned that it's more important to make sure we have the resources there to respond in a timely manner.

There have been trainings, however, on things like what is an indicators, so we talk about these concepts but communities don't necessarily understand it at the level we need them to in order for them to make informed decisions. And so it's so important that we take a step back and when those trainings are necessary that we provide that. And so the communities are saying, “Oh, I understand, when there's smoke this is fire.”

So, you know, really breaking it down in a way
that helps them to understand it. Under community convenings, what we're talking about here is providing infrastructure support. So, these are the meetings where we've talked about where partnership members are coming together and making decisions about what they're going to do in the communities.

And so we want to take an opportunity to give you just a little bit more information about what that actually looks like. So we talk a lot of about community partnerships meetings, but 13 of the comminutes actually have leadership and guidance bodies and these individuals are charged with going deeper and really getting grounded in the concepts so that they're able to share information with other members of the partnership.

Now, there's only 13 of these because one partnership decided that they wanted to engage more members of the community before deciding who the leadership group would be. And so we're -- we're allowing that process to unfold there. Other communities have decided to have learning-by-doing work groups, and again, these are structural things but things that the community has put in place because they want to make sure that it's a seamless process and a good decision making structure so that they're able to move through the learning-by-doing process.
Here we have the number of attendees up to this point. And you'll notice that in March, there was a peak and that was because the momentum had been building and then the roll outs happened and people really wanted to see what was going on with Best Start and they wanted to get reengaged into what was happening in Best Start.

And so the small dip we see in April is part of just the normal way that community that work happens. There will be people who come in and people who may miss a meeting that particular month or work group meeting that month, but it looks pretty stable that we have, you know, over a thousand people consistently participating in the learning-by-doing process.

During the time period that we're looking at, January through April, there were 54 community partnership meetings. And that's just the large -- those aren't -- the learning-by-doing work group meetings and all those smaller work group meetings we've been talking about. This is strictly the community partnership meetings where you have 50 to 60 people coming together diverse stakeholders and within this time period, we had over 1,500 unique attendees.

So again, there are lots of people engaged in the process of learning-by-doing, but lots of people who are coming on board to be a part of Best Start. Under
resident engagement, we have -- we want to make sure that
the work that's happening is not just the partnership and
we've heard that loud and clear from the board, as well.
Now, we want to make sure that we engage the broader
community and we actually have our colleagues from the
South Bay Center for Community Development, Colleen Mooney
and Kelly Hopkins here; so if you have any additional
questions about that work in the community and how we're
bringing that voice to the table they're here to answer
those questions.

But what we're talking about here in terms of
really engaging various stakeholders we wanted to know how
many parents versus community based organizations. And so
what we see here is 61 percent of the leadership groups
are actually parents and residents.

This table here tells us how many parents in the
leadership group by community. And so, we see Lancaster,
they really want to make sure that parents are involved in
the process and are doing what's necessary to make sure
that they have this -- the supports needed for those
families. There's a large hearing impaired population in
Lancaster.

And so they are also being very much engaged in
this process. In terms of the relationship based
organizing, this is again bringing those voices from
outside the community into the community and again this is January through April.

And the in person contacts that have actually happened as a result of this relationship based mapping that we've been going through and of those, we have 184 who are now engaged in Best Start. That engagement means sometimes they come to partnership meetings or they want to get involved in other types of activities, but they've expressed interest in being further engaged.

And these numbers are low now, because again we're talking about January through April and we were just on the -- on the rise in terms of the outreach to residents.

What we found is also that the -- the partnership meetings, residents coming together, that it's about social connections. So, we often talk about the Building Stronger Families framework and the six core results as if they're things it that are going to happen later, but we want to iterate here is that it's happening now with the individuals who are participating in Best Start.

And so just one example of that, and I am checking the time to make sure we stay on track here. One example of this is we heard from a community member who said that there was a lot of violence in her home and she didn't know where to turn. And she got connected to Best
Start and started coming to the community partnership meetings and how this has really transformed her life and the life of her children. And that she has been able to connect to concrete supports, that she's been able to gain these social connections with people who have helped her to move into a much better place as a parent and as a person who can be healthy and safe and also contribute to her community.

and so these are the kinds of things -- I know we talk about meetings, but these are the kinds of things that are happening on the ground right now in terms of achieving those six core results that we don't tend to talk a lot about. And there are lots of stories like this. Here under results focused actions this was about the -- what are they going to do.

So we had a presentation about what are they learning and what are they doing. And here, what we're highlighting is where the community partnerships are in terms of the learning-by-doing process. And again, this is as of April 30th, so these numbers are not exactly correct anymore because we have community partnerships that are moving from one stage into the other very rapidly. The thing to really point out here one of the edges that we have mace faced is the -- the -- our need to fulfill our six-month objectives and the communities need
to really understand the process and to really dig deep into the process.

And so we have been having -- we've been providing a lot of information and in our presentations we've been saying that communities are ready to go, they've been waiting for us.

So you may look at this graph and say, "Well, it doesn't look like they're ready to go because most of them are just in stage one." But what we want to point out here is that it's so important that it we understand that it took us nearly a year to understand the Building Stronger Families framework and to really put the mechanisms in place to roll this out.

So we're honoring the community's process and allowing them the time to really fully understand the Building Stronger Families framework, the six core results the protective factors. I mean, if we think about everything that we're asking them to understand, then we've got to honor the process. So that's why we see the stages and the majority of communities still in stage one. But there's -- the momentum is still there.

I don't want to walk away leaving the thought that we're in a -- not in such a good place. I mean, we're in a great place and I know we have members of our community partnership members here today who can speak to
that if you would like more information about that.

But one of the things that -- what we're finding
is that it just -- it takes time and when we get there, we
have no doubt -- we have all the confidence in the world
that this is going to go much faster than we actually
anticipate once the communities bring -- feel like they
have the right people at the table, have the right
information and can make informed decisions about how to
move forward.

In terms of the selection of core results, many
are choosing family capacities and equal as many at this
point are choosing social connections as well with one at
crude supports. In terms of assessing progress, this
was providing the support necessary for the staff and the
community to have access to information that helps to make
informed decisions and also we want -- we were starting to
implement evaluation activities tracking performance and
formalizing feedback loops.

And so we reported several times that's the
communities are using data through data gallery walks,
through infographics, many different means to actually
gain access to this information that they haven't had
before. We know that we have platforms like Healthy City
where community members, organizations can go on and get
information about their community, but the communities
have not, and the residents for certain, have not had access to this level of information and what we have found is that if we use -- if we take complex concepts and lots of information, but break it down in interactive ways, the communities can grasp the information and they want the information in order to make their decisions.

As you know, we have implemented developmental evaluations and we're finding out that this is the largest investment in developmental evaluation, and so, our colleagues Harder & Company are now starting to get so many phone calls from other funders and other entities who are interested in this; so we're really paving the way not only in place based work, but also in place based evaluation and developmental evaluation, in particular and here we want to point out that there is a rapid feedback loop.

So every community has their developmental evaluator and in real time as communities have -- as residents have questions, organizations have questions as they make decisions, they have access to someone who can get them that information and help them to really think through and vet that information.

Okay. Now, moving forward, we'll continue to implement the Building Stronger Families framework across the 14 communities. The communities are in
learning-by-doing as I said while the graph show that's many are in phase -- or stage one, they're rapidly moving into stage two really trying to understand that the story behind the data many have also gone into stage three and it's also important to note that these are not discrete stages.

In one conversation you can say here's -- here's the core result, what do we understand about what's happening behind the data and who is most effected by it. So it's not as if, you know, it's going to take another six months to get to stage five.

As Rafael pointed out, we are also doing more cross community learning exchanges and, in fact, some of the community partnership members wanted to meet monthly. And we thought that -- that's a bit much given everything else, but they really appreciated learning from each other. We'll continue with the long term business model development. And as I mentioned we will come back to the board in July -- the July P and P to talk more about that.

Training for grantees and contractors, we're working with our grants management department to have a training of our grantees and contractors in the protective factors by the end of this fiscal year, and in addition to that there are -- we continue with marketing and communications activities.
One of the things that we're working on right now is a profile although we've got to come up with another name for this, but we really want you to understand what's happening in each community in terms of the core result, the impact that we're having and all of that. So we will return next month with more information.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: thank you.

Questions, folks? Susanne?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Antoinette, thanks so much for your explanation of the steps and it makes sense how it has to -- you have to start with step one before you can go to step five.

My question is more of a logistics question, especially when you're talking about internal alignment and capacity, when you want to make sure that all the different initiatives are working together and that people are aware of them and you are informing the community and they're learning about resources.

Where would be the best place to go so if I wanted to do a presentation, but I don't know which one of your 14 community agen- community settings are ready for my presentation like you said maybe eight are only ready for this or maybe a couple of them are only at this stage, who would be the best coordinator to try to get something
together so I don't have to call all 14 at the different
--

MS. ANDREWS: right. One of the things that we have done is assign staff to the various initiatives so there is a point person that you would go to. So for example, for the obesity project, we have a single person in Best Start who's working directly with the program development department to kind of inform that process and understand, you know, what's going on on both sides.

So -- so instead of our program development department having to contact every single program officer, we have an individual who is knowledgeable of what's happening for that particular project, and so, that -- that's how we're trying to coordinate -- foster coordination between the initiatives.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: okay.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: And I'll find out exactly who that person is.

MS. ANDREWS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: To continue a question I asked at the previous time, you know, here's like three or four different flavors of community empowerment activities going in LA County at this time. So I wondered what your linkage strategy or idea would be with those other --
other programs as they are operating or will be operating.

MS. ANDREWS: so we continue to have those
conversations with -- I know it's not all about DMH in
terms of health neighborhoods, but on Wednesday --
actually Sam and I have been having conversations and on
Wednesday we go to talk to a group of folks who are very
much interested in forming a collaborative or -- or it's a
collaborative that's already formed and I wish I had the
--

COMMISSIONER SOUTHDAR: It's in sync?

MS. ANDREWS: Yes. And so, that's happening on
Wednesday. So we're reaching out to these other --
because there are lots of other things going on, and so,
we understand that Best Start is not about the community
partnership in a vacuum and in an isolation of everything
else that is happening. So we're trying to figure out
ways to better coordinate and to work together to advance
what we're all trying to do in terms of outcomes for kids.

MR. GONZALEZ: There's another opportunity
actually through the LA trust and the funding of the LAUSD
school wellness centers, and so, they've also reached out
to us. I mean, it's a great thing First 5 already has an
relationship and investment there, but looking at
opportunities like that that we're able to leverage is a
way to go because I mean, think about the population
that's there, the leadership that's there, the opportunity also to be able to extend our reach into other communities and vice versa. So yeah that's -- that's what we're looking at.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Well, that's precisely what I was thinking about. What makes it complicated is that it's different in each place. So the opportunities and partnerships in Panorama City are different from the ones in Compton, are different from the ones in Long Beach. They're all different.

