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MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your patience. We will now begin our regularly scheduled meeting of the First 5 Board. Madam Secretary, please call roll.

(Roll called.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. And we will proceed with the next item on the agenda which is approval of the minutes from February 14. Is there a motion to move?

(So moved.)

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Moved and second -- seconded. Is there any discussion?

Hearing none. Please record a unanimous vote regarding the approval of the minutes.

Third item for today is the approval of the monthly financial statements. And we call on our interim financial director for any remarks.

Sir?

MR. ORTEGA: Thank you, Supervisor Ridley-Thomas.

Good afternoon, Commissioners. Before requesting the Board approval for the monthly financials, I want to
give you a little update of the work efforts that staff
and the finance department and work with the budget and
finance committee has been doing in the last couple of
months.

In the prior month's presentation, you recall
that we started producing the check register. The check
registers are still available via our Web site for you
guys to review. And it's always available so that we can
continue to be transparent.

In addition, for this month's presentation I
would like for you guys to pay attention to page 119-A in
the hard copy of the Board packet. And it's page 2 of 7.
If you're looking on it electronically.

This month, what we have done is we've of course
with the support of our budget and finance committee is
that we're introducing a new statement which is our total
revenue and our total expenditures for the month.

It is a new presentation that we think is a tool
that represents all the information that summarizes all
the other statements that we have produced on a monthly
basis. Again, it is a summary, and it shows you the
projections of our cash balance at all times, and we're
hoping that such a tool continues to help you guys make
good sound decisions for the Commission.

On that, I ask for the Commission to approve the
financial statements as presented.

They are a soft close and unaudited.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

(Motion moved.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's been properly moved. Seconded?

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: And seconded as well. We received the financial report and submit it so that it is indeed filed for audit.

Are there any additional comments? Any objections?

Then we will record it as a unanimous vote.

Item Number 4 is before us.

MR. GALLARDO: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Good afternoon.

MR. GALLARDO: For your consideration in the consent calendar you will find information on 14 new agreements, one contract amendment, and one contract renewal.

I would like to bring to your attention the 11 new grantees in support of First 5 LA public policy strategic efforts.

There are 10 new grantees under our policy advocacy fund initiative.
This is the second cycle of this initiative, and these grantees submitted very strong proposals to do work in one or more of First 5 LAs identified policy areas.

In addition, to these grantees and this item we have also included for your consideration the contract with our Sacramento advocate. Together the policy advocacy fund grantees and the Sacramento advocate intend to enhance First 5 LA's policy efforts to promote system change in the areas of health, safety, and school readiness.

In the packet we have also included a snapshot of the policy activity that these efforts will be supporting, and later in the meeting, Stacy and I will provide the commission with an overview of First 5 LA public policy efforts.

If there are any questions we will be happy to address them.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Great. We recognize Commissioner Au.

MS. AU: May I ask, is there a policy subgroup at this point in time? I know we used to have one where I think Marv was the chair of that committee at some point in time.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Essentially, programming and planning --
MS. AU: I see.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: -- functions in that capacity.

MS. AU: So I guess the question that I'm asking is whether or not these contracts were vetted through that -- some kind of process. Because I guess I'm finding it really difficult to sort of draw some connections between our strategic plans at the moment and many of these policy contracts. So if I can get some assistance in terms of how they relate, that will really help me.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Madam Executive Director.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to talk a little bit briefly about the solicitation which began, I believe, last -- late summer or fall. And it was a process that has yielded these ten proposals.

Now, from a big picture perspective, I think it's important for us all to remember that public policy and advocacy is an absolutely critical strategy that the Commission has identified as absolutely essential to achieving large scale and sustained change in the health, the safety, and the school readiness of young children.

The commission, through work that preceded my tenure, identified ten public policy priorities that had
anchored the work of this organization in the public policy and advocacy arena.

These ten recommended grants are the product, as I say, of this second cycle of policy advocacy funds, and you know, frankly, I think these are ten strong proposals. They reflect a very broad policy agenda. And this is something that I will anticipate -- or I anticipate through the Listening, Learning, and Leading initiative, we will get some feedback on whether or not there's some missed opportunities for this organization and policy, whether or not we would be better offering a bit more focused and prioritization.

But that being said, even with the ten broad policy areas that this commission identified previously, I think there's some very clear themes that emerged from the grants before you.

Number 1, one of the most important opportunities that we have as an organization is contribute to the successful implementation of the Federal Affordable Care Act.

And so of the ten grants, four of them are specifically targeting priorities that exist in the context of that reform, such as outreach, enrollment, and retention of targeted populations: Principally immigrants and Latino families.
Focusing on implementation as it relates to pregnant women and improving health outcomes.

Strategies related to oral health which this organization has identified as a very high priority.

There's also another series of themes in terms of improving child care quality and the care setting.

So, in my mind, we have an opportunity to bring more focus to our policy agenda, but in the context of a solicitation that began last summer and fall, I think these ten proposals are very strong, very reflective of the broad policy agenda this organization had identified previously.

And I think the Sacramento advocate, our lobbyist, will be a very important piece of our effort to bring further focus and definition, and, so, strongly encourage the Board's support of the recommendation.

MS. AU: May I ask another question?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: The matters before us. Any other questions?

MS. AU: May I --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: You may ask as many questions as you wish.

MS. AU: Thank you.

Is there a criteria or a specific outcome that is going to be utilized to gauge whether or not these
contractors have been effective in their policy work?

MS. BELSHE: Absolutely. You know, the measuring
of impact in public policy and advocacy represents a
different set of challenges than measuring the number of
services provided, which does represent quite a bit of our
work.

But that being said, we want to be accountable to
the Board, we want to be accountable to the broader
community, we want our contractors to be accountable; so
we're working with them on the scopes of work. And there
will be process as well as outcome measures that through
the course of their work and our work with you, we will be
reporting on.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. To that point --
Dr. Fielding.

MR. FIELDING: I'm really glad to see these.

I don't think we're enough in the policy realm
and, you know, some of our discussion today will be
sunsetting contracts or not sunsetting and the like, and
the only way to produce resources that we're going to be
able to have the impact that we all wish for fervently is
to have policy change.

And so making sure that we have a strong
foundation of policy advocacy, policy analysis that
supports it is absolutely critical.
My -- my only question is not only how we can do more but how do these come together? Is there -- some of these are early around several nexus and nexi. And so how do these --

MS. BELSHE: Nexi?

MR. FIELDING: Nexi. Yes.

MS. BELSHE: Nexi. Okay. Interesting. I learn something from you every meeting.

MR. FIELDING: I'm not even sure it was grammatically correct.

MS. BELSHE: I don't think the word exists.

MR. FIELDING: I like the way it sounded.

MS. BELSHE: Let me, if I may, ask our policy director or manager, Stacy Lee, who does convene indeed our policy advocacy fund grantees.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Let the record reflect that Dr. Fielding is attempting to rap today.

Thank you so much.

MS. LEE: So in terms of your questions we do have very diverse grantees and it is challenging because of the different areas where they worked.

But we do have quarterly grantee meetings where they come together and we find ways to have discussion about how we can work as an advocacy community and areas of similarity or alignment where people can work together
within a specific area such as health or across as a children's advocacy, sort of, committee.

MR. FIELDING: Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Other questions from the commission about the item before us in terms of the action moved to.

(Motion moved for approval.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Let me just ask the question about the evaluative component. I think that's a very substantial concern. And I'm not sure that what has been communicated -- spoke to whether or not the evaluation is predetermined or if in fact it is yet to be negotiated, pursuant to the approval of these recommendations.

MS. BELSHE: If I may, let me ask Stacy to elaborate on my comments which were focused on the scope of works which have been negotiated which speak to objectives, responsible parties, deliverables, which will help us monitor impact.

But, Stacy?

MS. LEE: Sure. So what Kim was mentioning was one layer of contract management. We work closely with the grantees to ensure that we're aware of their progress.

And, you know, with policy, things can be unpredictable; so we talk with -- work them very closely in case we do need to make course corrections.
Within each of these grants, they're required to set aside 5 percent of their grant funds to engage in some level of evaluation of their project. And so many of them hire external reviewers.

We have a technical assistance provider who works closely with the grantees to help them develop their evaluation plans.

Evaluating policy -- and as we'll talk about later today -- is a newer area in evaluation, and we're working very closely with them to try and ensure that we can find the right evaluative processes to match the varieties of projects that they have within their grants.

And then there's also the research and evaluation department is doing an evaluation of all policy -- public policy strategies as well. So there's the grantee level and then there's the agency level.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much.

Madam Executive Director, and to the entire team, is my point of view that the notion of accountability is how's then effective evaluation of program policy, let us just simply say, the expenditure of public funds?

Therefore, in my mind, while there should be creativity and flexibility up to a certain point, I would hope the Board would appreciate and affirm the need to
have clearly stated up front evaluative tools by which grantees are guided.

I do not believe that it should be negotiated in the back end, nor do I believe that it should be left to the grantee to make a determination as to what the parameters of those evaluations would be.

And what I think I heard was that this was more undefined than, frankly, I'm comfortable with.

It is a recipe for, at the conclusion of the grant process, not having what one might have hoped for.

Madam Executive Director, your response, please.

MS. BELSHE: I think it's a really important statement around accountability and working with our grantee partners at the front end to ensure that there is mutual understanding and clarity of what our expectations are and how we're going to hold ourselves and our grantees accountability.

My point -- and many members of this Commission know how nonlinear a policy process can be. And so a number of these grants are -- you know, at the end of the day success will be measured by whether or not a law gets changed. And we all know that that can take years.

And many times the success of a policy change, whether it be in the context of health care reform or changes to eligibility enrollment systems or facilitating
access to child care subsidies or creating a healthier child care setting that supports better nutrition will take many years.

But there's near term actions that present or provide some forward movement in terms of education, coalition building, engagement of policymakers; so those are the -- those are some of the accountability measures, if you will, of the kind of deliverables that we articulate at the front end of these contracts to ensure that we and our contractors have a sense of what to expect.

We also need to be nimble, because we know the external environment changes. And that also changes how we and our contractors might approach a policy change they're seeking to advance.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: See, I'll take it further. The -- leaving it to the grantee to determine parameters of the evaluation gives me pause.

It seems to me that there ought to be some negotiation and definition that the grantor as well as the grantee understands early on.

MS. LEE: There is.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I didn't hear that. And I think I would appreciate having evidence of that.

MS. LEE: So we've worked very closely on this
very topic for that very reason that you raise with our
technical assistance consultant. We've developed our own
evaluation guidebook. And we regularly provide trainings
and overviews of the main components that First 5 LA would
like to see in all of the evaluations.

We do work with them in partnership as they
develop their plans and hire their consultants because the
grants -- the projects are so different.

There are some that are working in the community
levels, some are working at state and federal policies; so
they do require some nuances between each of the projects.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Let me ask you a question.
When is it, then, that the agreement between the grantor
and the grantee is fixed as it relates to the evaluative
process?

MS. LEE: Well, if they're making payments
related to evaluation, then we have to review and approve
their memorandum of understanding with their evaluators;
so that is a fixed point in time in which we work with
them and make sure that we're clear -- the plan -- and the
plan is clear.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I'm assuming that there's a
granting period. There's a cycle.

MS. LEE: I'm sorry.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: My assumption is that there's
a granting period and there is a cycle.

MS. LEE: Some of them do and --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: So when in the cycle? Is it in the first quarter that you have to have the evaluation component determined? That's the nature of the question.

MS. LEE: We give them six months to a year, because they have to begin the --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: And the length of the grant?

MS. LEE: They're three to five years.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Commissioner Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: I just -- I think Kim said what I was going to say.

I think you have to separate the policy piece from the advocacy piece. You know, in the advocacy development, you can speak to numbers of people as process.

I think that policy development, you may not see the end result for years to come. And that is a result just of what goes on. If you're trying to impact on a regulation or a law, the work that's done now may not be realized for five or ten years down the road. And that's what happens in public policy. So --

MS. BELSHE: The work we've endeavored to do with our grantees is consistent with the ten policy priorities
that the Commission has identified. And the solicitation
process that we pursue is to identify those -- the
strongest proposals that are grounded in our ten policies
priorities.

    We do work with our contractors. We do have
money set aside, as Stacy said, for evaluation. Though I
don't want to mislead you in terms of thinking these are
imperical analyses.