So the configurations of potential partners are -- are a little bit different, but they're all rich. So trying to figure out the overarching policy that guides how we hook up with -- you know, with LA Unified in Panorama City, with The Endowment in Long Beach, and so forth. It's different in each place and I'm having some similar confusions.

MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah. But you know what? We have to be very thoughtful, very strategic, because as good or well intentioned, you know, that other collaboratives are, we have to make sure that it also falls, you know, within the mission, you know that we're able to come together and -- and move it forward where it makes perfect sense to be aligned.

You know, I think if it's a situation where you
have a square peg, you have to really think about, you know, the success of moving forward in a collaborative like that or initially like that.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: So I think we're at a developmental stage where we can influence the shape of what will be. So we can make it be what we need it to be to meet our purposes, and so, that's why I think this is such an interesting time for these things.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Deanne.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I'm really glad you brought that up because it would be not good to have some competing coalitions (inaudible) that area. You really got my attention on the family violence examples you gave, that they connect to the Best Start community leaders and resolve.

So my question is this: I don't see Partnerships for Families as one of the initiatives that has been connected with. In the coordination activities and since violence in the family is something that I have a whole lot of strings attached to it and (inaudible) including law enforcement and domestic violence shelters or whatever. How well saying that (inaudible) would that community be connected to law enforcement or connected with the shelters or -- I mean, I would not want people to think that (inaudible) Best Start's involvement
(inaudible) terrible outcomes (inaudible).

MS. ANDREWS: Yeah. The -- in that example in particular, the families connected to concrete support. So although in that slide that you're referring to Partnerships for Families is not listed there doesn't mean that that kind of coordination isn't happening.

And, in fact, this again was January through April. And so, so much of what has happened with individuals has been occurring from the beginning. And so it's important to us that not only do other First 5 LA initiatives are connected but who are stakeholders within that community given the needs in that community and many of them have -- have seen family violence as a major, major issue. Child abuse and neglect is a major, major issue and are connecting with those agencies and supports necessary to be a part of the partnership to help to make decisions about how to best address these in the community.

So it's not as if individuals come, they get connected and all of their problems are solved. It's they come and they get connected to -- with -- because the other people at the table are people who have connections with those agencies and individuals that's can provide those concrete supports to families.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I understand what you're
saying. I just want to make sure that there are direct
connections with -- is law enforcement involved with the
(inaudible). I mean, how directly is that connection, you
say child abuse and domestic violence is a huge issue.
Well, I'm thinking that's a very significant (inaudible).

MS. ANDREWS: Yeah.

MR. GONZALEZ: And there are those connections.
I can tell you as an example, the West Athens area.
People are connected with the sheriff's department and
that has a pretty fabulous outreach program and is working
with some really good groups.

MS. ANDREWS: And Pacoima.

MR. GONZALEZ: Right. We also have, you know,
the same type of relationships, we see more. But that is
definitely, when you think about a collaborative those are
the type of interests and diversity that we are looking in
terms of what people, what organizations are bringing to
the table in terms resources, experiences and other
support systems.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Jonathan.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Oh, thank you. You're
Duane dennis?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Just checking I'm in the
right place. One comment, one question; in terms of
evaluation, I agree entirely with Marv in that alignment -- one of the problems with too much alignment is that it's really hard to tear apart and understand the relative progress or the relative lack of progress of -- of two different intersecting programs and what's the reason for it.

So I think the fact that you're looking at each one separately as well as looking at how it does together is very important. I salute you. The other -- but I do have a question and that is you have different levels of participation in the different communities and I wonder if there's any of the best practices or you think just the nature of the communities are different or the coordination or the leadership what -- what, you know, is your impression of why that occurs and what can be done to maximize it in every area?

MS. ANDREWS: Absolutely. You know, the communities are all different. They have their own personality and what we know is that in at least initially there was a large service provider community that came to the table.

And there have been more intentional of getting parents and residents to the table. And so, in terms of best practices, what we're learning is parent engagement is more than just getting up having a -- an organization
provide -- or even First 5 LA, provide a presentation. It's really about how you get them involved in the planning of the work moving forward.

So that's one of the best practices that we're uncovering now.

In terms of why it looks different, I just think there are varying resources across the communities and I think the Best Start pause helped actually because the people who remained are those people who are most committed to this regardless of what First 5 does.

And so, these are the individuals who are still there and although it looks different across, it's the uniqueness of that community and how they work together and their desire for change that brings them together. And so, there's still going to be -- there are many opportunities to grow, but it is an organic process versus a top-down you have to have these many people from -- and these particular stakeholders at the table. So it is going to look different, but through the developmental evaluation we're uncovering more about what that really looks like and what it means for communities

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Excellent presentation.

Thank you very much.

MS. ANDREWS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I have a couple of things,
the first of which Rafael answered. When should we expect some preliminary highlights of the developmental evaluation that speaks to the overall as well as the individual (inaudible) that's my first question. And then secondly, we speak some -- from January to now, this increase of parental engagement, which is significant and important, but it also speaks to, for lack of a better term, the trust me term.

What has, in essence, impacted the trust meter, you know, what has happened to make parents more engaged and I actually like that chart. That was very, very nice. So what is going on there? If you can put your hand on it that would be important.

And then, lastly, and, you know, a comment, to what degree do you all feel that commissioners could be helpful, you know, different community meetings and to assist in support in the work that we, you know, that we do and the messages we're trying to give because, you know, in my community I'm involved, but I think -- to make good use of commissioners as we move forward is important, as well.

And so you can deal with all three of them at the same time or deal with one and let me know two meetings from now (inaudible) any way you want to deal with it.

MS. ANDREWS: So the answer to your first
question and I'm glad you brought that up because I failed to mention that and that is the developmental evaluators have produced a learning brief and it's in it's final -- now, it covers January through March, but the plan is to include that in your commission materials for next -- for June. So there will be a presentation on what we're learning overall in June in addition to how we're moving forward.

In terms of trust, it's been challenging because First 5 LA has done this before. In terms of rolling something out, and then, saying, "Oh, no, we're going to stop."

And so, it has been our staff out there rolling up their sleeves and really helping the communities to take ownership of this in a way that wasn't done before. That starts to build that trust. And so, when we talk about the community convenings, we talk about the meetings that are happening and there are lots of them, but it's providing that platform for residents to come to the table and say this is what I want to do in my community. And, you know, one example of that, and I know we're running on time, but as PA our public affairs department is gathering stories about what's happening in the communities, what we found is in some communities particularly where there are a lot of undocumented families, undocumented parents, that
this is the platform, the only platform where they have a say and a vote in terms of what happens in their community.

So as long as that is authentic, that we continue to put it in their hands versus it being driven by First 5 LA's timeline, we begin to -- we continue to build that trust and momentum within communities.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And the only reason I brought that up because to some degree, trust can be seen through the -- the -- the increased number of parents you get involved, meaning the stakeholders. And so it's important to identify what has happened different to in essence get to the point where you have more parents willing and want to engage.

MS. ANDREWS: Yeah. And I think also the fact that we have the relationship based outreach and really getting parents where they are and letting them know that even if they don't participate in the meeting doesn't mean that their voice can't come to that meeting. And also connecting them with other families around things that they're interested in is another way that we're building trust.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. And you don't know have to talk about the issue around the commissioners, but I would think that if you want to make other use of -- of
us, I think that's part of what we should be doing as ambassadors on behalf of this initiative (inaudible).

MR. GONZALEZ: Absolutely. I mean, a bridge to this conversation because we talk about, you know, our commission before the community, we talk about sharing the stories with you all. But to actually go to, you know, an event that the community is putting together. I know that Commissioner Bostwick was meeting with -- went to go meet with Metro; right? She actually went to go visit Metro and that's great because you're able to capture the, you know, full depth of what's going on in the community, the conversations that are taking place out there. So that's very valuable.

I think that, you know, supporting them, Susanne went -- Commissioner Bostwick when we were talking about the Macori (inaudible) grant, you know, it was really -- it was really motivating for us, you know, your excitement and your enthusiasm in terms of how important this piece is to receiving the support from the Department of Public Health made a big difference, the collaborations.

You know, Commissioner Southard talks about, you know, are exactly the type of opportunities that we're looking for and I know there's a lot more that can come from the Commission and we welcome that. And so, we look forward to working even closer with you on this.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other comments before we take our break? Right on time. Okay.

MS. BELSHE: Actually we're about a few minutes late. We wanted to be -- we've got work to do. Dr. Fielding?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Okay. Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER AU: What did he do?

MS. BELSHE: We've got work to do.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We have a 15 minute break.

MS. BELSHE: How about 10 minutes?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We have a 12 minute break. We'll come back at 2:10.

(Brief recess.)

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: With the bulk of our work today, that's around strategic planning. Jessica and Steve are going to frame the discussions and the outcomes for today. And then, we have our consultants who are going to give a (inaudible), as well. All righty. Let's get started, folks.

MS. KACZMAREK: Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. Good afternoon, commissioners.

So today we begin to dive deeper into the process that we began a few months ago related to strategic planning. Our partners on Learning for Action are here today to help facilitate our conversation. We're going to
be cover -- covering quite a bit of material today.
First, we're going to be looking at our vision and target population statements for this next strategic plan, and also looking at goals. And the intent around those conversations is to lead us to some recommendations that we can take back to the Full Board for approval next month.

We are also going to be looking at how we can use the strategic imperative and the levers for impact the home positions that were approved last month to help frame our decisions around outcomes and pathways.

And so the outcomes and pathways conversations, they are very important conversations, and we're going to be allotting significant time to those over the next couple of months.

We're going to begin the conversation today with outcomes and introduce the concept of pathways; and then, as we move forward in June at our next policy -- Program and Planning Committee meeting on the 23rd and our retreat, which is scheduled for the 30th, we're going to dive deeper into those areas, as well.

So again, we're excited to begin this work, and we are going to be -- so again, breaking into small groups to do some of the work ahead of us today.

So I want to -- if there are any questions about
process or Tracy wants to add anything, we can go ahead
and pass it over to Steven.

Steve?

MR. LAFRANCE: No problem. Thank you. Good
afternoon, commissioners and members of the community and
staff. Thank you for the introduction, Jessica.

And as Jessica indicates, we do have a fair
amount of ground we'd like to cover today.

The first point that I wanted to make, though,
before we get into the substance was really to put in
context the components of the quote unquote framework for
impact that we're going to be talking about today. We've
been taking the strategic planning work as it's needed to
be addressed from a broader policy perspective, and we're
getting into a narrow -- you know, more and more sort of
narrowing in on focus here.

And having taken those pieces one by each, we
have not kind of appreciated the full picture of what
ultimately is what we're -- we're calling the Framework
for Impact Four-Year Strategic Plan. So as a compliment
to and to help implement the strategic imperative and the
home positions, we are working with you in this phase now
to put together these other elements of the final plan; so
the vision -- the goals, the overarching and contributing
goals, outcomes, pathways, and target population.
Note that, in addition to these components, there will be a vision statement -- I -- I'm sorry; a value statement or set of value statements that will go along with the strategic plan. We know that this work is art and science. It's head and heart. And that there is a spirit behind which any policy guidance you give will need to be implemented, and that can be articulated in values, often as in strategic plans.

So I just wanted to note that is another piece of the puzzle that we'll be getting into, but that will not be until the June 30th Commission retreat. One quick note is that it has been our observation that, in all of your conversations regarding planning to date, that you have been expressing aspects of your values, and what First 5 values; and so, we have been picking up on those as we've been going along.

So we won't be -- I -- we won't need to have a blank slate conversation come June 30th because we feel we've gotten to know a bit about how you've been expressing values throughout this conversation. So I wanted you to know that there is a place where that aspect of the plan will be discussed.

So my next goal is to walk us through the definitions of each of these components of the framework for impact not to belabor the point, but to just make sure
that we're all on the same page. So the vision will be --
we have a vision statement to propose to you today that is
a slight tweak on your -- the current vision, but that is
essentially the statement of if you are very successful,
here's the change we'll see. This is the future state.
Think about something like a 25-year timeframe.

The target population on the other end of the
framework kind of if you were to think about it as
undergirding all the work is the -- those are the folks
who -- whose outcomes we care most about improving, the
ultimate beneficiaries of the work. Now, we've talked
about First 5 LA's work by virtue of the home position on
the systems change and policy change to direct service
continuum, falling largely on policy and systems change.
So we know that there are outcomes that you will want to
achieve that are outcomes for systems and policies, but
that they will be in service of a target population.

Back to the vision; there is an overarching goal
that is the high-level statement encapsulating the
ultimate impact of your work. It is what we would
consider or encourage you to think of as the language
you've used along this process of maybe the north star
that knits all of the work beneath it. There are
contributing goals that advance progress on the
overarching goal. It's where we know we have to focus our
efforts if we're going to affect the ultimate goal. The priority outcomes are the specific and measurable components of each goal that we hold ourselves accountable for affecting. So what I'm trying to do here is to show you how all these different pieces of the puzzle fit together, and so when we're having a conversation about vision, you're thinking, "Okay. This is what should be true in 25 years." That's the really big picture thing. Goals is slightly narrower nearer term and more focused, but it is not as focused to be at the measurable level that an outcome is. It is -- that is where things get more specific and measurable. And then, the pathways are our -- how the -- First 5 LA will contribute to attaining the priority outcomes. They leverage your core strengths and reflect your philosophy about how change happens.

I need to move through this and trust that, if there are questions or objections to anything, I'm positing you will raise them. I just wanted to highlight that you might consider the vision overarching goal and contributing goals as a package that, together, express the what of the strategic plan, complimented by the pathways and the outcomes, which is the how of the strategic plan; how you will go about achieving the what. And then, of course, the target population is for whom.
And to just drive these points home with examples, for a vision statement, and this is not a random example; it is an abbreviated version of what we'll be putting before you shortly. Division may be that First 5 LA contributes to a future where all young children healthy and raised in a loving and nurturing environment so they reach their full potential.

It's -- it's inspirational. It's far off, but it contains a statement about what the future state of affairs would look like if you were to be successful.

Target population; maybe children at high risk of poor health outcomes. Now, for the sake of these examples, I'm -- I'm choosing health as a thread to follow through here.

If that were the case, we were targeting children at high risk and poor health outcomes, then -- then there is a series of goals and -- and contributing goals that would contribute to that. The -- the overarching goal here that children enter kindergarten ready to succeed in school and life, again, is -- is not random; it is -- it is a version of the overarching goal that we're going to be putting before you. But the contributing goal in this example of health, we have the contributing goal of children (inaudible) keeping optimum physical health.

At the outcomes level, we may have an outcome,
for example, of increased rate of healthy births that contributes to achieving children (inaudible) keeping optimum physical health. And to get there, an increased rate of healthy births, we may advocate for policies and systems that strengthen health services to children and their families. So this is meant for illustrative purposes. It's to get us all on the same page about at what level each of these different parts of the framework hit at.

And unless there are points of clarification or questions that the commissioners have -- yes, Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I -- I just -- the issue of -- of having goal, and then goals is kind of funky, to use a technical term. You know, I think it's going to confuse a lot of people. "Our goal is this, but our goals beneath that are" --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: And if there is some different nomenclature that might elaborate that in a way that didn't use the same word with a -- a plural on it, I think it would be much easier for most people to understand.

MR. LAFRANCE: Two -- two thoughts. One is that I -- for what it's worth, I have seen this structure out there before. So it's -- it has been managed through
communications and -- and language, etcetera. That said, to offer you an alternative so as not to make you feel as though we're trying to force this framework upon you, I also have seen nomenclature that would include -- I -- I'm sorry; that would use the -- for the overarching goal, something like our ultimate intended impact, or something along those lines. We do not feel strongly about the nomenclature that you use.

What we do feel strongly about is that there be an articulation at this level of what any priority areas of work we're going to point towards in a singular way.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I -- I think your -- you -- what you've done is very good. I would just -- I -- I like your alternative, frankly, better because I think it just -- it -- (inaudible) eliminates or precludes the need for communication, a major issue that can help use people sufficiently to make them not get to the point.

So I would -- I would argue that this -- what you said before, ultimate impact, ultimate desired impact, ultimate, something like that, would be better, but I'm just one person.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Well, I -- you know, we -- we started this commission with the conversation, what, fifteen years ago now or so, on using Mark Freedman's result and that -- that protocol. And we could never make
it stick. So I think whatever we use is what we use, and
we'll figure it out.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. And -- and I had a
similar reaction, which is why I appreciate you responding
by giving that definition first before we sort of launched
into this. And but as I sat and sort of chewed on it a
bit, I'm at this juncture, Jonathan -- Jonathan, I think
we can probably rise -- rise to the occasion and adapt
another almost like it's semantics. Right? You know,
because we're really talking about a -- a systematic way
of looking at how we construct the interim steps in terms
of when you talk about a pathway.

It really is, when you talk about pathway.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I'm not worried about us.
I'm not worried about us.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: I'm just trying to
communicate this to many stakeholders (inaudible)
interact.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. I know.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: That's what I'm concerned
about. We can -- you know, we can -- we can jump through
a lot of hoops.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And I -- and I -- I don't
think we should spend a lot of -- a lot of time -- a lot
of time on this -- this particular issue.
COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Been there, done that.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah. You know, because what's important here is that Steve, in his outline trajectory, how we get from one place to another. And then -- and -- and then, as Nancy suggests, nomenclature is really not that important. And -- and mind you, this process is an internal process. That which is given to the community in an external document is going to be totally different and it's going to be, you know, grossly, you know, not so detailed and -- and -- and -- and that sort of thing. So --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Okay.

MR. LAFRANCE: So -- so Commissioner Fielding's input is -- is well-taken, and -- and I think that we will come back with a variation on this language along those lines. Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: All righty.

MR. LAFRANCE: So then, moving into the substance of the conversation on -- on the individual components of the framework that we're asking you to review, discuss and make a recommendation on, the first does regard the vision statement, so we will take a look at it. Essentially, we'll be asking you to review a proposal, discuss and make a recommendation. That is also the case for the ultimate impact and contributing goals or the goals for the -- to
achieve the ultimate impact, as well as the target population.

So we will be going through, in this first part of the session, vision, goals, and target population. And we're going to ask you to take a look at something we've proposed, discuss it, and land on a recommendation if we can get there. And ideally, we will. The outcomes conversation will be one that is more generative and, as Jessica said, will not end today. It's actually the first time we've not asked you to get into a conversation and complete it in the same day on the outcomes and pathways.

COMMISSIONER AU: Thank you.

MR. LAFRANCE: It is such an important part of the work that we be really clear about the specific and measurable outcome that will advance progress towards the goals that, today, will become an important first step that frames subsequent steps, which will involve getting input from members of the -- the complete First 5 LA staff, grantees, contractors, and other partners, members of the communities, including Best Start community residents. Okay?

A note on mission and -- and values. I -- I mentioned values will come into the June 30th retreat. The mission statement will, as well. Okay?

So in terms of vision, as we defined earlier,
it's the statement that, if we were to be very successful, this is the change we would see in 25 years. So the vision statement that First 5 LA currently has is -- is presented here, and we are essentially proposing the -- virtually the same statement for the new plan with a very small language modification that does have implications about what it communicates with respect to First 5 LA is part of a larger ecosystem creating change. So I -- I will just focus on the proposed statement, which reads that "First 5 LA contributes to a future throughout Los Angeles's diverse communities where all young children are born healthy and raised in a loving and nurturing environment so that they grow up healthy, or eager to learn, and reach their full potential."

The modification comes in the beginning where we've changed from is committed to creating to contributes to. So the creating verb suggesting that it is solely First 5 LA who would contribute to this vision -- or that would make this vision come about versus in the proposed language recognizes that First 5 LA is part of a much larger ecosystem. That our recommendation is to consider this slightly modified vision statement for a number of reasons. In our assessment, it effectively conveys what will be different in -- in the world 25 years from now. It demonstrates, as I mentioned, how First 5 LA is part of
a larger ecosystem to support children's zero to five and their families.

It is consistent with Prop 10 mandate, as well as First 5 LA's values. It's consistent with the mission statements from many other First 5 commissions. And in large part, because of the last point, which is that it is aspirational and inspirational. So with that, I'm asking the Commission to have any discussion you may wish to regarding the vision statement with the goal of getting to a recommendation that is either taking up the recommendation on the statement we've put forth or -- or perhaps a slightly modified one. And I -- I can scroll back to --

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Just one word. Okay? Just one word.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think it's good.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Yeah.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I think aspirational without being a creationist.

MS. BELSHÉ: But it really -- it also speaks to some of the strategic choices the Commission has already begun to make, such as the -- the -- the choice around partnering with others, and acknowledging the complexity of these issues; how we're not going to do it alone, and
our effect is going to be in concert with others. So it endeavors to align with decisions the Commission's already made.

COMMISSIONER AU: I guess it's missing, for me, one element, and I guess maybe I'm -- maybe a bit more ambitious because I think that First 5 LA cannot only contribute, but can play a vital role in the future, because I see First 5 LA as in a very unique position because of its public, private structure that it has a whole lot more latitude than many of the agencies in LA County. So we can take some additional risks, if you want to call it that, and -- and -- and sort of become this -- this leader in -- in changing some of the conversation when we deal with issues and challenges.