    In my mind, one of the strongest aspects of
accountability is being clear with what is the policy
objective we're trying to accomplish; so one of our
grantees, for example, has identified and provided some
data on inequitable distribution -- or raises concern
about inequitable distribution of dollars through one of
the state departments that seems to be inequitably
addressing or affecting certain racial, ethnic, and
geographic populations. So the policy objective is to
achieve greater equity in the distribution of those funds.

    Over the course of this grant, which is a
four-year grant, they've identified a number of very
specific deliverables to help advance that policy goal:
Creating a coalition, educating parents and other
stakeholders, conducting an evaluation of the distribution
of dollars, using data to form coalitions and advance
advocacy.
In the end, what is success? Success is policy change. But as we all know, that doesn't happen overnight. And so our grantees were saying at the front end, these are our expectations of what you will do. And what we were going to assess your performance on, to give us a sense of the progress you make.

Is that a formal evaluation? No. That's really looking at what are the deliverables at the front end of the agreement and hold them to that.

On top of that there is a more qualitative type of evaluation that Stacy mentioned.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I'm quite familiar with the difference between qualitative and quantitative evaluation. The point is simply evaluation; so if, in fact, you move to a qualitative scenario, there still has to be some sense of accountability of public funds as it relates to progress being made.

Speak to me, then, about where is the check-in point as to how respective grantees are progressing.

MS. LEE: Sure. So I actually think in terms of that question, the contract management side is much more responsible for ensuring accountability along the way.

They are on a reimbursement basis, and we review their invoices on a monthly basis.

When they pay contractors or subcontractors, we
review their memorandums of understanding and ensure that we're clear about who those people are, what their functions are, and how they're serving the purposes of the grant.

And we check in with them very regularly. We see them at their quarterly grantee meetings, we read and review the reports, we follow up with them and ask questions. And when we see some positive achievement, we highlight them. We write articles and support their work through the Monday morning report and other avenues to support the things that they are doing.

And when we see challenges, we meet with them and talk about course corrections; so they can make adjustments along the way.

And that happens much earlier than any evaluation would find.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Right. So that speaks to the question of accountability between the staff and the contracting entities, the grantees.

The next level of accountability seems to me to be in terms of the staff to the Board. So what, then, is the feedback mechanism to the Board that gives indication on progress in the area -- the ten areas that these respective grantees will be working on? Where will the Board then hear as to what's being done other than through
the Monday morning report? Is there a formalized presentation or a point in time --

MS. BELSHE: Actually, Mr. Chair, we are kicking that off on the agenda later this afternoon in terms of shining a light on the work of public policy as a part of our strategic plan implementation.

You recall, each month, we're trying to highlight work that is underway related to the implementation. So this will be a big-picture overview that will give the Board a sense of the array of activity underway within this organization through public policy. Some of the lessons learned, and direction forward.

As I have shared with you before, I would like to include on each of our Board agendas, specific attention to public policy so that we can use that as an opportunity to call out particular issue areas or grantees.

Finally, as part of the Listening, Learning, and Leading undertaking, I do expect that we will be coming back with some findings and recommendations related to the work we do in public policy.

Dr. Fielding has a --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay. Dr. Fielding, then I'm going to try this one more time. Go ahead.

MR. FIELDING: Just two things.

One, pursuant to your point, Chairman, I would
like to see us have some defined points, whether it's
every six months or whatever an overview, where we have
made progress against our specific goals and objectives.

And it seems to me that we're talking about
policy as if it's kind of one thing, and we all know it's
not. And I would overly simplistically divide it into two
groups.

One, we're trying to change laws and ordinances
and regulations and that takes time. It doesn't happen
all at once.

But more than that, we're trying to change the
implementation of things that are already in place; so, in
fact, it's consistent with the goals of that regulation.

And you heard a good example from Kim how, you
know, things may be not being implemented in a way that
provides equity.

And so that's the implementation side of what's
already in place -- has a lot of opportunities, and many
of those opportunities, you can't predict. Your things
that come up as -- you know, as implementation goes on, as
you get feedback from the community. As you may see the
examples of where things could have been done better.

And that's why having coalitions and having some
people holding those people who are responsible, holding
them accountable is something that we should hear about on
a frequent basis. But we can't always project a priori what that will be two years from now.

MS. BELSHE: I might suggest, Mr. Chair, that through the monthly Board meetings and using some time to focus on this issue is one mechanism for us as a staff to engage the Board and provide periodic updates.

Number 2, the programming and planning committee provides another opportunity to engage the Board in terms of our work in the policy arena.

So those can be two mechanisms that I believe have been used in the past. And as I said at the front end, really believe that this is such an important part of our work, that I really do want to encourage us to use a little bit of time in each Board meeting talking about public policy. What are we learning? What impact are we having? What course corrections do we need to take?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think that would be helpful, and Dr. Fielding, thanks for that intervention.

I guess, Madam Executive Director, the -- the issue of dealing with the public policy generically or practically in the abstract is one thing. But as it relates specifically to these contracts, it would seem to me that that's a good way to begin the test.

The staff relationship with the contracting agencies as it relates to delivering product, whether it
be policy or whether it be services.

The nexus is that resources are being expended for X. And then the question becomes how is it that we are good stewards of these resources, in terms of what it is we are -- are expecting.

And I think the Board has to be held accountable in that regard collectively to oversee this process.

And so I guess in the final analysis, there may be a need to give some attention for how we brand the drill down on evaluation and accountability.

Dr. Fielding has made a suggestion of a six-month check in. I'm fine with that. Or I'm quite open to the Executive Director and her team coming back with a proposal to do that.

But that needs to be done, and that's what the Chair would be expecting.

Commissioner Au.

MS. AU: Well, I bring up -- I'm I guess a broken record, but the other concern I have is sustainability. Because these contracts, as I read, they're not small contracts. Although they extend over a period of time, some of them are half a million dollars.

And I guess my question is -- and we're going to be dealing with sunsetting issues today. It's on our agenda.
So from the get-go I want -- since we're entering into a new contractual agreement again, is what happens when this period of time has ended and we say there's no more funding? What happens beyond that? You know? What is going to be in place?

Because if I'm -- I hear correctly, policy change is going to take a while. Will it take five years as some of them are here stated? This contract is for five years. Some are for four years. You know, what happens at that end of that contractual period if we have not seen any of the changes that we are expecting?

MS. BELSHE: These are absolutely time-bound time-limited grants, that re -- sorry.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Southard.

MR. SOUTHARD: I'll let -- I was going to be a second question. So if there's a response --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay.

MS. BELSHE: The length of the grants recognized that policy change takes time.

And, you know, this is only, I think, the second cycle that the -- of policy and advocacy grants that these organization has funded.

The first cycle, I think we were still in the process --

MS. LEE: And there are some policy grants from
the previous strategic plan from the community fund.

MS. BELSHE: Okay. So you know, the test of the success of this grants, the existing ones and the ones that are before the Board now for it's consideration, will be whether or not the policy change that was identified and the specific objectives and deliverables had, in fact, been realized.

And I think to the Chair's point of accountability and evaluating results, those will be -- that would be the basis by which either this organization or the staff would come and back and say, you know, we're this close.

One more year, we're over the finish line. Or you know what? The external environment has changed. Or what we've learned in the context of this work is that this is no longer a policy-relevant objective or this is just too hard and complex.

I mean, so we will absolutely come back with our best thinking about how we can engage the Board on a periodic basis to keep you informed of what we are learning and the kind of outcomes we are seeing.

But this is messy and hard and the world changes. And at the end of the day, some of this work will be very successful, and some of it may well not be. And these are time-limited grants. Time-limited grants.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Dr. Southard.

MR. SOUTHARD: I'd like to add a third category to Dr. Fielding's policy category. Which is in those circumstances like the Affordable Care Act, where the policy is in place but the actual implementation is being determined; so it's not so much policy change, but policy formulation, and the timelines are very quick and sensitive; so I -- I think there will be some wonderful opportunities that are lost if we're not nimble in our approach to changing circumstances that you referred to, Kim.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right, Dr. Southard. We thank you for your remarks.

Members of the Commission, it's time for us to move forward. I think we've had a reasonable discussion at this point of the matters before us.

Is there a motion?

(Motion moved.)

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's been moved and seconded that the recommendation of staff be adopted.

If there are is no further discussion, I'd ask the secretary to record a unanimous vote.

Thank you very much.

We'll move to the next item on the agenda.
We have a number of things to cover today; so let me just keep my remarks as brief as reasonably possible.

Last week, you'll note that we held the first of a series of special meetings focused on Best Starts -- Best Start, rather.

A number of key questions were raised and we are engaging in an effort to take a close look, a fair look, some might argue a transformative look at the communities in which we are focused.

Building community capacity is one piece, prioritizing our resources and providing services with the high -- high-risk children and families is another vital component of Best Start.

But the question that some of us continue to propose is what is Best Start community absent these services? Thus we need to get to those things that improve the quality of life.

So as we continue our discussion around Best Start, let me offer four guiding principles.

First of which is that services do, in fact, matter, and we can measure them. We can measure the outcome within reason.

I would say to you that results matter. And we ought to build on results, often referred to as "best practices."
It doesn't surprise you that I would assert that accountability matters.

But all of that has to be grounded in a sense that infrastructure matters. We have to have those things on which to build.

So I'm looking at and suggesting services, results, accountability and infrastructure.

This task is not a simple one. It's not an easy one. But yet I believe that there's evidence that the new team that's assembled here is prepared to engage it with all that it has.

And at the end of the day, our ultimate goal is to improve the quality of life of these families and these children, and that would be a very, very good thing.

Now, today the Commission will consider options for providing Best Start communities with interim funding.

And I want to highlight another matter that we will address today on Item Number 8, and that is the consideration of expiring grants and contracts.

It's important that the commission reach consensus today on this matter. And consideration of this matter is, in my view, to be prudent. It will allow each grantee time to plan.

And finally, the staff will provide one of the seven of county-wide strategies by providing a policy
implementation update.

This is a continuing effort to broaden our understanding of the investments we have made so far. It's a way of being transparent. It's a way of being responsible stewards of the resources.

(Telephonic interruption.)

We have a new commissioner, I assume.

All right. Thank you so much.

Ladies and gentlemen, please recognize the honorable Bill Browning for his technological lift.

That was his way of saying I should bring my remarks to a close.

Therefore, we'll move to the Executive Director's report.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Maybe we can ask Commissioner Browning to be the timekeeper. This disembodied voice --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's right. Give him a promotion. Thank you so much.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It has been an incredibly busy month since we last met -- the Board met as a full commission. There is a lot going on. There is a lot getting done, which has been my message with my staff colleagues.

And I really want to acknowledge the First 5
staff that really pulled together on a number of different fronts not within their -- exclusively their respective departments, but really in an important organization-wide way.

I hope that our Board members who have participated in a number of our recent committees have seen the contribution of our staff, the quality of the work, both substantively and analytically, to help inform the important decisions that rest before you.

I want to acknowledge Commissioner Delgado for serving as the acting chair of our program and planning committee meeting, which I -- to underscore how much work we have going on, that committee began it's work at 8:00 a.m. And it was a very productive conversation on two principle themes.

Number 1, the issue that the Chair just spoke to, the fact that we have a number of grants that are slated to expire at the end of this fiscal year. And presenting the framework for proceeding, soliciting comments, questions, and feedback, which was very helpful.

And secondly, we talked with the programming and planning committee about our family strengthening investment, also known as Welcome Baby home visitation, with an eye towards reminding the Board of some of our fiscal projections associated with that initiative.
And as well as our sustainability challenges in terms of finding innovative ways to bring in resources beyond First 5 dollars to support this important initiative, and the implications of that learning both in terms of the cost and sustainability challenges for how robustly we move forward with implementation.

So there were three options presented to that committee. This was for discussion only. This is an issue we will be wanting to have come back to the Board.

Both Number 1 a more robust comprehensive set of strategies for maximizing nonFirst 5 resources to support our Welcome Baby home visitation work.

And, secondly, to look at implementation of home visitation. I.E., how many -- excuse me. Our implementation of Welcome Baby. How many hospitals and so forth.

So that will be an important issue that we began the conversation with programming and planning and we'll be coming back.

We then had a meeting a couple of days later with budget and fiscal. I want to thank Dr. Southard and others who were able to participate.

We talked about an issue there that we'll be bringing back to the Board in April which kind of emerged from our January meeting where we presented to the Board
the long-term financial projections, which gave, I think, a very important and somewhat sobering picture of our revenue picture.

That prompted a discussion about a reserve policy. We made a recommendation to the budget and finance committee, which was approved in the interests of today's agenda, we didn't have time. But we will be coming back to the Board on that.

We also engaged our budget and finance committee to provide feedback on the expiring grants issue in a fiscal context and received the Board -- the Committee's support of that effort -- or the set of recommendations.

As the Chair mentioned, we then had an opportunity to meet that afternoon and begin what will be a time bound but iterative and thoughtful process related to Best Start.

I think the Chair has framed well some of our guiding principles as he is also a framed well the overarching questions that we really need to call out explicitly and work through and resolve to move this important initiative forward as effectively and successfully as possible.

And we will be coming back to the board with some specific dates and time lines for moving that inquiry forward.
At the same time, we are also pursuing our Listening, Learning, and Leading initiative. You'll recall we had just kicked off the outreach to our 120-plus staff colleagues for the survey. And I'm delighted to report that 96 percent of First 5 Los Angeles staff participated in the survey.

After conferring with our director of research and evaluation, Director Jimenez, informed me that 96 percent is statistically equivalent to a hundred percent. And so the incentive we put forward to our staff, that John and I and our director colleagues would be cooking a pancake breakfast for everyone will be executed happily.

And I think it really speaks to our staff's engagement and enthusiasm in this exploration and the opportunity to identify issues that really can help us move this organization forward in terms of the impact we seek.

I also want to thank our Commissioners who've agreed to participate in the one-on-one interviews that have begun and hopefully will end over the course of the next week or so.

Finally, the third piece is we will begin shortly an outreach to all of our contractors and grantees, as well as former contractors and grantees, to solicit their
feedback on the interactions with our program staff, their experience with your processes and rules and requirements in terms of how our business practices help or hinder their important work. And, finally, to get their feedback on our implementation of the strategic plan and the impact we seek.

Next month, we plan to bring to you another strand of L3 activity, which is what we're calling an environmental scan, which we believe is -- will be a very important context setting document that gives us all a very clear picture of some of the critical issues and trends -- socially, politically, economically -- affecting young children and their families in this county, as well as a comprehensive picture of others who share our interests and are involved in this phase.

Final note I would make is really on -- on the macro policy front, and we didn't have time today for a presentation as I had hoped.

But, you know, one of our overarching aspirations is around school readiness in children being able to learn and making a contribution to closing the educational achievement gap which we know, particularly for low-income children, exist before they even show up in kindergarten.

And so the President of the United States, as we know, has put forward a pretty significant although a
still evolving early childhood education proposal, which I think really represents an important federal policy context for our work, and it's an important acknowledgement by the President that early childhood -- quality early childhood education is really foundational to children's success in school and in closing that achievement gap. As well as the importance of early head start which is also an area we'll be talking about later this afternoon.

So I will leave it there, invite any comments and questions. Otherwise, we will recommend that we move forward with the Best Start interim options presentation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

The Chair notes that there was no interruption of the executive director's report by any commissioner through technological gaffes; so we can move to Item Number 7.

Thank you very much.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair and members of the Commission, Item 7 is a continuation of a conversation that we began about ten days ago at the March 4th Board Meeting regarding options to authorize interim activity in our 14 Best Start communities pending the Board's time-bound examination of the overarching questions related to Best Start's implementation.
I just want to underscore, before turning it over to Marsha, to be clear, this request is to authorize the expenditure of resources that remain available from the $280,000 that the Commission approved last July for some very specific activities in our Best Start communities which we're going to hear a little bit more about today. But that authorization is slated to expire at the end of this month.

So Number 1, this is to authorize expenditure of resources that remain available for this activity.

And secondly, to underscore, the type of activity that Marsha's going to speak to is really foundational, it's baseline activity that is so important to the type of placed based work that is embodied in Best Start in terms of strengthening community partnerships, assessing community assets, and actively engaging residents, parents, and other members of the community in important issues affecting children, families, and community health.

So let me turn it over to Marsha Ellis, our assistant director of Best Start to, in particular, focus on some of the questions that were raised by Board members at the March 4th meeting.

Marsha?

MS. ELLIS: Thank you, and good afternoon everyone.
There are three principle goals for today's presentation.

One, to remind the Board of the context for providing interim support for the communities.

Second, to provide an update on community capacity building activities.

And to identify goals and options for support and provide staff's recommendations.

As you will recall from the March 4th meeting, I presented context for why staff is proposing interim support for Best Start communities while the Board goes through its review of Best Start.

As we shared with the Commission in February and again in March, there has been a lot of work done in the communities to achieve important milestones which I will speak to momentarily.

Last summer, the Board directed staff to do more work to define desired Best Start outcomes, refine priorities, and identify measures and tools to track progress.

At that time, the Board also authorized continued support for community activities in the area of communication, partnership support, and evaluation.

I'll turn to examples of these areas shortly.

Of note, authorization for these activities
expires at the end of this month, or on March 31st.

Today's presentation is to present options to extend this authorization for an additional six months pending the Board's review and assessment of Best Start.

Some of the critical milestones that were discussed at previous meetings with the Board focus on two areas. The establishment of the community partnerships and development of year-one community plans.

Over the past two years, a tremendous amount of time was spent on a range of activities including conducting initial outreach in the communities to increase awareness of First 5 LA, its forward goals, and Best Start.

Through the process of establishing the community partnerships, our experience reaffirm that it takes time to develop meaningful and authentic relationships.

Some of the initial activities that the partnerships engaged including proposing refined community boundaries, determining their decision making structures, and drafting their year-one community plans.

Attachment C in your Board packet provides a snapshot of the time line and activities that were initially anticipated.

In hindsight, this was a very ambitious time line -- and we had discussed that at previous Commission
meetings -- therefore is not really surprising that some
of the activities took much longer to accomplish.

Likewise, because the focus of the work was on
developing the community partnerships and completing the
plans, some of the foundational capacity building
activities were either not initiated or not completed.

The example of this is the baseline assessment
for community capacity building which I will speak to in a
moment as part of our recommended options.

Building on the structure of the two milestones
-- milestones discussed on the previous slide, in July of
2012, the Board authorized funding for communities to
continue work in three principle areas. And they're
listed on this slide.

At it's March 4th meeting, the Board requested
more information about activities undertaken in the Best
Start communities over the past six to eight months.

Attachment B of your Commission packet provides
details on these activities for each of the 14
communities.

Across all of their -- all of our communities,
there's a focus on common priorities which include parent
and resident education and engagement, healthy and safe
communities, an awareness of and connection to community
resources.
Now I'd like to share some highlights of specific
communities examples related to these three areas.

To remind the Board, the objection of
communications is to support community awareness and
engagement.

With assistance from our public affairs
department and contractors, for example, in the Panorama
City partnership, that partnership designed and
implemented a health and fitness event called "Get Up and
Move," featuring nutrition and fitness activities provided
by local community organizations. Over 600 children and
parents attended this event.

In Metro LA, that partnership developed a short
video to tell the story of Best Start metro LA from the
community members perspective, and this video is used to
share their experience with other community members.

And in Best Start East LA, they sponsored an
event called "Dia del Nino," or "Day of the Child," that
increased general information and awareness about Best
Start.

In terms of partnership support, the objective is
to support community partnership development by increasing
participation from community residents and fostering
collaboration among service providers.

Partnerships are provided logistical support
which includes facilitation, child care, translation and interpretation, and transportation.

Working with our community partners, each partnership has also identified areas of training that are reflective of identified community needs.

Some examples of training and workshops include the work that's being done, for example, in West Athens where they are conducting trainings on power dynamics and asset mapping.

In the Lancaster and Palmdale communities, they're conducting trainings for parents, residents and community stakeholders on child abuse and neglect which is one of the community's identified priorities.

An example of how communities are collaborating with other efforts can be seen in the Compton/East Compton community, where the partnership is collaborating with the Interagency Council on Abuse And Neglect, or ICAN, to bring awareness to the issue of sudden infant death.

The partnership is also working with the Watts and Compton interfaith task force on issues related to the zero to five population.

And in Central Long Beach that partnership has established a collaborative focusing specifically on child abuse prevention as a result of Best Start.

Each community is also responsible for completing
a community-led evaluation which will help to document and
evaluate community-specific activities.

Responding to the Board's request for more
information about Best Start investments, this slide
reflects investments to date, which have mostly been
focused on community capacity building and partnership
support.

The family strengthening wedge that's listed on
this slide includes work that's been done in metro LA for
Welcome Baby and home visitation.

The following four goals for interim support,
were presented to the Board at the March 4th special
meeting and they are to continue finding in the
communities for an additional six months while the Board
undergoes its review of Best Start. And this will help to
maintain activities that are currently underway in the
communities, will help to support the community
partnerships, and will build upon work that is
foundational to increasing the capacity in the
communities.

That brings us to the options. As you will
recall, Option 1 is to maintain support for the types of
activities that I just discussed, and they are, again,
related to communications, partnership support, and
evaluation.
Option 1 has the benefit of maintaining existing levels of resources in the communities, but will limit the opportunity for the community to apply skills that they have developed in a concrete and action-oriented way.

Option 2 would authorize the use of existing funds for activities in two additional areas of capacity building.

The first area is baseline assessment for the four core areas of community engagement, leadership, infrastructure, and investment, and implementation of the community base action research project.

By completing a baseline assessment, the community partnerships will be able to determine in which of the four core areas they need additional support.

The baseline assessment will also enable First 5 LA to measure progress in these areas over time.

The focus of the community based action research project or C bar is to train parents and residents as community researchers who are involved in every step of the project from determining the research questions to disseminating research findings.

Details about C bar are also included in your Board packet in Attachment D.

Many of the communities have already identified C bar topics. For example, in Watts/Willowbrook, that
community partnership is interested in understanding the barriers that prevent young fathers from engaging in activities pertaining to their zero to five children.

This El Monte community partnership is interested in exploring factors that contribute to current rates of child abuse and neglect.

And Best Start East LA has identified research topics related to childhood obesity and school readiness.

Metro LA, which is the pilot Best Start community, is the only community to date that's had an opportunity to complete a full C bar project. Metro LA residents and parents recently completed an assessment on the challenges of accessing child care in that area.

Based on this data, parents and representatives from organizations have started taking steps to address some of the barriers identified such as working with child care centers to have more flexible hours for working families, and researching the possibility of operating a parent-led child care co-op. And they're really excited about that one in particular.

We believe that Option 2 has the advantages of supporting communities to do work that's foundational to place based change, including helping the communities apply their skills, develop the baseline assessment for capacity building needs, and continuing to build momentum...
in the communities.

A disadvantage of Option 2 is that some of the C
bar projects may take longer than six months to complete
in some of the communities.

It is important to note that while both Options 1
and 2 can be supported from remaining funds that were
initially allocated, and that again was the $280,000,
staff is recommending that the Board approves Option 2 as
it best advances the suggested goals which are to support
the communities over the next six months while the Board
goes through its review process of Best Start.

Option 2 helps to build on the activities that
are underway in the communities, strengthens partnership,
and helps to strengthen the communities by establishing
the baseline assessment in the four areas of capacity
building.

So those are the options. Again, staff is
recommending Option 2, and we welcome your feedback.

MR. KAUFMAN: Dr. Southard.

MR. SOUTHARD: I -- I'm wondering if there is an
adaptation to Option 2 that might be worth considering.
And it seems to me that the six-month period would be a
perfect period for looking at sign up for and
implementation for the Affordable Care Act.
That's one the things that the County needs to do to build
the future of its health system. And enrolling as many eligible people over a short period of time is a really important task.

It could be that a community-based organization could use enrollment in the Affordable Care Act, various health programs, could be an organizing tool.

It's something to reach out to the communities for. And if there's already an existing organization there with some community support, we could add that task to the menu and -- and measure relative effectiveness. Because as various communities are able to actually enroll their residents in those programs or not, it would give us a metric as well.

It also would really strengthen families to have access to health care.

Anyway I'm suggesting that as an addition to Option 2. As something that we could -- that could be a task that would be easy to evaluate, train, and it would be for the good of the community.