You know, many of the other agencies are more hinged (phonetic). Their hands are more tied. So I -- and I -- I don't see this particular statement really capturing that -- that notion. Do -- do you see? I -- I'm not sure --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think -- I think what you're saying is -- I mean -- I mean, and I -- I think it's (inaudible) because you're saying not only contribute, but develop our leadership around some of this, as well, and that is not contained there. And you know, I mean, so that would be something to discuss, you
know. Do we not only contribute, but are we the conveners of thought leadership around these very important areas that -- that involve children, you know, zero to five? And a lot of organizations can't do that. And perhaps our resources can do that.

MS. BELSHÉ: And is that maybe getting into mission and/or values?

MR. LAFRANCE: It -- it may. And so, I do think that there are other parts of the conversation that will round this out in a way that you're getting at, Commissioner Au. But I do also want to offer that I could -- I could see language with -- without getting into his word-smithing exercise in the -- in the moment, but I could see language along the lines of First 5 LA contributes to and catalyzes a future throughout or First 5 LA accelerates progress towards a future, which I think hits it at the right level where you want it have more of an active leadership expression at your vision statement level.

The aspects of convener and thought leader, etcetera, I do think will come out through the -- the full picture of your -- the articulation of your strategy when we get to it. But I do want to offer, I can -- I can see a -- a more exciting leadership-infused word at the start of this.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Thoughts, comments, other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Both of those ideas are -- are -- are good. And we certainly want to be a catalyst. We certainly want to accelerate. I don't know. I was just wondering how many words we want. More -- more lines seem to be good for a statement.

MR. HILDEBRAND: I will weigh in very quickly the -- the purest mission statement.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I'll tell you -- we -- I'll tell you one word you could take out, if that helps. Yeah. Most children, when they're born, are young.

MR. LAFRANCE: Some of us were born sager than others. That's -- yes.


MS. BELSHÉ: Alex.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Just -- just a very -- from -- just from a strictly technical standpoint, a vision statement describes the future statement that you want to happen, and -- and doesn't necessarily get into a description of your role, which is more of the purview of a mission. Again, not to say that we can't do it --

MS. BELSHÉ: I -- I actually was -- I want to echo Alex's comment. You know, a vision really isn't about the entity; it's about the future. It's about the
world in which we all want to live, and then the mission speaks to our business as an organization. What is our role and contribution?

MR. HILDEBRAND: So it should say throughout Los Angeles' diverse communities, all children will be born healthy and raised in a loving -- that's -- that --

MS. BELSHÉ: Exactly.

MR. HILDEBRAND: -- would be the vision statement.

MS. BELSHÉ: And then, the -- the mission statement, which would then get into so what is our business, what is our role in these issues of catalytic engagement accelerating impact, etcetera? I think that is probably where it fits most effectively.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. I like that.

MS. BELSHÉ: Are you okay with that?

COMMISSIONER AU: I would be okay with that because it doesn't speak to --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: You're absolutely right.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- you know, ourselves; it really speaks to the children. I like that.

SPEAKER: I just have a quick question. I was curious how you (inaudible).

MS. BELSHÉ: It suggested 50.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yeah. It -- we -- we -- it's
really -- it's -- it's -- it's suggestive. It's -- it's really just intended to be suggestive of a -- yeah, beyond any one or two planning cycles. And it acknowledges the complexity and how entrenched some of the issues are that are preventing the future state. But -- but it's not intended to be literal, more suggestive (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER AU: And we won't be around, anyway. So --

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, that was the problem with 50.

MS. BELSHÉ: Okay.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. So then, is our resolution to take up the language that invokes catalyst acceleration thought leader convener more in the mission conversation? Okay.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes.

MR. LAFRANCE: And then, the vision statement essentially begins with a future.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER YBARRA: Could -- could I offer something, which would be simply that First 5 LA envisions a future; just to make it flow a little bit.

MR. LAFRANCE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah.

MS. BELSHÉ: I -- I would -- I -- my counsel
would be -- don't -- don't even -- just take us out in the 
future. Just throughout our diverse communities, all 
children are born and raised in a loving nurturing, 
etcetera.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. Then -

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That's it.

MR. LAFRANCE: Let's go.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That's the recommendation 
we'll give to the larger board at the next meeting.

MR. LAFRANCE: Excellent! Thank you for the 
questions and discussion.

Moving, then, into our next discussion, which 
regards target population. So just a -- a little bit of 
context before we propose a target population statement. 
So why does First 5 LA need a target population statement?
It has come up in these conversations already to date, but 
we know the Prop 10 was established with the intention of 
reproving outcomes for all California children ages zero 
to five. We also know, from the data and our experience, 
that the -- there are children and families for whom there 
are greater risk factors that pose more significant 
barriers to achieving the outcomes that we want to see for 
-- for them, such as developmental delays or other serious 
physical or mental health issues; violence, substance
abuse, mental health issues in the family caregiver environment; neighborhoods that are economically disadvantaged that affect opportunities available to young children, neighborhoods where violence is prevalent. So these -- these realities come into play together when we think about what a proposed target population statement might include. But we also want to encourage the adoption of a target population statement as a matter of policy for your strategic plan because it will help you achieve the vision faster, we believe; and that it will provide policy guidance to staff for how to make implementation decisions once you're into the implementation cycle after the planning process is complete.

So with that, and -- and essentially having looked at a variety of documents expressing First 5 LA's intentions with respect to whom to serve, we are proposing a policy statement that reads as follows: that First 5 LA will work on behalf of all children zero to five in Los Angeles County, but will prioritize children who experience significant risk factors in relation to achieving optimum health, socio-emotional health and/or learning. The rationale for the statement includes some of the points I've just made, but will also underscore, it is -- it is consistent with how First 5 LA has been operating. To date, with Best Start being a good example,
a place-based approach, targeted (inaudible) communities. It is also consistent with many other First 5 commissions, how they've grappled with this tension between a mandate that is to serve all children, but knowing that outcomes and risk factors are much -- outcomes are poorer and risk factors are more prevalent for some. And we also feel the statement is clear about intent, but has -- is not overly literal; that would make it very difficult to implement; and that it aligns with the intent of the strategic imperative articulated for this plan.

So -- so with that, I also would then now invoke discussion and -- and ask for a recommendation. I'll just move back to that slide so that we can see (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We're also just doing the call. I mean, we've had a lot of discussion in the past with regards to target population, especially when we've had families and they had older children in the family. So do you not provide services for those older children of, you know, of the child that's zero to five. And we've gone back and forth, depending on whoever the initiative was. I mean, so it would never come to, you know, any resolution around that particular issue. Just from a social services and a social worker perspective of the -- how could we not serve, you know, siblings of -- of -- of those children? So if you're bringing in a health
initiative or what you're doing something around abuse and neglect education, or whatever have you. So that has been an issue that this commission has had historically. And so, my question; would that in essence prevent us from working with other children in those families where the, you know, the -- the target child is, you know, is within that age span.

MS. LAFRANCE: I -- I have --

MS. BELSHÉ: I'm sorry. What would be an example? I'm just -- I'm just curious because we -- we do have a statutory requirement, obviously, around zero to five. But what would be an example, Duane, where First 5 LA would be in a position of -- of like serving some but not the whole family? Where has this been a tension point? I'm just looking for a concrete example.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It's -- it's been more in the health arena, John and Suzanne. I mean, we've had discussions in the past. I would think it was more in the -- in some of the health initiatives --

MS. BELSHÉ: Yeah. And that -- that was absolutely an issue -- it would still be like undocumented immigrant children above the age of six.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah.

MS. BELSHÉ: But -- but we have I statutory prohibition. We -- we can't use our dollars to do that.
We know that.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Right. But it simply says, although we still -- but say with healthy -- the healthy kids program. We will still help the entire family enroll in whatever services they need. We wouldn't specifically stop with the zero to five. We also enroll the siblings in whatever program is available, and if the parent needed assistance, also, we would help them. The problem is, if you're -- it makes it a little bit difficult to count.

But getting back to the point, I wrote down the exact same thing as far as family, siblings and community; how it's reflected in here, even though, if you are assisting these children zero to five (inaudible), because you're not walking up and giving the -- the services directly to the -- the child who's zero to five; you're helping the parent, you're -- and you're helping, in essence, the community. But it -- it somehow seems to be missing. And what I also see here is prevention in there because you're -- we're prioritizing children who experience significant risk factors in relation to getting this. But prevention, you're addressing everybody out there before they may be experiencing these significant risk factors. And so, I see kind of limited in that way. So I -- so I see it twofold. Try to get the families,
siblings, community altogether because you really need to help everybody in order for this child to work and be able to reach optimum physical health, etcetera. But also, making sure this prevention is coming in before they reach this point, you know.

COMMISSIONER AU: I think that's the -- that's the -- the dilemma I'm -- I'm encountering, as well, because if we're going to focus on an upstream, and going back to the levers --

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- and our home position is that of being upstream. And we're wanting to make as broad an impact as -- I think that's where we landed a broader impact. Right? Then, just this conversation about target population and limiting it to children at risk zero to five, for me, it contradicts those -- those -- those home positions. So that's where I'm trying to sort of ameliorate in my head. The -- the -- the other is that LA County is -- we do have traditional communities that continue to -- to be challenged. And -- and yet, I envision, at some point in time, hopefully, if we do our work well, that we will see a shift that -- and I -- I guess if we're talking long-term in some aspect of this conversation, that I'm -- I -- I live in Manhattan Beach, which is an affluent community, but inherent in Manhattan
Beach, with this affluence, we have high drug abuse issues that the teens have engaged in. And -- and so, you know, I -- I'm thinking, mm, is there a point in time where First 5 LA may have a position to take on a system policy level that will assist families to address those issues early on? Don't know. And so, I'm -- I'm struggling with this.

MR. LAFRANCE: Sure. My -- the way that I hear the conversation is largely one of -- of perhaps a rising out of the way in which the process is tackling each of these pieces kind of in turn and -- which is to say that the target population -- well, no one piece of the planning framework will stand on its own; that the target population exists in the context of the home positions on the levers.

And so, that there is an intention to get ahead of children and families experiencing this -- the risk factors themselves is part of -- is articulated in the home position. And so, again, that's -- when you consider the whole package that -- that is articulated there, as well as the home position on systems and policy change and broad impact, it going broad, which is actually why we chose to propose the language, will work on behalf of all children in these -- all children in the county zero to five and their families, because the understanding we had
heard in the conversations on the -- on lever home positions was that, if you were to do work targeting a particular high-risk community bringing in evidence-based model, it would be, for example, just to play this out, it would be with the intention of understanding how that worked and -- and bringing partners in very early on to come up with the scaling and sustainability strategy from the outset.

So that does get to -- it may be that the work -- the original work doesn't happen in Manhattan Beach; it may happen in another community. But that you're committed to understanding what it was about that work in that given community that would inform the systems change and policy change work that would affect all children in the county. So my -- my general response to both points is -- is that it -- I think this is an instance of where we have to think about how all the pieces of the package fit together, and that not any one of them, kind of on their own, encapsulates the full intention of the Commission's policy guidance. So that -- that's -- that's how I think about the -- the comments you raised, but I -- not --

MS. BELSHÉ: And I -- I think that's a really important reminder in terms of considering how the different pieces don't stand on their own, but really
interact. I -- I wonder, though, if a -- a modest change might capture a little bit of what I'm hearing is -- and I -- I don't know if this was our -- our intent when we were working together in drafting this proposed statement. But we say prioritize children who experience, okay, we're saying experience significant risk factors, which is basically saying kids who are at risk as opposed to kids who are already in systems. Right?

So the -- the intent there is to use data and -- and information and research to think ahead relative to what kinds of kids may be at risk using Jacquelyn and -- and Emily. Emily. And other smarty pants; but the intent is not to be engaging downstream with kids who are already experiencing risks, but rather (inaudible) upstream to prevent. Right? So others kids -- just who will prioritize children at risk, children -- just the word "experience" makes me think of kids who are already downstream. You might want to think about --

MR. LAFRANCE: Sure. And I -- I also -- also -- I also -- I also thought a small wording adjustment by adding "and their families" after their --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: You said -- it was funny; you said it when you spoke.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yeah. Yeah, and I had to stop myself.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And so, basically, I think we need to. And then, that deals with the issue that I brought up earlier. So if we make the decision to provide services to other children, it's covered with the "and families".

MR. LAFRANCE: Right. So here's -- here's the rework that I have. First 5 LA will work on behalf of all children zero to five and their families in Los Angeles County, but will prioritize children who are at risk of poor physical health, socioemotional health and/or learning outcomes.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Do that again.

MR. LAFRANCE: First 5 LA will work on behalf of all children zero to five and their families in Los Angeles County, but will prioritize children who are children and families.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: That's hard.

MR. LAFRANCE: Who will -- but will prioritize children who are at risk of poor physical health, socioemotional health and/or learning outcomes.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah. We've got to clean it up a little bit.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: But you've got the gist.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Emphasize the family
upfront.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Our - their families.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: And then --

MS. BELSHÉ: That captures more with the commissioners or raising -- let -- let us play with that.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. Well, just a -- a note. I -- I -- I like -- actually, I like this original latter part of the statement because it really talks in a more positive (inaudible) --

MS. BELSHÉ: That's -- that's true. That's true.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- in terms of achieving optimum physical health, and it -- and it moves away from the more traditional deficit --

MR. LAFRANCE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- mentality, which I really feel the need to -- to --

MS. BELSHÉ: So maybe it's prioritizing those because we'll have referenced children and their families, those who face -- those at risk in relation to; I mean, that's what we're trying to get those at risk in relation to achieving optimum. I think Nancy's point important; makes it positive.

MR. LAFRANCE: I agree.
MS. BELSHÉ: Okay?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I think some more word-smithing to do, but I think you've got the general gist.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AU: I think so.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: We can move on.

MR. LAFRANCE: Do -- do we -- anything more? That's our recommendation. Woo-hoo! All right? So --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Question about that is we don't say anything about communities there. We have a huge place-based investment, so do we want to say children in communities, or somehow put the community in here or are we happy without it? I don't feel very strongly, but I just raised (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER AU: My -- my reaction is that maybe it falls in the how-to's, you know, how we go about it.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Fine. Fine.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. Thank you. Wonderful!

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: (inaudible) saying how important organizational systems, policy level, something about with the communities.

MR. LAFRANCE: Communities. Okay. We can flesh
that out in -- in the footnote. Okay. Thank you.

Moving along then, our next discussion regards the element formerly known as overarching goals, overarching - yes; that's what it is; ultimate -- ultimate impact and contributing goals. So we did, you know, take a look at best practices for goal-setting. Again, we had a discussion about nomenclature here, but the spirit of the first point is that clarifying the kind of single overarching, what you're driving towards, is a best practice among strategic-funding organizations as a -- as a technique for honing focus. It's to express the intended result that -- that all investments and efforts ultimately are in service, so even that explain the (inaudible) bullet point, and gets to Commissioner Fielding's point that there's no other way we can talk about that, and -- and we will.

But the more important notion is to identify what the contributing goals are, to advance work towards that overarching ultimate impact, we'll call it. That -- that should be derived from research evidence and experience regarding the nature of the problem to be solved, and should speak to some of the preconditions that must be addressed for that ultimate impact to be achieved. So we have just a -- a rough sort of conceptional visual here about how that might look.
But to remind ourselves, when we looked to proposing some recommended goals for today, we grounded ourselves in the current four goals, which are presented for you here for the current strategic plan. And in reviewing them, identified several concerns, some of which we've talked about already to date. But that they aren't structured in a way that provides the kind of focus and coherence that First 5 LA is seeking in its investments moving forward given the strategic imperative. That -- we also found some currently-funded programs do not contribute to an existing goal, and I'll show you on that next visual how that actually played out. But essentially, we -- we -- we created a fifth goal bucket to contain some of the current investments and programs.

The goals are disconnected from each, and there's nothing that really knits them together. And in fact, at least one of the goals is -- is really more of a priority outcome. It's kind of targeted at the wrong level. So we don't -- we don't have to beat up the existing goals too much further, but it -- it -- you know, but this is -- this map, a current investment map, which I know you will not be able to read, you know, it shows the expense of investments that have emerged from the current goal structure; and it has our, you know, shadow or ghost goal on the farthest right that we created to capture some of
First 5 LA's current work.

And this is really just underscoring the larger point that we're trying to make regarding restructuring the current -- the goals so that they provide the kind of coherence and focus that -- that we know you're looking for in this planning process.

So in terms of proposing a goal structure and content for the actual goals, we were looking at a couple of key parameters in thinking about goals to propose for your consideration today. First, of course, is the very fundamental mandate that Prop 10 revenues benefit children zero to five and their families, but in looking at the data synthesis, as well as other county First 5s and the child development literature, all point to an overarching goal or ultimate impact in our case, focused on the most significant milestone in the life of a five-year-old at the farthest -- because that's the farthest endpoint of the age continuum for First 5s in general; and that is entering school.

So building from that premise, we then looked at the literature on what definitions of school readiness are and how best practices framework that contributes to school readiness. And when you take a kind of whole-child view on the definition of children entering school ready to -- to learn and succeed, then in school and life,
you're fundamentally talking about three dimensions of -- of the child's person, which are their physical health, socioemotional health and development and cognitive development; so those three domains.

And -- and this is -- again, this is a good example of where we will be -- we'll want to remind ourselves that the importance of family and the context of community for families, but if we are thinking again just at the goal level for now, knowing that there are more specific layers to the framework to -- to bring into the picture as we think about how to express what the work will look like under these goals. This is the structure that we -- we would like to propose, and the content for the goals, as well so that we would have, as your ultimate impact, a statement along the lines of children enter kindergarten ready to succeed in school and life; and that there would be three contributing goals that express the intent to advance work that supports children zero to five achieving their optimum physical health, children zero to five achieving their optimum socioemotional health, and children zero to five achieving their optimum cognitive development.

And again, I just want to underscore that this -- we recognize that part of how to do that regards work with families and communities. Part of how to do that regards
systems and policies. But when we think about framing your goals in a way that makes it very clear what you want to be different at the end of the day 25 years from now.

MS. BELSHÉ: And we're all going to be here.

MR. LAFRANCE: It'll be five -- five planning cycles from now. We're proposing this goal structure that is child-centered, whole child per -- you know, has a whole-child perspective and is anchored to an ultimate impact that is about children entering kindergarten ready to succeed in school and life. Doesn't preclude -- preclude you from saying, "Yeah, but we decided to work upstream so all of our work has to be in years zero, one and two," if you were to go there. But it's still -- in terms of what that work is in the service of is -- is this -- this statement.

So we -- we are -- we'd like to invite discussion on -- on the -- the proposed ultimate impact and goal structure. We've unpacked the discussion a little bit here. We can follow these questions or just get into it. But essentially, the question we have before you is, you know, how does this -- how does this strike you as a proposed format and structure and content for the goals?

MS. BELSHÉ: Recognizing again, as we keep emphasizing, this is really not about -- this is not at all about the what. It's about -- excuse me; it's not
about the how; it's about the what. Right?

COMMISSIONER AU: Right.

MS. BELSHÉ: So by -- by affirming or modifying wherever we land as the Commission lands on these contributing goals, it doesn't get into the -- the -- the how we're going to get there. That's the really hard meaty difficult discussion and decisions before the -- the Commission around priority outcomes and pathways.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: My -- Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Just following the conversation we had, we're talking population, do we want some family language in -- in this area, as well? That -- that -- that's a question for -- I mean, you and -- and -- and other commissioners. Do we want some family language in here?

COMMISSIONER AU: I -- I -- my response is no because really, the -- our focus is the child and children. And the family aspect really addresses how -- in -- in a way, it -- it -- it talks about how we're going to go about supporting children, and having children become thriving contributing, you know, individuals down the road. So no, I don't -- I don't think "family" needs to be inserted in this --

MR. LAFRANCE: At this level.
COMMISSIONER AU: -- area; at this level. I -- I did struggle -- remember my reaction when I heard the suggestion. I really liked the inclusion of life versus just the focus on succeeding in school. I also understand that the reality is that, if we're going to go about finding a -- a -- a -- a point in which a child is going to be observed or -- or measured as to the child's overall health, whether it's socioemotional physical health or cognitive health, if there's such a thing, that it would be in an institutional -- sort of institutional environment versus, you know, in their families or, you know, or even in their neighborhood; maybe to some extent, in their neighborhood. But -- but I think that's really at the point in which the public, at large, begins to ascertain whether or not a child has met sort of the -- the -- at least the -- the -- the elemental fundamental requirements, if you want to call it that, or milestones in order to envision the -- the -- the trajectory for success.

So although I -- I'm fearing that the automatic thinking is that, "Oh, we're just going to invest in -- in cognitive development", which is development -- child development and -- and preschool, and so on and so forth, but I don't think so. I -- I now realize that, in order -- in order for a child to truly enter into school ready
to be successful, we need to address the -- the whole array of what constitute the optimum nurturing of a child. So I -- I -- I'm okay. I think -- I've -- you've won me over.

MR. LAFRANCE: I actually -- I actually think --

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah.

MR. LAFRANCE: I -- and I actually think Commissioner Fielding's language -- language suggestion further helps the clarification that there is -- there is this ultimate impact for a number of very important reasons that have to do with First 5's mandate and who you are. And -- but that the -- there are a number of goals under it, you know, really delineates that. It's -- you're not solely about preschool and early learning. That you're -- again, it's -- it's a whole child view; a holistic whole-child view on what it takes to create a nurturing -- a -- a young person child who is ready to succeed in -- in life.

COMMISSIONER AU: Well, yeah. It -- it --

MR. LAFRANCE: Achieve their optimum potential.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- their -- their view on through the stage of life, so to speak.