MR. DENNIS: Marv, In that suggestion, are you also suggesting an increase in the allocation or maintaining the allocation as it currently is with staff's Option 2 recommendation?

MR. SOUTHARD: I would leave that to staff to figure out what would make sense in that. It's just
something that really needs to get done. And I think a community organizing kind of effort like Best Start would be a perfect way to did it.

MS. BELSHE: And I think, Dr. Southard -- if I may, Mr. Chair, Dr. Southard's raising an issue that Commissioner Bostwick and Commissioner Fielding and the Chair's office and myself and others have been having about my staff colleagues about.

So how -- in anticipation of the extraordinary changes looming very large in terms of coverage options -- how do we as an organization most effectively connect this new information and these new opportunities to the populations we serve?

So what you're touching on is a very important point, which is it's not just our contractors and grantees in a formal sense, Best Start communities, with whom we should be actively engaging and work on this subject.

It also speaks to this issue of intentionality where we try to be respectful of the priorities that our Best Start communities have identified as important -- of what we find to be important.

But I would take your suggestion as or direction that staff engage very intentionally with our Best Start community partners, and some creative project development in terms of how they can play a role in ensuring, to the
greatest degree, coverage options and are connected to a
lot of work that John and the option team have been
reading.

You want to weigh in on this?

MR. FIELDING: I think this is a new day,
but we do have contracts through the First 5 providers.
So it's getting people to those agencies, helping in terms
of outreach to get them there. To get the throughput
higher as new options become available.

And, of course, it's not just about the kids.
It's particularly about the parents. So it's getting the
whole family covered, which is in some ways, the big
difference maker here.

I do have one other point and that is the only
problem I have with Option 1 and Option 2 is it treats
everybody the same. And I think some communities are
further ahead. Are -- you know, it suggests that
everybody's at the same station, and that's just not a
natural phenomenon.

And I'm not -- maybe at this point, it's the best
we can do is treat everybody the same, but at some point
some are taking more time, which is not necessarily bad
but when you provide the same level of resources over time
to each, it seems to me, would be to take a standardized
approach that may not be entirely justified.
It may well be at this point.

MS. BELSHE: I'll call on Antonio or Marsha to elaborate.

To be very clear, the work to date, the recommendation that is before the commission and probably a more concrete way going forward recognizes that the communities are in different places so. Details of that information, the staff provided in your book -- your Board book, that I think gives you a pretty good picture of that. I have directors of the type of activities that have been undertaken, the different projects and priorities.

So as Marsha noted, this community based action research is a really good idea.

Some of the 14 communities -- metro is certainly ahead of the others, because they've been around longer. But a number of the communities have already identified research projects that they're prepared to take on. And with authorization -- further authorization of the resources that are available, they're poised to move forward. Others aren't quite there yet.

This is not a one size fits all.

MS. ELLIS: And I think the recommendation also allows for flexibility within the uniqueness of the communities, because some communities are focusing more on
communications on activities. So all of the communities are unique and have different priorities regarding those actions that are listed up there. So I think the recommendation allows that flexibility.

MR. FIELDING: Giving everybody the same amount of money implies everybody is at the same place, or roughly comes to that. And I -- it may be for that six month period, all positions should be treated the same, and we're reassessing. But over time, I would think that the level of resources might not always be the same.

MS. BELSHE: I think that you're anticipating a really important issue and decision point for the Board. To be clear, this is an authorization, and so it's only for those communities that are far enough long it would actually be undertaking work in community action research, and thus they would draw down from that allocation. So the resources are only being expended if the work is actually being done.

MR. FIELDING: Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Members of the commission -- Dr. Fielding.

MS. SWILLEY: Back to the point, I think -- for example, the idea that -- in terms of using the communities in terms of signing people up to the
Affordable Care Act, as attractive as that is, I think it's very important that we don't decide for the community their priorities. And there's always the possibility of doing that. I think we should share with them why think it's important that they should consider it.

But that if they have other priorities, that instead of -- so insisting that they use their resources for what we think is a priority, that it would be additional moneys to take on projects that we think they should have.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you, Dr. Swilley.

I'm going to move around. I'm going to start with Commissioner Curry followed by Commissioner Browning, Commissioner Boeckmann, Commissioner Au.

In that order, please.

MS. CURRY: I think that the points made about the Affordable Care Act are important, and I think your comment about, you know, seeing what the communities want is really important. But if we are going to work with some of the Best Start communities that are already developed and work with signing them up for the Affordable Care Act, it's important that we do it as -- teaming up with the Department of Mental Health and the Department of Health Services and the Department of Public Health. And
not go in and just use the money we have coming from First
5 to help sign the Best Start communities up, but to
really look at integrating it with other outreach
organizations and work as a team. Going in together to
sign these people up.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Noted.

MR. BROWNING: I had a question about whether
Option 2 limits the communities in terms of just research.

If a community knows that obesity is the problem,
and they've identified that, would they be able to
implement anything that they thought might be needed to
help reduce obesity? Or is it only a research project
that they're authorized to engage in?

MS. ELLIS: Under C bar it's just a research
project. When the communities submitted their plans to
staff last July or June, they did have a list of priority
and some of those priorities, for example, did include
issues related to childhood obesity.

From there, the communities did come up with
proposal projects, but our Commission has not fully vetted
those projects to determine if those direct services will
be funded under Best Start.

So under is this option, they would not be able
to implement direct services related to, for example,
childhood obesity.
MR. BROWNING: So that's letting the community make the decision.

I guess the concern I have is if you've got a forward thinking community, that might have already identified through this last year's process, something they think is really important, they're given this additional funding, but they're not able to do anything except additional research.

I'm not suggesting that's not a good use of the money. But I'm thinking it might be a better use that the communities want to put their monies toward. But I understand the option now.

MS. BELSHE: What we have endeavored to do, Commissioner, is acknowledge -- on the one hand when the Board when it -- when last summer the Board said you know, additional works needs to be done to define priorities, measurements tools, et cetera. We don't want to stop the work underway. But we're not prepared to go forward fully with funding of the full community plans that have been drafted and submitted to staff.

The Board, as Marsha said, approved funding for three specific areas. So that Board decision then reflected an understanding of the importance of clarifying some really critical issues before moving forward to support specific project or activity or services; so we're
in a similar position right now, identifying critical
issues and wanting to continue to provide support to our
community partners without getting ahead of the process
that the Board is just beginning.

And that's why we're recommending C bar as an
additional use of dollars already authorized, because
Number 1, the communities haven't undertaken this work.
They've identified some specific issues they really want
to dig into, and recognize the importance of that
information help inform coalition building and advocacy at
the local level. And if the Board were to approve this
recommendation, they would have the resources available
because they're ready to do that work.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Boeckmann.

MS. BOECKMANN: Yes. I'd prefer to maintain the
status quo right now, because I think we need a clear
understanding of Best Start.

At least, I do, and where we're going with it.
And what the implementation of it is.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. And comment for
commissioner Boechmann at this point?

Madam Executive Director?

MS. BELSHE: We put forward two alternatives.
And Option 1, as noted, basically maintains commission
authorization of community activity in these three areas
of communications, partnership, and support and evaluation.

As Marsha outlines, there's really interesting and important work underway.

At the same time, this is work that our community partners have been undertaking for many, many months and some of them are in fact ready to kind of apply the skills that they've been developing through the training, through the community partnership development activities, through what they're learning.

So that's why we put forward a second option that doesn't move Best Start in a different direction, it's just providing the community with access to a few more resources to kind of roll up their sleeves and really dig in to some of the critical issues they're identifying in terms of getting a clear picture of the extent to which obesity is a key problem for young children, or what's it going to take, what are some of the issues and barriers for children being ready for kindergarten?

So we wanted to put a second option before the Board that doesn't presuppose what the outcome of this inquiry process will be, but also gives the communities something really to dig into in a more actionable way, and apply the skills they've been developing over the course of the past two years.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Au.

MS. AU: I guess I have to go back to a little bit of history again. And one of the reasons why we are having this conversation today regarding the extension and funding for Best Start started six months ago, when our chair at that time had some questions about what was Best Start all about. Especially the place based program.

And this is an opportunity for us to get clarity. And unless I'm assuming -- I'm looking around the table, and I'm saying do Commissioners have clarity as to what Best Start place base work is about? What our goals and objectives and how we're going to measure our success with our place base work? And Commissioner Boeckmann was very candid and said she still isn't clear.

So I -- I don't know -- I guess I'm feeling quite frustrated at this juncture. And because we haven't had this kind of really in-depth conversation about what place base work is about, what is it that we're going to be doing and what is it that we're wanting to achieve and what mechanism we'll have in place to measure the progress that we're doing and what our accomplishments are?

I -- I don't think it's shared around the table here.

Number -- that's one. So Number 2, here we are at the witching hour where the funding for Best Start
place base work is still pending. Their -- it's going to sunset at the end of March, and I'm feeling quite frustrated and anxious because Best Start and the work that's occurring in the communities are really quite powerful, and yet there's still this puzzlement around this table in terms of are we in consensus in supporting this work?

Number 3, when the two options were presented to us two weeks ago Monday, I was surprised by the insertion of Option 2 and C bar. And so I -- because I only had cursory understanding of C bar.

And so it came about actually through our breakfast meeting with Jenny Chin from CalEndow and someone from SSG who had expertise in C bar.

And so that alerted me, and I said I needed to delve more into this. And I had additional conversation. And apparently through our own funding, we had funded a C bar project -- First 5 LA -- prior to my coming on Board.

And there was tremendous learning that occurred through that experience. And I had this conversation with Armando regarding that learning.

And it's not embedded in this presentation at all. I also had subsequent conversation with CalEndow person, Jenny Chen and she essentially said C bar is really a research tool. And echoing Commissioner
Browning's comment. And it's a very helpful tool. But it's just a tool. It is not a mechanism for community to really become organized in a sustainable way. Nor does it have a mechanism for action. It's really to engage community folks in focusing in on an issue that they truly have a quandary about. And they really want to delve into it so they can be more informed and then move from there.

But in reading the report that was -- and I thank the staff for including so much detail information that I haven't had to this point in time regarding the work in the communities, as well as how the budget has been expended out up to this point in time. And I really truly appreciate that information.

So now it's a basis for me to say that based on our learning, C bar needs to be looked at as a tool that's available for those communities that are wanting to truly struggle with -- these are the things that we're challenged with. We don't have a real idea of how to address it. And we would like to engage in this process.

But there needs to be an infrastructure or mechanism to take it beyond, because again, based on lessons learned, we had a project where grandparents were finding themselves having to parent their -- their grandchildren through the foster care process. And they
engaged in C bar. And they came up with a beautiful report. And that -- that was it. I mean, because we had no mechanism in place to support "what then."

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Commissioner Au?
MS. AU: I know. I'm going on and on.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I'm going to arrest that right about now.
MS. AU: May I make a suggestion?
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes.
MS. AU: Is that as an appointed liaison, I would have truly appreciated some guidance as to what my role and responsibility is as a liaison because I would have loved to engage in more of this meaningful kinds of conversation with the Best Start staff.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes.
MS. AU: So that when we come here -- when the staff come here to do their presentation or updates to the commissioners, or if there's any question that they need further clarifications, that they would be a lot more informed.

I don't like to go on and on in some ways. There's a whole lot of questions unanswered. I'd like to be able to participate and be a contributing member in terms of the rest of the body here.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Great. Thank you.
MS. AU: So if I could have some guidance there. Option 1 is more my preference, although I still have some questions.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Au, we will work hard to assuage your frustration. Suffice it to say that help is on the way.

MS. AU: I appreciate that.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN: I really like what Nancy is talking about.

My question is really the next six months. Let's assume Option 1, Option 2, Option 1-1/2 because some of the communities may not get all the way to 2. But that's fine.

But do we have in our minds a firm deadline that says in X number of months, we are going to understand what's going on, be able to make a recommendation to answer some of the questions that Nancy had, and we all have, what are we going to do? Put our vote down -- or our nickel down -- or our hundred million dollars down or whatever amount it is. Because it seems like we've done this once, twice, three times before. It seems like we continue to make extensions. And at some point we've got to decide.

And we know that with the new administration, the
L-cubed the L3 process, can you give me some sense of --
remind me -- because I think maybe you've told me but I've
forgotten, remind me what's going to happen.