But the other thing about this, and I'm -- I'm going to -- you need to stop me, Duane, at some point, probably.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Me stop you? Who the hell do you think I am?

COMMISSIONER AU: Oh, dear!

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Go ahead, Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. I -- I -- I -- Jacquelyn is sitting at the prime spot in this conversation because -- remember how we struggled in terms of trying to find a point in which we could measure, you know, how successful we were with children; and the only data source we could think of was third grade reading score. From zero to five to the third grade was such a -- I mean, I -- it -- it was so frustrating.

But I think we have an opportunity here with -- as focusing in on the child's entering into kindergarten that doesn't preclude the whole notion of the -- the parents being the child's first teachers --

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- for example --

MR. LAFRANCE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- or the enrichment of the -- the social connection that the child may have --

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- growing up in a safe and caring neighborhood, and -- and having access to healthcare --
MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- when they're needed, or even in preventative kinds of --

MR. LAFRANCE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- opportunity, and having this enriched interaction with significant folks in their -- in their -- in their childhood, I mean, so I -- I -- I'm -- I'm okay. I'm excited.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay. I'm stopping you now. Jonathan.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I think you're really smart to stop her.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That's when you stop Nancy; when she finishes.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I have some -- I like this in general, but I have some concerns. For example, you can be ready to succeed in school and life and not have optimal physical health or optimum socioemotional health or optimum cognitive development. So it looks a little, you know, idealistic to me, and particularly on the physical health side; does that mean that we can reduce the 24 percent asthma rate in African-Americans in -- you know, in Los Angeles County? Or -- or I mean, it's -- optimum just sounds very --

COMMISSIONER AU: Ambitious?
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Unreal. Not just ambitious; unreal. And -- and we're -- we're going to have -- the question is, have we supported in ways that the outcomes will be better than they would've been. And that's really (inaudible) sense of we contributed to -- to cognitive development, or we contributed to socioemotional (inaudible) physical health.

But I -- I -- I don't -- just the optimum part that makes me concerned because it's not -- it's not -- doesn't -- doesn't resonate with me something that, you know, that the -- the program should have. It's something that we would teach in theory.

MR. LAFRANCE: Is the issue, Commissioner, just to clarify, achieve versus maximize because you could maximize a personal -- your personal optimum health and, you know, it may be very different than someone else's ability to be physically healthy.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: You want to achieve people's potential or different things. Their potential may be quite varied, you know. We have (inaudible) differences, we have other differences. So yeah, I think that you're on your own to -- the right direction.

MR. LAFRANCE: Perhaps children zero to five achieve their optimum physical health potential or something along those lines.
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Sorry.

MR. LAFRANCE: Children zero to five achieve their optimum physical health potential, or something along those lines. I -- I -- I -- what I'm -- as I hear the conversation, I'm open to, and I think it --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: It may be just their potential; physical health potential.

MR. LAFRANCE: Achieve their physical health potential? Okay.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: If all these are their potential, then I think that, this we know; that everybody has the same capacity for cognitive development --

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: -- achievement, either.


COMMISSIONER AU: Optimum is not a relative term, though; optimum through that individual child.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Well, then you have to say optimum for that -- but optimum just sounds like something, you know, it's up -- you have to look up to the stars.

COMMISSIONER AU: Mmm. I guess I read it differently. Well, okay.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Now, I do -- I thought of
that, too, Nancy. Optimum seems like the best you can do.

   COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah.

   COMMISSIONER FIELDING: That's -- that's our
interpretation of it; for this purpose.

   MR. LAFRANCE: Well, how do other commissioners
feel about the -- this -- the -- the friendly amendment
that I hear Commissioner Fielding suggesting, and about
the -- the fundamental structure of what we're proposing?

   COMMISSIONER AU: Maybe, the -- the question to
ask, if I may, would be how -- how did other commissioners
read that? Is it optimum in terms of relative to that
individual -- individual child or optimum based on
so-called the -- the standard?

   MR. LAFRANCE: A standard.

   COMMISSIONER AU: A general standard. I guess I
need to know --

   COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I think it's ambiguous.
I just think -- me -- me, anyway.


   COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. All right. And?

   MS. BELSHÉ: Well, the synonyms -- it's always
interesting to start with synonyms. Ideal. Perfect.
Optimal. That's really helpful. Optimum is defined as
"the best or most favorable point, degree, (inaudible), etcetera, as of temperature, light and moisture". Well,
that's helpful.

Second definition is "the greatest degree or best result obtained or obtainable under specific conditions".

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: So it's ambiguous.

COMMISSIONER AU: Very ambiguous. What does "potential" say?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Don't even bother.

MR. LAFRANCE: And thoughts or reactions? Yes.

Commissioner Bostwick?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: When I first read that, I -- I did have a hard time keeping family out of goal Number 2 because the socio - and with that, socioemotional health, I mean, it's all about the family. It's -- it surrounds the family, but (inaudible) I'm okay with (inaudible).

MS. BELSHÉ: That will then be a how.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: That would be a how. And I -- and I also -- so the how may be it's there also about where -- in a safe environment, it lands, because I -- I -- I am not sure with this we're looking at the physical or socioemotional and cognitive development, but where they get this safe environment, safe and nurturing environment.

And the only place I can think is up at the top, and I don't want to belabor this any longer; the children,
I think, are ready to succeed in life, in a safe and nurturing environment; and -- and I -- I don't want to make things longer, but I really want that safety issue in there.

COMMISSIONER AU: Thank you. I -- I guess maybe it's my way of thinking, but to me, if a child is confronted on a daily basis with unsafe situations, they would not be operating at the most potentially -- this is -- I like optimum; optimum socioemotional health or have -- be able to develop cognitively in a way that they would if they had a -- a really safe and nurturing environment. So I guess that's where my head is at here. So maybe -- maybe it needs to be more explicit. I don't know.

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, I do -- I mean, there's a couple of different ways I could see this going. But I -- I certainly expect that, in the outcomes conversation, you would -- you would have outcomes about the family, about the -- the community environments. I -- I -- knowing what I know now about your work, I couldn't imagine them -- them not being part of that framework.

So I -- I -- I absolutely see them being expressed there. And I also am of the very strong school of thought that, you know, these planning frameworks need to be owned and by and felt a strong sense of ownership
over from -- from the boards that create them. So there's a proposal on the table that Commissioner Bostwick put regarding, you know, slightly elaborating the ultimate impact. And I think it can be -- I think it's your decision. I can -- it absolutely -- families and communities will be caught in the outcome.

So there's no question in my mind given what I know about your work. But I think it's a reasonable point of discussion on the table to consider elaborating the ultimate impact statement in the way that Commissioner Bostwick proposed.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Comments? You -- you can talk. I mean, you're allowed.

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Well, I just -- all I wanted to say was something that I heard from the table before in that the vision, the target population, the ultimate impact, and contributing goals all work together. So they may not all have the same language, but together, they create the package. So you may not have the safe and nurturing environment in every statement, but it's definitely in the -- in the vision.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I would -- I would recommend that we go on to the goals through the out -- or outcomes.

MR. LAFRANCE: To the outcomes.
COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: And then, we come back to this. And if we're happy with it --

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: And make sure it's somewhere in there.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Well-seeded.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. So then, what I'm hearing is that there is directional agreement with the goals --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yeah.

MR. LAFRANCE: -- with some friendly amendment to the language that we'll work on, and though we will come back to the specific construction of this ultimate impact and goals contributing to it following the outcomes conversation. Does that seem right? Okay.

So -- so then -- so fantastic! That -- that takes us to the outcomes conversation. I just want to take a moment, just process-wise so there -- either just a few slides, and I'm going to go through to tee up the outcomes conversation; but the work of outcomes conversation will happen in small group breakouts where we will be asking you commissioners to select yourselves to choose a -- a goal area to work in. So conceptionally, those are physical health, socioemotional health, and cognitive development. And in that discussion, we have -- we have examples of outcomes for you to work from.
But what I wanted to say mostly was that we had thought that we would get into the pathways conversation today, and we might. But we really want to insure you have enough time to get into this discussion about outcomes. And now, we do need to come back to the goals before the end of the day.

And so, I'm just positing that we might -- we might not get to the pathways conversation today which, from our standpoint, would be okay, in terms of it won't hold up the rest of the process. Okay? Does that seem reasonable? Okay.

So then, in terms of outcomes, we just want to have in mind a couple of best practices as you're having the conversation. First of all, that the outcomes really must articulate an expected change; not a process or deliverable or other (inaudible), so outcomes are all about change.

So have that in mind as you're engaging in the conversation. They must focus on those, or we should focus on those that the organization can reasonably make a measurable difference in, and that they are positively linked to the -- the goal area, ideally based on research and evidence. So those are our -- those are the points of guidance that we offer you generally about outcomes. But specifically in thinking about outcomes for First 5 LA, we
are asking you to also bear in mind demonstrated need in
the community, and we have been presented with data from
the environmental scan, again, research and evidence
linking outcomes to contributing goals and the home
position -- the home positions on the levers. And I would
offer that the home positions do help us think about at
least the four -- first four levers; and the home
positions do help us think about outcomes, prevention to
intervention, but landing on prevention systems and policy
change, how do we achieve broad impact knowing, at times,
there may be targeting of high-risk groups, and that we
are mindful of the family and community context.

So all of this -- this -- earlier conversation
today really is culminating in this guidance to you in
thinking about outcomes. It's where you do get to think
about the how.

MS. BELSHÉ: Steven, how -- how do you encourage
commissioners to think of the issue of contribution versus
attribution? Because under best practices, there's -- the
second bullet talks about "focus on those that the
organization can reasonably make a measurable difference".

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, that -- yes. Thank you.
And that -- it's carefully chosen language. The make a
measurable difference can speak as much to a difference
that you've contributed to as -- as it could to a
difference that you can lay claim to in a cause affect manner.

Given that, generally speaking, I would encourage the Commission to think more from a contribution perspective than an attribution perspective, because I think if you were think from an attribution perspective, that would be too narrowing, and not in keeping with the partnership spirit of the previous conversations today.

MS. BELSHÉ: So that also, then, brings in the sixth lever.

MR. LAFRANCE: You're right. It does invoke the sixth lever.

MS. BELSHÉ: And the third bullet under Best Practices, when you encourage us to be reminded that the Commission should -- Commission should be focused in on those that are positively linked to (inaudible) ideally based on research and evidence?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. And so, my -- my language there is about the -- the research and evidence that has identified, for example, that we know breastfeeding --

MS. BELSHÉ: So kind of at a meta level.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. At a meta level; that breastfeeding is a preventative measure for obesity and overweight later in life. Yeah. But thank you for the probes, and I'm happy to have those levers be as relevant
as we can possibly make them.

MS. BELSHÉ:  Great.

MR. LAFRANCE:  So there are a number of tools
that we'll be providing you with.  They're - they're
really sample -- illustrative examples of outcomes.  We
actually have different handouts for you than what is up
on the screen, so I won't stay on that screen.  You'll
have different prompts.  We are going to ask you to -- as
I said, move into small group conversation to ultimately
recommend -- I'm -- I apologize; there's a discrepancy
between the handout you will receive for your table work,
your small group work, and the slide.  We're asking you to
identify five to seven outcomes; not two to four; five to
seven outcomes that will most significantly advance
progress towards the contributing goal.  And we have
considerations that are essentially questions -- question
versions of the criteria we just discussed.

The reason why we're -- we're saying five to
seven outcomes, not two to four, is not because we don't
want focus, but because we're acknowledging that this is a
multi-staged conversation; and we are not opening and
closing the discussion on outcomes today.  What we will do
with the list of outcomes that you generate today is we
will use it to -- and -- and plug into response options on
the community survey; the staff and grantee and contractor
survey. And so, they will be narrowed over time, and so this is again one -- one point in the process where we can start at a more generative longer list that will get narrowed through subsequent phases of the process. Sound good and clear?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Yep.

MR. LAFRANCE: So then, as with the lever home position conversations, you will be paired up with an LFA facilitator and a First 5 LA executive team member and another team member from First 5 LA to take notes.

Members of the community.

MS. KACZMAREK: Or they may observe the small group discussion or we are going to, again, have Conference Room C available for members of the community to provide input into the outcomes conversation, as well.

MR. LAFRANCE: If -- if members of the community observe the commissioner small groups, we just ask that you adhere to that guidance; that it is to observe the conversation. It is -- it's the commissioners' conversation. Our -- our facilitators will, you know, enforce that, and its obviously not that there can't be dialogue to -- to the extent that the commissioners would find that helpful, but that this is -- this is a commissioner-generated list of potential outcomes.

MS. KACZMAREK: So we have 45 minutes for the
exercise?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. We have 45 minutes for the exercise, but I will -- I will both be with one of the groups, and I will also circulate to the other groups to just check in on how that's going. And what we feel strongly about is not shortchanging this conversation, so if we -- if we need to go past the 45 minutes, we will. So I guess what I would like to do is just see by raise of hand perhaps from commissioners which of the groups you would like to -- which of the three groups each of you would like to go to.

So maybe I could just name each (inaudible) group and see a raise of hands for which commissioners would like to go because we're -- we haven't pre-assigned you. So which commissioner or commissions would like to participate in the physical health discussion?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Well, as a pediatrician, I probably --

MR. LAFRANCE: And then, the socioemotional health?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Well, for the ECE people, it's like -- it would be socioemotional, as well as cognitive. And I'm -- I'm just trying to figure out what would be -- it's both, I mean, so.

MR. LAFRANCE: Which -- which would the remaining
three would you choose?

MS. BELSHÉ: So you'd like to be on more than one, Commissioner Dennis.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I'm just saying, the ECE (inaudible) both, but I will start of with cognitive, and then probably need some transition at some point in time.

MS. BELSHÉ: So would you do socioemotional --

COMMISSIONER AU: Socioemotional because of --

MS. BELSHÉ: So maybe Nancy and (inaudible) and Joe and Duane on cognitive. Are you good with that?

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. Sure! And Commissioner Bostwick?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: Well, I know that Dr. Fielding has to -- to leave for another meeting at four o'clock so (inaudible).

MS. BELSHÉ: Okay. That's a good idea.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Okay. It helps. Okay.

MS. BELSHÉ: And I'll -- I'll join that group.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Okay.

MS. BELSHÉ: (inaudible) my shadow. I have to look at what is brown and --

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. That sounds good.

MS. BELSHÉ: And where would you like the commissioners to go, Steven?

MR. LAFRANCE: So --
MS. KACZMAREK: Do we have the use of the commissioner conference room, and maybe the physical health team can use the commissioner conference room; and then, we can use the middle, as I asked, for the socioemotional discussion, and then the cognitive development team here.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Okay.

MS. KACZMAREK: Sounds good.

MS. BELSHÉ: Okay.

(Discussions off the record)

MR. LAFRANCE: I (inaudible) at this stage -- early stage in this process. I suggest we start with health, and then we'll go to socioemotional health, and then (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: All right. So I guess we'd just like to point -- point out that we kind of had two different conversations in the health group; one was around health issues that are most affecting children in Los Angeles County and that we kind of care most about. And then we had a conversation that stemmed from that based on what -- what is our role in relation to those issues.

It really focused on the realm of early screening, early intervention and referrals, which turned out was what we saw as a very significant -- it was
getting a little bit more into pathway, you know, getting a little bit more into pathway, but is a really -- a high potential way to effect a lot of these issues. So -- and in reviewing the -- the health issues that we identified, there were two major criteria. Number One was to what extent from the environmental scan and other areas was there data suggesting?

This is a very important issue. And we also really thought about are there other systems, agencies, etcetera, that are right now doing a really good job or playing a big role, and -- and therefore, it is less of kind of a reduced need of rationale for First 5 to get into that space. So as I result of that thought process --

MS. BELSHÉ: And -- and -- and if I may, we also talked about entertaining policy environment.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Right. We -- we -- so this is our preliminary list, and we decided that some additional review of players out there working on this stuff, policy trends, funding trends would be helpful in further informing and refining this list. But we basically landed on healthy weight as a really important issue; oral health, asthma management, and then getting into the earlier years, breastfeeding and healthy births is really important outcomes to work towards that have a
lot of bearing on these. And the -- you know, the rest of our conversation, we really talked about the powerful role that early screening and referral can play in setting, not only families up, but also, in some ways, providers, doctors, in helping to manage and mitigate these issues down the road. So it basically talked about the -- and this is very consistent with upstream lever, the -- the value and the leverage of really thinking about this space; and not necessarily what First 5 can do here, but how it can look at this process from a systemic standpoint and create bridges into the rest of the health system and family support systems to make sure that this early screening intervention is happening for all kids, and that families and doctors know what to do once some of these indicators and -- and -- and data start coming back.

COMMISSIONER AU: Excellent.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. Excellent! Unless there are any questions or comments, I'll -- I'll move into sharing the socioemotional health group; the results of our work. There are, in fact, five outcomes. But what we identified was that there were a number of indicators that, when it came to measurement evaluation framework time, we'd want to be sure to capture under some of these outcomes, but the -- the increasing family protective factors and reducing risk factors was a key outcome that the group
discussed.

Those would be indicated by exposure to violence, positive social connections, reducing levels of stress and depression, more safe and nurturing environments, and positive parenting practices, and knowledge of child development; and this is parent/child bonding. Yes, Commissioner Au.

COMMISSIONER AU: The -- the -- maybe another in there would be economic stability. When you talk about family protective factors, that if there's economic uncertainty, their ability to be in a state of mind to focus in on protective factors may be compromised. What do you think?

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, I just -- well, I would suggest that we keep it in perhaps in relation to the access to concrete supports in times of need, which was the --

COMMISSIONER AU: (inaudible) But I guess that would be another place to put it, although I think protective factors can also be impacted --

MS. BELSHÉ: Oh, here. This is where -- this is actually one of them -- to the extent there are five, some say six evidence-based protective factors, most of them are captured here, and they -- they only have access to (inaudible). That's actually one of the protective
MR. LAFRANCE: So maybe this is even subsumed here. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

MR. LAFRANCE: Great! And -- and excellent point! Thank you for raising it. We went to talking about the -- you know, the result of that work would be a reduction in substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect. It's kind of our key outcome that we would want to achieve from that earlier stage more upstream work.

And then, the conversation went to talk about, "Okay. So though they're" -- well, first of all, did we need to have early detection of an intervention for developmental concerns, which I think is, yeah, parallel to what you had in health. But recognizing that there are children who are in family environments that are -- have risk factors today, and that -- that shows up in behavioral problems with the children, and what ends up happening is, in the early care and learning settings, they are often removed from the settings for what could otherwise be prevented situations. So the commissioners came up with a -- a -- a new outcome to reduced removal from early care and learning settings for severe and preventable behavioral problems. So that was the discussion there.
And I would just say that the discussion started with work in the health arena, so your healthy births, breastfeeding was important to the socioemotional group, as well. And we thought that was a good sign that your plan was starting to hold together. And there was also discussion about -- or cognitive development, but recognized that would be handled here. Okay. Any other comments?

SPEAKER: So in the cognitive group, we also did recognize some of the outcomes in terms of socioemotional and physical health, and knew that they would be captured there, and would chime in if we saw anything missing. But we started in thinking about, which was helpful, framing outcomes on family community in the workforce, and thinking of parents as active and equal partners in their child's learning; thinking about the inclusion of children with special needs and other disabilities and all ECE settings that's important to having be an outcome for this area; improving listening and language skills, wanting to break that out.

We still talked about wanting to maybe see if others could be integrated, so we started doing that work, as well.

MS. BELSHÉ: I'm -- I'm sorry. Say more about bringing listening, language skills out.
SPEAKER: In thinking about some of the key developmental milestones for young children, that having listening and language skills, we were wanting to think through some of the English -- English language learner skills, and thinking about that more as being some of the indicators, but we did want to capture that as an outcome.

MR. LAFRANCE: At the child level.

SPEAKER: At the child level, yes.

MR. LAFRANCE: Together with (inaudible) self-regulation, steam skills?

SPEAKER: Yeah. So steam, which is the new --

SPEAKER: It's adding the arts -- arts into stem.

SPEAKER: Yes. Steam is the new stem, and so wanting to have that outcome for young children, as well.

COMMISSIONER AU: What's that?

MS. BELSHÉ: And then, five.

SPEAKER: Well, then, five --

SPEAKER: And so, five is the combination of increased access to high quality ECE through nationally accredited or certified providers, wanting to combine that and insure that it's quality ECE, but it's also increasing on the level of education of providers.

MS. BELSHÉ: So is that -- is the inclusion of (inaudible) getting into the how?

MR. LAFRANCE: (inaudible)
SPEAKER: Of course!

MS. BELSHÉ: There's more!

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. I mean, I'll have to work with these to make sure that I hear about (inaudible). But I -- I see your point.

SPEAKER: And we did have that conversation with a few of the outcomes, really talked more about, you know, about being a part of the pathways. Not for that one. We got really excited about that one. Increase initiative and curiosity. Once again, some of the skills that we see for young children to be able to develop optimum -- for their optimum cognitive development. Improve motor development, improve reasoning and problem solving, and improve child literacy, would be the last outcome.

MR. LAFRANCE: So one might -- if -- if -- you know, there are like (inaudible) lumpers and splitters in the world. So the lumpers of the world would probably put the child level outcomes together and say, "This is kind of the package of what, you know, healthy cognitive development looks like."

MS. BELSHÉ: Are you a lumper or a splitter?