MS. BELSHE: Let me invite the chair to offer his
observations.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think it's reasonable to
suggest the following. And this is in response to both
Commissioner Au and Commissioner Kaufman and all the
people with similar questions. Although perhaps they're
not articulated at this point.

The effort here is an earnest one to sort out and
improve -- that is to say to build consensus about Best
Start. To the extent that we're faced with the decision
of resources being depleted or contracts expiring, we have
an opportunity to extend for a specific period of time,
during which time we sort through the thrust of what we
think Best Start ought to be.

And so it is not a matter of staff and Board
going dormant over a six-month period. To the contrary,
this is a working time.

They're not taking a time out. This is not a
breather. This is an extension of resources for the
purposes of allowing those entities that are doing the
work or attempting to do the work to continue to do so as
we continue to think through, refine, and build consensus
about these programs that are collectively defined as Best Start.

Members of the commission. The time is 3:55.

Your Chair feels as if he is failing you by not moving this matter forward.

There are persons who wish to be heard by way of public comment. If we can hear them, and then move to the balance of your questions in order to dispose of the matter, the Chair would be appreciative.

Hearing no objections to moving in that direction, I'm going to call Sal Figueroa and Kate Mar to be heard.

All right. We have some new technology for us to try today.

MR. FIGUEROA: Hello, my name is Sal Figueroa. And I'm the program manager at Family Centers in Compton. And I'm part of the leadership team of the Best Start in Compton.

First of all, thank you Commissioners. Thank you honorable chairperson, Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, for the time that everyone's spending here.

And most of all, I'd like to thank all the Best Start community members who come here taking time from their busy schedules and their responsibilities at home.

I'm for extending the funding for the next six
months beyond March 31st.

I want to recall -- I want to remind everybody that when Best Start first rolled out, it came to our communities and asked us to be involved. They asked for our input. Beyond the money that has already been expended, there has been thousands of people hours of moms and dads and young people, of community members coming out to spend their time and their effort to get the ball rolling, to get the momentum moving on Best Start.

It's been a long process, but I think it's one that we can see the light at the end of the tunnel. It's been the low-hanging fruit.

Not to continue it is doing a disservice to the many, many families, moms, and dads and kids that this will benefit.

I know there's some questions and a sense of ambivalence among the Commissioners, but that is nothing from the community part; so please remember that we've come a long way, and let's not end it now. Let's move forward because there's a lot of good that's reachable right now. Don't give up. We're not giving up either.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony.

Next speaker, please.

MS. MAR: Hello. My name is Kate Mar, and I'm the co-chair of the leadership partnership in Central Long
First of all, I want to thank all of you for your time.

In Long Beach, our partnership members have put in thousands of hours as you've just heard to develop our community plan. And as you know, we are one of only 14 communities; so we're talking about tens of thousands of hours of work that we've put in.

In the case of parents, these were hours that took them away from their families. And in the case of the agency representatives, these were hours that took us away from providing critical services in the community we serve.

We did this because we believe in the place base model. And we believe that this initiative would make our communities a better place, not only for children zero through five, but for all residents.

And I can only speak for Central Long Beach, but I can imagine that the other 13 communities feel very similarly to the way we do.

It is really, really disappointing and, frankly, frustrating that it's been almost a year since we submitted our plans to this commission for approval, and we're here today talking about bridge funding instead of discussing the successes that our communities could have
made if the plans had been implemented.

These discussions should have taken place before you presented the Best Start initiative to the 14 communities. Yet it feels like we're back at square one, and all the hours and energy we put in were for naught.

This process needs to keep moving forward even if it is only in baby steps. If it doesn't, this Commission is going to lose the faith of the 14 communities that have put in so much work.

So with that in mind, I have to say I think that maintaining the current funding levels is really just not fair to the communities that have put in this work.

And Option 2, while not ideal, it at least allows us to move forward and add on to the tremendous work being done.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you. We thank you for your testimony.

Members of the commission, we've had a useful discussion today. I believe the matter is before us, unless there are additional comments that might be forthcoming.

Commissioner Dennis?

MR. DENNIS: There's a possibility staff has said and Commissioners have noted that different communities are in different places. There could be a hybrid of 1 and
2 that will allow us to go up to the 2 amount, if necessary. And so that could be a possibility, that you go up until a certain amount.

That prevents us coming to this again to give staff the flexibility it does.

It is not meant that you have to go to the 2.1 million dollar amount, but based on where the communities are, you can go to that amount or the $150,000 amount.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Very helpful. Thank you, Commissioner Dennis.

MS. BELSHE: That's well said, Commissioner Dennis.

Again, Option 2 is intended to provide the opportunities to -- for those Best Start communities that are ready to move forward with some very targeted projects.

C bar sounds like this esoteric thing. But as Commissioner Au said, it's a very grass roots tool that engages, that nurtures relationships, that focuses on specific issues that require mobilization.

All this recommendation 2 would do is authorize the use of funds that have already been allocated for, I think, 1.5. I think that captures it well.

As in terms of the second Option, 2, capacity
building assessment from a staff perspective, this is work that should have been done early on in Best Start's development. But because of the focus -- an almost laser focus on developing the community plans, a lot of work got put to one side.

In community profile, that we believe is work that needs to be done to move this initiative forward, and this broad moving forward in a very time bound way. This is work that needs to be done.

So those two pieces are why we're recommending Option 2. And the community assessment which is really worth it, needs to be done.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Members of the Commission, the matter is before us.

MR. SOUTHERN: I would like to move Option 2.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: At the recommendation of the staff that we adopt Option 2, that is before us. So will there be any questions -- is there any further discussion?

MS. AU: I --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. AU: If the commission approves Option 2, I strongly suggest that the C bar component rest in the resource evaluation department, because it is really a resource -- a outreach project, and -- and I don't think
it belongs in the Best Start arena in terms of program area. That's my suggestion.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you, Commissioner Au.

Madam Secretary, that matter is before us, which is a recommendation and second with respect to Item 2 of those before us.

Would you please call the roll on all voting members.

THE SECRETARY: Nancy Au?

MS. AU: No.

THE SECRETARY: Jane Boeckmann?

MS. BOECKMANN: No.

THE SECRETARY: Philip Browning?

MR. BROWNING: No.

THE SECRETARY: Johnathan Fielding?

MR. FIELDING: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Jennifer Figueroa-Villa?

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Neil Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Mark Ridley-Thomas?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Mark Southard?

MR. SOUTHARD: Yes.
THE SECRETARY: Ms. Swilley?

MS. SWILLEY: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: The motion carries.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

All right. We will move to the next item on the agenda, with the full intent of focusing on the improvement of the services that are being rendered with Best Start over the next six months and beyond.

All right.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee -- of the commission the agenda item before you is follows.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Pardon me for a moment.

Ladies and gentlemen we are still in session. If you do have to leave, may I ask that you do so quietly so that we are not disrupted with respect to the balance of our deliberations. Thank you.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair, members of the commission, this agenda item follows on two in-depth presentations and discussions, first with the planning committee on February 28th, and then with the budget and finance committee on March 4th.

As members of the commission who have served for many years know, the expiration of the grants is not a new issue. And it is a very sensitive and important topic
that is worthy of this conversation and dialogue among members of the -- the commission and members of the community broadly.

And as I've learned about the history of First 5 LA during my limited time here, it's clear that the strategic plan, when it was adopted, it articulated an intention to move away from comprehensive but discrete initiatives to a practice of funding strategies through the place based and county wide approach.

And the commission also acknowledged that there's a need for a transition plan for those initiatives scheduled to end in the context of First 5 LAs new strategic direction.

A number of initiatives have been the focus of the transitional strategies articulated a number of years ago. They have been the focus of Board discussion and deliberation subsequent years as they have come over the course of number of times, have come to be scheduled to come to an end. Partnership for families school readiness initiative and the family of literacy initiatives.

Since the time that the strategic plan was approved back in 2009, '10, the commission on the one hand is endeavored to maintain support for those grantees does strategic direction that was a part of the strategic plan. And at the same time, provide transitional support for
those whose work does not align with the new strategic plan.

As we've seen in practice. Some First 5 LA support as sunsettled. This organization has scaled back significantly, for example, it's for school readiness initiatives. Some have continued including those are county wide in nature and not necessarily related to Best Start.

So here we are in 2013. And at the end of this year, 54 I believe, multiyear grants are scheduled to come to an end.

What we have endeavored to do -- which Tara will be walking through. What we've endeavored to provide for the Board a framework a decision framework to inform work consideration and framework that is grounded in criteria. That are transparent, that are objective and reflective of strategic plan priorities, and commonly and consistently apply.

So the threshold question is is there a sustainability plan. If there's not a sustainability plan, is this project in practice or potentially related to the three different strands of Best Start activity? The Welcome Baby home visitation strand? The community projects to strengthen family strand, which is contemplated to be a part of the community plans? And the
capacity building strand.

Finally we've endeavored to acknowledge as we did in January, the Board makes decisions in the context of our fiscal picture. And so we also want to acknowledge that any extensions do come at a cost. Because the five-year projection assumes that these grants are that are scheduled to expire will, in fact, expire.

The decision making framework yields 41 grants to be recommended for continued support given either the sustainability plan and there's a pathway to other support, or because of their clear or potential relationship to Best Start.

There are 13 grants who -- that are scheduled that would move forward with sunsetting consistent with the current terms of our contract.

These grants, as I said, are not scheduled to expire until the end of the fiscal year, which is June. Going to the planning committee then to the budget and finance committee and now to the full commission.

Because of the importance of proper notice as the chair noted in his ownership comments.

We feel it is important and responsible inform to appropriate notice so that they can plan for transition accordingly. Also internally, we're developing the budget for the next year, and it is important information to
account for.

So before turning it over to Tara. I want to recognize the sensitivity of this issue, the value of the work that this organization has been supporting across all of these programs, and the context of our strategic plan which really presents the framework for the recommendations that Tara's going to walk you through.

MS. FICEK:. Thank you, Kim.

Good afternoon, commissioners.

Before we get into the focus and purpose of today's presentation, I wanted to first walk you through a quick background on the work that has been done by staff prior to today.

At the February commission, as an informational item, staff presented a self assessments that are scheduled to end in June 13. And then at the February programs meeting, staff presented grants and contracts that are to close on or before June.

In addition staff walked commissioners through a framework as Kim mentioned that was developed to inform Board funding decisions related to these expiring grants and contracts. We will be going over that again today.

A very detailed summary of partnerships for families, healthy births, school readiness, family literacy, and the neighborhood action councils was
provided which included project statistics such as numbers served and cost per participant.

Staff also shared key evaluation findings and outcomes for these initiatives and finally reminded commissioners of the most recent Board action, and our recommendation for next fiscal year '13-'14.

And I think my Power Point is moving without me touching it.

MS. BELSHE: The chair just left the room; so I'm wondering if there's some relation to it.

MS. FICEK: And finally at -- the budget or fiscal impact staff recommendations were also discussed in detail last week which approved staff's recommendations.

So for today's presentation, staff is going to start by presenting the framework that was utilized by core funding decisions across these projects.

I'm going to highlight the evaluation outcomes associated with partnerships for families, healthy births, school readiness, family literacy initiatives, and the neighborhood action council's program. And finally, we're going to review the Board's most recent decisions and also present staff's recommendations which will include a total cost.

Please note that all recommendations include cost which have not been a part of a discussion around our long
term financial plan.

The Board memo provided a great detail on each of these initiatives program description and model, numbers serves, and cost per participants.

And to be mindful of the time allotted for this presentation, please refer to that Board memorandum for more detailed initiative information.

The investments that are ending on or before June 2013 fall into the three categories identified on this slide.

Staff has mapped out a framework to inform future funding decisions, and as you will see those three categories are presented here.

To quickly walk you through the framework for those grantees and contracts that are not one time investments they're limited, we ask whether or not the initiative as a sustainability plan.

Partnerships for families does have a likely sustainability plan, and will therefore be a part of today's conversation.

For those that do not have a sustainability plan, we then asked is the initiative potentially tied to Best Start.

For investments, healthy births, school readiness, family literacy and the neighborhood action
councils are all tied to Best Start and therefore, all four of these will be addressed during this presentation as well.

And, lastly, we looked at evaluation regarding impact and cost. The next part of the presentation is going to be focusing on that. Armando Jimenez, our director of research and evaluation on the major valuation themes for those projects.

MR. JIMENEZ: Thank you very much.

I'd like to remind the Commission that all of these evaluations took place over multiple years. They also include multiple components.

I'm not going to go into detail in those evaluations. We presented those evaluations to the commission over the course of the implementation of these initiatives. We've also provided detailed descriptions of the data at the last program and planning committee.

What I'd like to focus on in this particular part of the presentation are the more longitudinal outcomes of the evaluations, specifically focusing on outcomes for children and families.

These are the major headlines for the evaluations and the initiatives.

For PFF, when compared with families that received no services, fully engaged PFF had lower referral
rates, open cases, and placement into foster care.

For healthy births, when compared to a match sample from the Los Angeles mommy and baby survey, fully engaged program participants had significantly lower preterm births and low birth weight babies.

For school reading, when compared to a sample of students participating in a similar program, school readiness students performed lower in third grade in English language arts and math.

For family literacy, when compared to a sample of students participating in a similar program, family literacy had higher attendance rates and performed better in English language arts and math for grades two through five.

The evaluation also found improvements in adult literacy, parental practices, and employment among family literacy parents.

For the neighborhood action counsels, when compared to baseline measures, NAC participants showed improvement in family functioning and parental practices as a result of their engagement.

Overall, the initiatives under consideration were originally created as a pilots. And at this point during their implementation, with the exception of PFF, there is no plan to scale up or sustain the programs.
The fiscal year 2012, 2013 cost per child and family on average are equivalent or lower than programs implementing similar strategies. Staff reviewed programs providing similar strategies, and looked at the range of cost.

The cost for these initiatives are on par with programs targeting similar populations.

A strong relationship exists between levels of participant engagement, in other words the dosage of the program, program quality, and positive outcomes.

The final point for all of the initiatives described here improvements and outcomes were seen at the program participant level. There was no evidence that improvements occurred at the community or county level for their measures of interest.

MS. FICEK: So using the framework as a guide for this presentation, let's begin with partnerships for families, looking specifically at its sustainability plan.

The Board action referenced on the slide was based on a recommendation from the PFF sustainability ad hoc committee, and the sustainability partnership for families, which references PFF's future administration to DCFS upon availability of federal title waiver funds. DCFS expects for waiver negotiations to conclude this year, and participants of PFF programs through DCFS by
July 1st, 2014.

As you can see from the graphic on the slide, we are anticipating a gap for PFF programs from the current end date 3013 and the current estimated date of July 1, 2014, for DCFS contracting to begin.

First 5 LA has reached out to both state and DCFS officials, who indicate that the state currently plan to begin negotiations this spring on the future of 4E funds. Obviously, if a waiver -- if it is extended or not at this time it's believed there will be resolution to the status of this waiver towards the end of the calendar year.

Therefore, consistent with the Board's action taken for fiscal year 2013 to maintain PFF programs through a transition to DCFS, we are recommending for Board consideration to extend funding for all nine current PFF grantees for 12 months through June 30, 2014, at the same level as their current fiscal '12-'13 allocation.

The recommended extension will provide funding until the title 4E waiver is resolved. It is important to note that if waiver negotiations are resolved successfully or unsuccessfully, the staff may return to the Board with further recommendations. For example, if the waiver is resolved sooner than projected, and a transition can happen sooner than expected, then the staff may come back to the Board with an update and further recommendations.
Moving now into the initiatives potentially tied to Best Start implementation.

In April of this year -- of last year, 2012, the Board included three elements or activity areas of the Best Start community plans which are listed here.

These three elements served as basis of framework in an effort to potentially align current involvements to future areas of focus within Best Start communities.

Each of the sunsetting initiatives presented to the Board today to a varying degree are tied to one framework, and therefore to it's implementation.

We're going to start with healthy births. Tied to the Welcome Baby and select home visitation component, and that grantees are similar to those being implemented in Welcome Baby and select home visitation.

The Board action referenced on the slide was based on recommendations from the healthy births ad hoc committee.

The attention of this commission decision was focused on maintaining infrastructure. Which included over 55 trained home visitors, including certified lactation educators, until Welcome Baby and select home visitation was launched in Best Start communities.

In light of the progress of implementation of Welcome Baby, and selected home visitation, staff
recommends that the six BBCs be extended for six months or until the Best Start Welcome Baby and select home visitation programs are contracted.

Welcome Baby hospitals that are expected to complete the contracting process this year cover the service areas of these six BBCs. Subsequent Welcome Baby services are anticipated to start in July or August.

We're also recommending a one-month extension for the Antelope Valley select home visitation as contracted whichever is sooner.

Welcome Baby has not been contracted for Antelope Valley. Staff is projecting that that could occur over this next fiscal year. If it happens earlier in the year, than expected, the Antelope Valley BBC contract would end earlier than 12 months.

In addition, we recommend a 12 month extension for LABBN to continue the T A support and the evaluation for this 12 month time period.

First 5 staff will be releasing the Welcome Baby and select home visitation provider pools over the next two months. Have been encouraged to apply to one or both of those provider pools so that there are agency can then be selected as a welcome baby or select home visitation provider.

School readiness. School readiness is tied to
the Welcome Baby home visitation component as well.

The -- within the Best Start communities in that 14 of the 17 S R A grantees are implementing one of the Best Start communities select home visitation models, parents as teachers, or often referred to as PATH.

The remaining three are using First 5 funds to leverage federal early head start dollars. The Board's recommendation was based upon recommendation from the kindergarten initiative.

The intention of this commission decision healthy Baby was around preserving and maintaining around home visitation programming.

The -- 17 out of the original 37 grantees that received the extension were aligned with the Best Start communities framework for home visitation. These programs -- because these programs were implementing teachers programs or were federal early head start funds, parents as teachers, in the Best Start communities through home visitation model last year early head start had been identified as best start framework however early head start was not included as a selection population for Best Start as the early head start model federal application and federal approval funds.

Over this last year, Best Start communities have chosen their select home visitation model.
Of the four options available, parents and each essentials or safe care as you can see parents as teachers, each Best Start communities forms a home visitation work four meetings each to model. The meetings focused on the following introduction and over through of the select home visitation policewoman a review of community data from local program representatives and then the community selected their program model for partnership approval.

The S R I Board recommendation for fiscal year 13 '14 has been informed by the implementation of their home visitation model of the current seven for continuation, because they meet the following criteria. They are implementing parents as teachers and the Best Start community that they are in or serving also chose parents as teachers as their home visitation program.

Similar to healthy births, we are also recommending a healthy one-month extension until select home visitation whichever is sooner.

Welcome Baby has not been contracted for Antelope Valley. That -- that could occur this year, and if it happens earlier, as with the Antelope Valley B B C, contract -- the S R A contract would end earlier than 12 months.

The Welcome Baby in select home visitation pool
over the next five months and as well grantees will also
be encouraged to apply to the selection select home
visitation pool so that their agency can then be selected
by the communities by the provider.

Continuing the S R I Board recommendation for 13,
14 as it was drawn -- as staff has been informed of kind
of further updates that it is not reflected in your Board
me memo we wanted to note that we also recommend that
staff we will direct staff to work with the three grantees
using federal -- using S R I to implement the federal
early head start foreman to explore and develop options
for one year support by First 5 LAs mobilization
opportunities staff will then present a recommendation to
at the April 11th meeting.

We're also recommending a sunsetting of the
remaining six school readiness grantees. The grantees
that staff are recommending sunset are not serving a best
start communities or they are serving a Best Start
community however that community selected a home
visitation other than parents as teachers as healthy
families.

The family literacy is potentially tied to
community based project component in family literacy are
most similar to possible program attic that could be
supported through this element of the Best Start community
plan.

The Board acts on this slide kindergarten the intention of this commission district attorney decision is similar to healthy births and preserving and maintaining from a support Best Start communities. The extension was approved for all family literacy.

Grantees and not just to those grantees in the better start communities so that infrastructure for Best Start the math that you have in front of you offers a visual of our family literacy sights in relation to Best Start community boundaries are outlined in red and the family literacy program sights are identified by their name and also by the orange highlight.

There's quite a lot there. Board recommendation for fiscal year '13-'14 includes extension of and family literacy and that the TA provider in an effort to grantee that's are in or serving a best start community staff reviewed foreman attic statistics on served by each bold for 2009 and 2011, for family literacy that served families for I Best Start community in either foreman years 2009 or 2011.

Staff recommends that those extended for another 12 months or until Best Start community plans are contracted whichever is longer. The remaining seven grantees based on the following in a Best Start community
and has not served families from a Best Start community as confirmed by 2011. Participant data -- and moving on to the next contracts are tied to the Best Start last year, the Board extended the contract dollar for the this year.

Recommendation is to continue support of the contracts matching the resident based organizing the left of that will implementation the relate today funding levels scale and scope is going to be determined at a later point as the Board continues closing as noted at the beginning of presentation staff recommendations are guided and informed by the framework.

Past commission decisions and around the sunsetting of these initiatives to help further are fine recommendations.

And lastly staff considered are current strategic plans that clearly articulates move away from comprehensive but discrete initiatives to a practice of funding strategies for the place based county wide approach.

Staff is bringing this item to the commission today as an action item in March so that the sunsetting grantees will have enough time -- three months is appropriately -- to ramp down services and make needed transitions for program participants as well as staff.

That concludes the presentation.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you for your presentation.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to move to public comment at this point. Each speaker will have two minutes to report; so please come forward with when your name is called. Antonia Garcia. Rick Overdorff. Kim Barker. Aaron Salazar. Carrie Thorn. Heidi Roberta Landerman. Sidelle Lopez -- Sidelle Martinez. Brianna Aramendi. Jose Yomo Haya.

Those are the speakers for now. Please proceed.

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: I just want to request that the speakers could identify what --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: As they wish. Please proceed

MR. OVERDORFF: I've been thinking about --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Your name sir.

MR. OVERDORFF: -- days and days and days.

Can you hear me?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Your name.

MR. OVERDORFF: My name is Overdorff, and I'm the director -- and as I said, I've been thinking about this for a long time.

And after sitting here and listening I think there's a simple solution. I'm just simply going to recommend if a program works, if the data verifies that it
works, fund it. That's my suggestion. If it doesn't work, don't fund it.

It's real simple. And that's the way I feel. I know that family literacy works fantastically. I favor not dropping any programs that are -- that are in compliance.

That's the way I feel.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony. Next speaker, please.

MS. GARCIA: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

My name is Antonia Garcia, and I'm coming from the program family literacy.

In the year 2007, I was a parent and ESL student in this program, and my son received the recommendations for the education. Now he's in fifth grade and he got -- he has schools very good grades thanks to this program. Thanks to the encouragement of this program and these group of professionals, I had my G E D, a college in Lancaster.

I -- later on, I became a part of the staff and I work with this program for two years. After that, I got offer by Lancaster school district as teacher as assistant and I'm still working right there and I'm helping families in preschool children right now.

I just wanted to tell you that programs like
family literacy are doing too much for the communities especially for me.

I -- thanks to this program, I became a successful person. I got my -- I have my associates degree. I -- I brought it here to share with you. I brought you with honors, as you can see. I brought it to share with you.

I'm still pursuing my bachelor's degree on early childhood education because I wanted to help other children and their families as they help me before.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Please come forward.

MS. BARKER: Afternoon. I am Kim Barker. I am the assistant director in the adult education department. I spent the last ten years of my life studying early childhood education. I've received a BA in child, adolescent, and family studies and a Master's in education with a focus on leadership in early childhood education.

As a specialist in this field, I am confused and concerned by the eagerness to drop family literacy. In my studies, I have researched many CE programs, and I can say without part of early childhood education, the long term effects of this program reach further than we could have ever imagined or hoped for connecting children, families,
and communities.

Leaders like Antonia come from these programs. They leave an incredible legacy their children their grandchildren and their communities.

Support the strength of family literacy and shows the importance of supporting and the continuation of each and every single one of these family literacy programs.

You have taken part in creating a revolutionary program, a program that says family is important, a program that says community is important, a program that says education is important.

Because of you, Antonia and those students who follow her will build futures we would be proud to call our own.

Please continue to make the dreams of so many others come true with the continuation of this life changing program.

I thank you for your time, but most of all I thank you for the opportunity you have provided these special families.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony. Next speaker, please.

MS. THORN: My name is Carry Thorn, and I'm an in-home counselor with project safe, which is part of PFF.
And I wanted to thank the commission for thinking of the amount of notice that you give to the programs; so if people do need to make plans that that is done.

I thought you should also know that there is -- there are people who have been with the program for a long time who, as it gets towards sunsetting, they get a little anxious for their jobs. They've been there for a long time to provide that continuity for the program. It's a shame when that has to happen, because it impacts the families they work with, and as you know, a lot of the families we work with have had situations in their life or haven't had a -- kind of things happen that impact the families we work with. And I'm sure you're already aware of it.

Remind ourselves of the impact of those things, and even though you've given attention to notifying people adequately, if there could be even more time it could be a benefit.

Thank you for your time.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony.

Next speaker, please. Please come forward.

MS. SALAZAR: Good afternoon. Afternoon everyone.

My name is Karen Salazar. I'm a family literacy director, and I work in the city of Cudahy, 90201. Not
90210. A bit different.

Recently the students mailed you 39 letters expressing the value and the need for family literacy program.

Here's a quote from one of those letters by Aricely Guerrero.

The economy of the countries are based on families. Mother's build families. Families build communities and communities build your help at this moment is very important for our community.

This letter is just one and in expressing who we are and in fact we are Best Start. The four goals of Best Start are addressed through our family literacy programs Best Start since it's inception our students and our staff.

Family literacy ensures that children are ready for school. I brought five items to represent First 5 LA. That you can look at after it's -- when you have time. But our children are ready for school. We have outcomes and data. Parents are parenting and classes and workshops inform families how to keep children safe. We integrate a healthy body, healthy mind as physically fit as well as associate is emotional cognitive.

Referred to as collaborators for prenatal care and information. Furthermore, we have community action
and leadership. I -- again I have some examples for us to
look at for some of our organizations.

So, yes, we take full advantage of support of
family literacy, and make the most of it in anyway
possible for the children and families. We are place
based. We are in the nature and as one student --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Ma'am your time has expired.

MS. SALAZAR: This is the place where you go for
a chance to do better, to be better. Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Next speaker, please.

MS. QUOTA: Hello. My name is Heidi Quota, and
I'm the program coordinator for school readiness. This
past year, between July and December, we provided services
to 103 parents, 69 families, and 73 children.

Closing this program will eliminate parent
education workshops, case management, parent child groups,
crisis intervention, and child abuse and neglect
prevention. It's a strong program in our community that
now families in need can utilize; so that we can benefit
from our program services this.

With me, today, I brought Steven and Edgar. They
are two of our graduates that were enrolled since 2006.
Their mother has been very active in our program. She's
the President of our parent committee and a parent leader
in our program.

They would like to share with you a few words with you guys.


CAESAR: My name is Caesar. We need this program because -- because I had the -- if I had the right to enjoy why can't other kids have the right to enjoy it also. And thanks to this program I now have all honors classes in Palm's Middle School and I want -- and the in the future I would like to be a lawyer.

EDGAR: My name is Edgar. Everything I know and thanks to this program I'm ready for school. And now I'm -- I'm mentally ready. For school. Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much for those thoughts.

Let's give them another round of applause.

And Caesar, come see me for a little career counseling. I'll save you from yourself.

SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Sal Nosres. I live in family about four years ago. From my neighbors. They told me to go to school and get on the waiting list because it's a very good program for the whole family. I did that and I've been a part of it ever since.

I am very grateful for the program. It has been helped everybody in my family. I spoke just a few words
of English when I got here. And now I am in level five of ESL.

I am a more understanding mother and that has made me more patient with my children.

I read to my children every day. And play with them most days. I help them in elementary school and school meetings and help with the Saturday school in their place.

My older son is in second grade and was named student of the month in September.

My daughter, she is strong in reading and not as strong in math. I ask the teacher if she could have some help, but she told she is on grade level.

I am doing extra practice at home with her because I know that will help her.

My youngest daughter Marianna, she is four years old. She knows all of the colors, writes her name, recognize the alphabet, and know the song that most of the letters make. She's very good at writing.

Thanks to a child family literacy program, she is in her own bed all night. And she's very proud of it.

She will never let me say good night without reading a book.

Now, my husband helped me so much because of the children, because of coming to the program. He's
voluntary literacy coach on Monday.

Please vote to continue all of the family literacy program.

Had I not been a part of the program, I would not feel our family would be doing as well as it is. We need help writing, help to understand the education system, how to volunteer, speak English, and support our children in school.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

MS. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon. I am (unintelligible) Matinez, and I'm so grateful to all of you that changed my life. Okay.

I just want to thank you -- all of you, because before I entered family literacy program, I used to not read to my children, and I feel guilty about that.

I talk to them, I read to them, and have a routine with them. And I didn't have that routine with my other child. He's eight. And if -- if I had that routine with him, it would be different.

Right now, he's having a lot of trouble with his school. And with my daughter, she's four and she entered in the program when she's two years old, and she's being so -- she's very smart in school. She's very confident. And as I am a mom, I think having -- trying to do my best
as a person and as a mom, I go to school, I volunteer, I just try to talk to them every day about school, about education, about trying to be their best every day.

And they with this program. I have very little speak English. I got any work permit. I got my Green Card. And I want to go back to school and be a better mom.

For a long time, I've waited to have an education and a career.

I want to thank for you for having this program. Please don't close the program. It will be a huge difference in our community.

I need this program. My community needs this program. And I'm really thankful for being in this country, for having this opportunity to be a part of this program, and have to help any kids for them have to have a better future for me and for them and for all of us in the community.

Thank you.

BRIANNA: My name is Brianna. I'm part of ESL. I learned to write my name. I know my colors. I know my ABCs. Please save family literacy.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you, Brianna.

JOSIAH: My name is Josiah. I can't -- he -- he is -- I'm four years old. I learn ABCs, numbers to one
hundred, the song.

Thank you.

Oh, for the luck of the Irish, we have a little gift for you. All right.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Josiah said he could count up to 100. Give these little ones a nice round of applause.

Thank you.

Next speaker, please.

MS. ROMAN: I requested -- actually lift the microphone. I don't have to lower it.

Good afternoon. My name is Roberta Roman, and I'm with Long Beach family literacy. We are a Best Start community.

I've been active in family literacy since 1992. So it goes before First 5 funding, our initiative.

I apologize, I only brought ten copies, but I'm bringing greetings to you from your local superintendent as well as greetings from Louisville Kentucky from the national center for family literacy.

Their president and founder -- and I love looking at those shamrocks -- who is the founder for the center, I want to remark on our chair's comments earlier.

I love what he said about services, results, which are best practices, accountability, and infrastructure, and how that improves the quality of life.
That, to me, is family literacy.

I do read through the letters our superintendent has thanked you for your investment in our community. He has stated again the alignment with Best Start and he spoken to our long term outcomes.

Our second and third graders that are outperforming on their test scores to other students that are not in family literacy programs, and he urges you to support our -- the vote today to continue funding.

The second letter from the national center for family literacy also speaks to research. We are part of First 5 LA and Long Beach are part of a research synthesis that will be outlined at the national conference that will be brought to the general public for recognition.

So thanks again, and continue supporting family literacy.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

Next we'll take questions from the Board.

We have several additional speakers Yvette Pineda, Naomi Galindo. The name is a tad difficult for me to read but the street is McBride. So if that lines up with you please come forward. Rosy Pike. Catherine Rooter and finally Louanne Atkinson. Okay.

In that order please.

MS. PINEDA: My name Yvette Pineda. In North
valley caring services we're a nonprofit in North Hills and the family first neighbors program, and we are part of Best Start Panorama City.

I just want to say that there are people out in the community that support family literacy and believe in the program.

This summer we have one donor that is willing to spend a hundred thousand dollar for our preschool, for family literacy children, and our fund raising is focused on family literacy. Our assembly member will be there, and will be hosting the kick off. We have our newly elected Phillip Finnes who will be riding this, people that believe in our program.

I also want to mention community partners who provide family literacy compensensation worth $64,000 a year. That have provided $50,000 for our family rate; so again, I want to encourage to you continue to partner why your grantees and support what we're doing in the work -- in the community.

We serve them with excellency. We reach out the outcomes that are specified in the initiative of 40 families. We have worked with the reduction from First 5 to now, 90,000.

So I just want to encourage you to continue to support at your current investments.
Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you.

Next speaker.

MS. GALINDO: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Naomi Galindo. I'm studying English. My English is -- I study English.

But I tell you about the things most important. She's my daughter. She's three years old. I need to tell you how -- how much the family literacy program has touched me.

We are learning a lot. But the discipline about the discipline habits speech communication patient education and many things the most important for the life of my daughter.

This program is excellent. I learned to understand that only I can make changes for a better future. A weekend, one weekend because we have excellent teachers and excellent coordinator. They have taught us how to read and interact with our children. I recognize they hard work. I can see this in my daughter because she has learned so much about the letters, shapes, colors, sounds, and she speaks English a lot.

But she's shy. Thank you for support this program. It's our future. Thank you for your good decision. Thank you very much.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Next speaker, please.

MS. PIKE: Good afternoon, commission members.

My name's Rosy Pike.

I'm the program advisor with LA unified school district and so I get the privilege of helping support the family literacy programs. And I'd like to ask you today as I've come several times before to ask you that prior to making the big decision about sunsetting any of the current family literacy programs, First 5 family literacy programs that you strongly consider the following.

All 19 family literacy programs are based on the philosophy that literate families tend to be stronger families. The philosophy intensive frequent and long term high quality education services through adult education we have spent. Helping them to think critically and creatively and set and achieve goals, pursue career training, if possible, and acquire meaningful workplace and through early education, learning, growth and development of young children, and engage parents and their child's education to foster meaningful involvement that will be maintained throughout the child's education career.

Parents receive instruction on how the children grow, develop, and learn. Through interactive parent
child activities regarding share their literacy experiences.

And I'm going to cut this short here.

As you make your decision today, I'd like to remind you that First 5 LA began the programs at 150,000 for each program. Currently we're receiving 90,000 per program. Thanks to your investment and design, adult division LA unified supports family literacy. We actually have a weak budget, about a million dollars in adult ed dollars to support the six family literacy program that's we are have under 480,000 are budgeted to support the community base programs. This doesn't even include what it costs to sustain the classrooms and the administration of the programs.

If at all possible, please continue maintaining the support your investing in the education of whole families as the date indicates make a different.

Thank you so much for your time.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony.

Next speaker, please.

MS. MARK: Good afternoon. My name Luanne Mark. I'm with the Long Beach head start program. And we have been the very gracious recipients of money from First 5 readiness and Best Start; so I'm really here today with a question for you.
As I was waiting, I was reading the packet that you received. And if you look on a page 237 -- and this is really point of action in the first calendar year -- at the May 2013 approved to extend funding for the current 19 family lit programs until June 30th, 2013, or until Best Start community plans were contracted, whichever is longer.

The commission approved funding for all family literacy that could potentially be related to Best Start communities.

I know that we're hearing that it was a one-year extension with that possibility to go longer. As a member of the Best Start leadership team, I know that our plan hasn't been approved, therefore, our safety net for our families is not solidly in place.

I urge you to please, especially in Best Start communities, to allow us to continue your vision of community collaboration and partnership to support children.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

I see a final speaker.

SPEAKER: My name is -- she's my daughter. Her name is -- my name is Paulina. And the family literacy program has helped me to learn English. I'm currently the
secretary of department advisories for learning center.

One year ago, I was worried about my daughter's education, but now this program learning helping to my daughter education for a better future.

This program change -- change my mind how to reach my goal more easily. And the last one, this program and this program I learned how to be better mother with my kids.

Thank you everyone.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

Does the commission -- that closes the public comment portion on our agenda.

Item eight.

We'll now here from the Executive Director.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you Mr. Chair. If I can make a couple of comments before turning it back to the chair.

And first to thank all the speakers young and -- I won't say old -- older.

It's wonderful to have a very human and authentic face put on numbers and call center lines and evaluated words; so thank you for your taking the time out of your busy days work schedules to come and share your work experiences with the Board of commissioners.

A couple of things that I want to clarify.

First -- and I appreciate this has been a moving
target, because the recommendations we had brought to the Board -- we wanted to have informed by the most recent available data. So there have been some changes in our recommendations as Tara spoke to as recently as this morning.

First, I want to clarify the decision before the Board is not about eliminating, wholesale, any programs. The decision point before the Board relates to a handful of grants that are slated to expire.

These are multi-year contracts that are slated to sunset at the end of this fiscal year. And what we wanted to do was not recommend that all of those programs go away. Recommendation to the Board to continue First 5 LA investments in many of these programs that are aligned with the strategic plan and the priorities that this commission identified back in 2009, and was affirmed, and that from a big picture perspective and then nor specifically either have a sustainability plan or are tied to in practical at this or potentially our Best Start program.

So what we put forward is not criteria that leads to the elimination of all these programs, but rather results in recommendations that make the case for continuing support for another year of 41 more of these grantees with one sunsetting.
So Number 1, there is a sustainability plan for partnerships for families; so we are recommending that all PFF grantees continue for one year. There is a bridge we believe that's not an entirely solid and assured bridge, but we have a reasonable expectation that working with the state working with the county, working with the federal government, the title four E waiver jargon word synonymous with federal money, Potentially can be use the reasonable high degree of child and family services.

Second inquiry is are these projects that really predate the strategic plan are they aligned in practice or potentially with the direction this organization's strategic plan sets us on so there are three strands of activity with Best Start as we know.

Number 1 is the Welcome Baby home visitation strategic as Tara describe all of our healthy birth partners we anticipate and will be a very important research so we're recommending to maintain that structure so all eight of the healthy birth grantees we recommend would be supported for one more year. School readiness to pare down from 30 plus grantees down to 17.

14 of those -- because 14 of those 17 are delivering the evidence based model that this Board approved as one of the challenges for our 14 Best Start community partners.
We are recommending that of those 14 school readiness grantees, that eight continue to be funded, because the model -- the evidence based model they provide is, in fact, the evidence based model those particular Best Start communities chose.

So very important resource and infrastructure we want to support. Three of those grantees so we have currently have 17 best -- excuse me. 17 school readiness grantees eight of them provide the mode that I particular Best Start community has continued support.

Three of them provide are using First 5 dollars to significant federal funds to support the early head start program in their communities such as vista dell mar. We heard from one of them.

As Tara indicated, we're recommending that you direct us to do some more work about how to maintain First 5 dollars to reference those federal funds and maintain that capacity. Not because it's related to Best Start but because we have a separate effort in this communication to mobilize resources and it seems there's a an important leveraging opportunity to encourage you to direct to us dig in March deeply with those three current S R I grantees.

But that does mean six of the S R I grantee that's provide evidence based models which have not been
chosen by our Best Start communities we would recommend that those sunset at this time.

The second strand of activity are the community partnerships and that is a work in progress as we know. Very important decisions for the Board to make but in an abundance of caution and in anticipation of the Board move this initiative forward, we want to make sure that communities activity related to family strengthening early childhood development that infrastructure be maintained.

We currently have 20 family literacy grantees. 13 of them are serving this is some evidence that that either in Number 2 whether it be in 2009 or 2011. Some service to Best Start communities.

So these are the grantees we are recommending continue be funded such as the Long Beach family literacy -- some of our partners there.

But there are seven current grantees that no question do important work.

They do good work but they are neither in nor has there been evidence from 2008, '9 or '11 data of service to Best Start community members difficult as the recommendation that those program sunset.

And finally the Best Start is community capacity building. And while there's more work date of birth done there. We don't believe that the neighborhood counsel
residents based organizing nod he will anticipate would
continue to be an important part of.

So we're recommending that be very sensitive very
difficult issues. With an informed and analytically
based framework which ultimately the decision rests with
the better thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Members of the commission, there is matter before
us to take action on. What is your pleasure?

Your questions, comments, recommendations? I
recognize Commissioner Dennis. I recognize
Commissioner Delgado. I recognize Commissioner Au. I
recognize Commissioner Swilley. And followed by
Commissioner Fielding.

In that order, please.

MR. DENNIS: This is a point of clarification.

Staff presented four different areas of -- I
mean, so will we deal with them separately? That we deal
with each of them separately and have a discussion to each
one -- each independently? So staff started off with PFF.
Start with the PFF, and then --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's up to the Chair.

Please proceed.

MR. DENNIS: And my PFF question is around the
four E waiver.
On this Commission, we've been told about the four E waiver as a sustainability strategy for some years now. And so the question is are we any surer now than we were perhaps two years ago, and if we're not, you know, I mean, obviously, you all -- staff will be coming back to us, and then the follow-up question around that is what has been the plan for the four E dollars that have come already to the department, how they've been expended if not through PFF?

I mean -- I mean, there have been waiver dollars. Where have they been expended?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Right. Response to Commissioner Dennis?

MS. BELSHE: Two really good questions. First one, we are in some position to have some thoughts to share because it's -- it speaks to what has informed our recommendation of the Board.

The broader question about where the counties four E waivers is an issue -- might -- my comments there.

MR. DENNIS: Say that again.

MS. BELSHE: Your second question is where have the four E waivers -- four federal four E waiver dollars been invested to date county wide, which really isn't a question.

Recipient of those dollars, that's really a
question for the county. I would defer to Phillip or --

MR. DENNIS: We can deal with that in committee.

I think that informs part of what -- what we should be
doing. And I'm not asking for Phillip to answer that at
this particular time. Perhaps that can be something that
is directed to programming and planning at some later
time.

MS. BELSHE: I would note a couple of things,
Commissioners.

Number 1, for a number of reasons -- and, again,
others can speak more directly than I -- and I would ask
John, in his former capacities in negotiating the first
four E waiver for a variety of the waiver has been put off
for a period of time. Ultimately this is a federal issue.
But it's also a state issue because the state is the
single state agency for LA, and indeed it's not just about
LA, it's about other counties as well.

So we have a reasonably good expectation that the
federal and state administrations recognize the need to
move forward and reach a dying decision on the four E
behavior this year.

It is because of that expectation that a decision
will be made and clarity will be realized that we noted in
the presentation that we may well need to be coming back
to the commission in terms of what the few fewer looks
like for PFF the waiver could be renegotiated but in I dramatically reduced resource amount.

Which could compel decisions by DCFS the and the county agency that doesn't provide for support by PFF supportive of PFF positive program as Armando spoke to the results have been very positive.

So we are working off of an imperfect going on, but based on the expectation that the federal and state administration to closure, we should at least have some clarity. And if the clarity is such that the resources aren't there, we'll need to come back and have a transition plan.

MR. DENNIS: Can you speak to the fact that we have talked about sustainability and attached it to the four E waiver? And so clearly the more we know about what's happening will help us inform our future discussions.

MS. BELSHE: John and I have been courtroom colleagues, associate services. This -- again, this is a work in progress. It's imperfect. We end our conversations with DCFS. We have a reasonably good expectation that this will be resolved in a positive way for sustainability, but if not, we'll be coming back and practice perhaps having a very different and more difficult conversation.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. I note the time is 4:15. Let's proceed.

MR. BROWNING: Family literacy.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes, you can dispose of each of the items suggestion of Commissioner Dennis, but let's continue to move the discussion.

MR. DELGADO: My questions are really to clarification.

The presentation mentioned relative to family literacy that there were 12 grantees that were going to continue, seven that were not recommended to continue. The agenda says that there are ten that are recommended to continue and nine that are recommended not to continue. And then I thought I heard a little -- just a little while ago from your director that the there are actually thirteen that are recommended to continue. So -- so I'm confused is what that number really is; so I have a full understanding of that.

MS. BELSHE: Tara, you can take that. As I noted as early as this morning, we were bringing in the most up to date data, which actually resulted our changing to extend to two additional grantees.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: A relevant point at this juncture is what specifically is before us now. Is it 13? Or what are the numbers to be recommended for continued
funding? What is the number for those who will not be recommended?

MS. FICEK: The recommendation is 12 grantees and one T A provider; so that's where the thirteen T A provider for a total of 13 sunsetting would be.

MR. DELGADO: Second question. The remaining seven, do we have any information or data that shows that they have been successful or not successful in spite of the fact that they haven't been serving families from Best Start communities?

MS. FICEK: We don't have it broken out by just those seven grantees, if that's what you you're asking.

MR. BROWNING: My direction there, just because they don't happen to fall into the --

MR. DELGADO: That seems to be a disqualifier for them, and if that were the case, is there a way for them to become qualified in some other manner? And so I put that out there for the commissioners to consider.

MS. BOSCH: If I may, as our director indicated, these programs are probably very successful, but that isn't established. That's just based on decisions made by this commission that indicate that we're moving in three areas with Best Start. And the link here is Best Start. They could be very successful programs, but, again, that is not the criteria we're following here.
What we're following was established by the commission where we have to make -- where the commission needs to make decisions based on that framework.

MR. DELGADO: Okay.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Next Commissioner who wishes to be heard.

MS. AU: I think it's me.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

MS. AU: I have a question for -- regarding PFF. Given that there's probably a strong indication that we're going to grant approval because this is a valuable program, and I think the data shows very objective.

The question I have is will this -- and currently we do have an RFP out that sort of encompasses PFF. Is there any impact that's going to happen to the current process that you're engaged in with the -- in terms of the folks that are going to be submitting proposals where PFF is embedded in this RFP? But there is only nine PFF grantees that First 5 is funding directly?

MR. BROWNING: There's a bridge here from July through -- July '13 through '14. So we're not sure what the Feds are going to do, whether, as the director said, the terms would be such that it would not be in our best interest after one after '13-'14.
So we won't want to take on something now that we couldn't be sure that we RFF has the elements that you just described so. That people could bid and say this is what we want to do and by the time that contracting process gets through. We would be in a position to know whether or not there are federal funds that with a would allow us to contracting process for the county is so lengthy that if we don't put an RFP out now.

By the time we know about the funding. Too late. There's no opportunity to pick that up. So there are, and is there -- is there no money for that? But the belief to pick those services up.

MS. AU: Is there then an expectation that you would be able to expand PFF?

MR. BROWNING: I think that will depend on the bids that come in and the terms that are negotiated in the Feds I think are go back going to be much more difficult to deal with.

The landscape has changed. The budget is tighter. Though we know that our cash loads have dropped dramatically; so moving back to our old way of doing business they would save a lot of money. So it's an uphill battle to show why we should be held harmless at the same terms we had five years ago.

MS. AU: Okay. Thank you.
MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: There's no guarantee, I'm assuming, that the same providers of PFF now would be in the system if they don't because of the bid; right?

MR. BROWNING: Right.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay.

MS. AU: I think the just a general comment is that I think as a commission we also need to think in terms of a number of these kinds of initiatives that have demonstrated really positive outcomes, and I mean the grantee is on the whole at First 5 LA has been engaged. And I'm looking at Yolanda. They have done remarkable work with First 5 LA dollars.

I think that we really need to move and this is the bigger picture piece in terms of agencies being able to continue a lot of the projects and programs that we had started and have shown really remarkable results, and I -- I think we need to really focus on when you talk about intentional reality, you talk about sustaining and maintaining these kinds of great programs that this is a good example of an opportunity here.

And I'm -- I'm truly looking at DCFS to monitor this. That you incorporate a lot of these wonderful bill is smiling there. That's it.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Swilley.
MS. SWILLEY: Yes. I have a question to -- related to the school readiness.

I do understand that after children participated in it, that they didn't do as well as those who will not participate in the program. And is that in the aggregate or in the school readiness programs? Or were there doing much better than others, and are we voting to support everything?

MS. BELSHE: No. Let's go to Armando.

MR. JIMENEZ: A group of school readiness programs that delivered the highest, most comprehensive -- we matched two Superior Court scores, and third grade and compared them to a similar program.

The issue that you -- that was brought up in the discussion is that as a result of those outcomes, we then and the commission made a recommendation to move and change and actually suggest that the implement a evidence based program; so it's several of the school readiness programs had been implementing parents as teachers and other evidence based programs and those were recommended to move forward.

So that was the original 38 which was reduced to 17. So the results that we presented were from the entire aggregated school effort.

So the -- the the folks that have been doing
parents and teachers we have reviewed their evidence based program so we have reason to believe that those outcomes would be similar to research that has been done on parents as teachers as well.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Commissioner Fielding.

MR. FIELDING: First of all, I want to congratulate the staff on an excellent presentation. You took us through step by step in a sequential manner, which is exactly the kind of