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Well, let -- let -- let me -- let me say this. In the beginning, I said that -- that, you know, a lot of this did -- deals with, you know, what a high quality early childhood setting would look
like; and you had three main areas: you had your workforce; you have your parents; and you have the child. So you have to focus in those three areas. And so, that's -- that's how we framed the discussion.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yeah. That was very helpful. Great. Any comments or --

MS. BELSHÉ: (inaudible)

MR. LAFRANCE: A lumper.

COMMISSIONER AU: Lumper. May I -- may I ask a question because it -- it -- it's something that I -- I shared in our group that I heard this morning that was really disturbing; that the CDC made a -- a report that they saw an uptick in the number of two-year-olds being prescribed ADHD medication. And so, my -- my question is, in the context of this conversation, what would that indicate, and what would we -- what would be our position regarding something like that? Yeah.

MR. LAFRANCE: I mean, to me, it speaks to the need for and supports the prioritization of the early detection and intervention. But -- but intervention in a way that is more, as you've articulated it, in terms of building family-protective factors and addressing risk factors, which is to say that I -- I think that's the (inaudible) of some of these problems that we see with kids today; and -- and young children are becoming -- are
-- are becoming more prevalent; and the question becomes
what's the root ethic. And I think it's more -- I would
-- I see it as more of a reflection of sort of our -- our
tendency to medicalize these problems, then -- then take
them in context and work upstream.

COMMISSIONER AU: And the other is, I guess, the
fallout for a lot of this medication strategy is that
children are -- are actually -- their growth has been
retarded.

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

COMMISSIONER AU: Its impacted their -- their
normal growth. And so, I'm just wondering also about the
cognitive impact with -- with the medications such as
this, too. So --

MR. LAFRANCE: And probably, the data aren't even
available because these practices are relatively new. But
my perception is that you're articulating a position here
which is very much a distinct one from that approach,
which (inaudible) we need to (inaudible) child in context
of family and the factors surrounding them.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

MR. LAFRANCE: And acknowledging that there are
kids who are going to have behavioral problems, but that
there are professional strategies for addressing those
behavioral problems that parents and providers may not be
aware of.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. Thank you, Steven.

MR. LAFRANCE: So this is really --

SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MR. LAFRANCE: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL: So I just wanted to share with commissioners some of the conversations we had in the community group. So it was actually a very helpful conversation. I think the members of the group that we were working with, they really brought up the similar position to Commissioner Dennis about how each of these goals are interrelated; and so, it's very difficult to identify outcomes that just align with one particular goal area because, if you're affecting a child's cognitive development, that also affects their socioemotional development, and their physical health has implications across all of the other pieces, as well. So one of the recommendations that our group had was that, if we look at protective factors, the -- the five protective factors as the outcomes that First 5 LA would potentially hold itself accountable to, that it is -- it allows us to look at what strengths exist already and what needs to be built in terms of strength for families in order to see the positive change across each of those three goal areas, and to look at those protective factors as crosscutting across...
all of them; and not just related to one particular goal.

Also, because of the -- the levers for impact in the home positions that we have articulated and approved, the -- the challenge to us was to think about, you know, if we are moving away from direct services and accepting specific cases, how -- what is the type of strategies that we're going to be looking at? They are going to be more crosscutting at the systems level or at the policy level and, therefore, you know, how would we be able to make any sort of contribution at -- at -- at the very specific child level that some of the example outcomes provided to us? So that was another challenge for us to think through in terms of measurement.

And then, lastly, if we are measuring at the child level, you know, that implies doing a lot of assessments of a child's development or progress, and it -- you know, various points in -- in the zero to five timeframe, and that can be very costly and very challenging and, you know, that's a value statement that I think they -- that the community members have asked us, is that something that we want to do, is that if we maybe look at the protective factors as a way to guide our work in terms of outcomes, that may allow us to measure at the systems and workforce and organizational level, which may be more cost effective and easier to attain knowledge
about the -- the -- the type of change that we're seeing. So I thought it was a very helpful conversation. Is there anything else from the group that you'd all like to add?

SPEAKER: I have something. I think -- I guess it (inaudible) it's cognitive. Actually, I have two things and, Duane, I think I was going in the same direction that you were. I have to use the microphone. I think I was going the same direction that you were in terms of this crosscutting -- cutting across all; but in particular, since I'm an early childhood education person, one thought, and this wasn't mine; it was somebody else in the group, suggested that where it mentions early care and education, that may be a how instead of a what. So I just add that.

And then, the other thing; this came up from me -- at least from me, I raised it; in the -- in the cognitive portion where we were talking about increased initiative and curiosity, improved child literacy. That suggests to me we're testing children or assessing children on specific skills; and I guess I wonder, should we be assessing individual children on specific skills, particularly children birth to five, when their development is evolving? So I just raise that as I question for me.

MR. LAFRANCE: Well, in -- I'll just speak from
the discussion in that group and the commissioners
essentially decided no; that that was not what they would
be recommending. That did not rise to the level of a
recommended outcome. Yeah.

SPEAKER: I -- I guess that's when -- when it
says improve or increase. It suggests to me that we're
talking about children -- it suggests to me that we're
doing some sort of measurement on individual children on
how they're, you know, not so much progressing, but how
are they doing on their math skills when, you know, they
enter kindergarten, and when they enter kindergarten, if
they've been in, say, a high-quality early care and
education program. They -- they are going to come in with
certain math skills. They're going to come in with
certain science skills. But it -- but sort of thinking
about the foundation of children's learning is through
their play. And so, how you do you -- how do you measure
that? Or I guess, it was just sort of something that just
didn't sit with me well.

MR. LAFRANCE: Sure.

SPEAKER: I'll leave it at that.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yeah. Thank you. Now, I mean,
there -- there -- the -- the question of what the
evaluation looks like and what this implies for data
collection is something we'll definitely have to take up.
And -- and your perspective is really helpful to say, you know, we can't get locked into so many of these, you know, hard dimensions of what we want to say is like where the kid should be going right into school. I mean, there are assessments that look at different dimensions, but that it is more complex than -- than they portray. What -- what would be really helpful, because we put off the recommendation on the goals, structure the ultimate impact and three goals because we wanted to have this outcome conversation and come back to it to see how we felt about the possibility of including some language in the ultimate impact box with respect to in nurturing environments -- in safe and nurturing environments, so we've -- we've now had the outcome conversation, we -- the safe and nurturing environments language is part of the family protective factors, risk -- risk factors and, really, the question of the commissioners, then, is, you know, seeing this all together as I package, how does that -- how does that either shift your perspective or -- what do -- what do you want to have be the recommendation that you advance to the Full Board with respect to the ultimate impact statement and the contributing goals?

COMMISSIONER BOSTWICK: So the Full Board would be able see how it's incorporated down below, then I say either way, I don't have a problem.
MR. LAFRANCE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AU: I -- I think we spell it out pretty clearly with the risk factors, as well as the protective factors, as well as the --

MR. LAFRANCE: Concrete supports.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. Exactly.

MR. LAFRANCE: Okay. Other commissioners.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I don't have no problem. I'm -- yeah. It's good to go.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yeah. Okay.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

MR. LAFRANCE: So -- so then, to summarize the recommendation is to have the ultimate impact language as it is presented here, and we are going to work on the wording of the goals, not the substance, but the -- taking up the optimum versus relativity of optimum to potential, and we'll come up with --

MS. BELSHÉ: Survey Monday (inaudible) --

MR. LAFRANCE: And but -- but we'll take the spirit of this discussion into account in making those revisions, and we'll bring forth the recommendation to the Full Board, then, on the goals.

COMMISSIONER AU: Excellent! Very good!

MS. BELSHÉ: So given the hour, I know we're going to close here; do you want to tee up the June board
meeting, Steven?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. I would love to.

MS. BELSHÉ: Particularly, given the pathways piece that we didn't get into at all today.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes. Yes. So I'll just quickly -- I'm sorry.

MS. BELSHÉ: No. Go ahead.

MR. LAFRANCE: No. You, please.

MS. BELSHÉ: So the point -- the point -- you're -- what you just summarized is exactly what we'll be bringing back to the Full Commission for formal approval. But will we also be using some of that time for further dialogue around the outcomes, kind of building off this work?

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes, we will. We will. So just to -- and to be completely comprehensive in this summary, we will bring to the Full Board in June the recommended vision statement, the target population statement, and the goal structuring content.

SPEAKER: June 12th?

MR. LAFRANCE: On June 12th. That's right. So all of those three will come to the Board. The outcomes will also be presented to the Board, just as we discussed in the presentation of a -- an emerging coherent package that -- that goes down to the outcome level. But to be
clear, the outcomes that came out of this meeting are
those that will go on the community survey because that
has to get into the field before June 12th. And that --
and that's fine I -- in our opinion, because this -- it's
still giving the opportunity for input on a larger set of
outcomes that the purpose of which will be to narrow them
over time.

So we will touch upon the outcomes in the June
12th meeting to share what the committee in this Special
Commission meeting recommended. Kim, I was just saying
that those out -- the out -- these outcomes that will make
their way onto the survey that goes out into the field.
Time permitting, in the June 12th meeting, we will -- we
will also introduce the notion of the pathways, and that
has not come up in this meeting yet. But we will want to
have a conversation about them at the June 23rd program
and planning committee meeting and the June 30th retreat.
So it would be helpful if we could at least introduce, at
June 12th, the pathways. And -- and that -- I mean, I
will just very quickly scroll to what they are, which is
in this very detailed slide, but it's the -- the
high-level takeaway here is that the pathways are -- are
-- there are three types of pathways: Direct services,
community capacity building, and policy and systems
improvement. Within them are more specific interventions,
and so the notion is that we will get into much more of the mechanics of the how as we start talking about the pathways conversation.

MR. HILDEBRAND: If I could also just add, just to be clear, if these pathways look familiar to you, that's because they have been imported from your previous strategic plan. These are your three, you call them strategies. We're introducing some language of pathway because, since this is a strategic plan, we want the strategies in your plan to actually be time-limited to the plan cycle where these are your more enduring ways of creating change. So just to be clear, these are not new concepts, so what we expect to be doing is basically just like with outcomes, focus and refinement within these pathways --

MR. LAFRANCE: Right.

MR. HILDEBRAND: -- going forward.

MR. LAFRANCE: That's right. Knowing that you've already made a policy decision to have relatively greater investment in policy and systems improvement and community capacity building relative to direct services. Okay.

MS. BELSHÉ: Very good.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Any other questions? We don't have any comments from the community. I didn't receive any slips, so that -- that means this meeting is
adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned.)
CERTIFICATE

I, Heatherlynn Gonzalez, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, License Number 13646, do hereby attest that:

The preceding is a true and accurate transcription of the audio file of the meeting of the organization named herein;

The audio file of the meeting was taken down in shorthand and transcribed into English under my supervision and authority;

I have no interest, financial or otherwise, in any of the parties, issues, or individuals who are involved in this organization.

Attested to on this ________ day of ________, 2014.

______________________________
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA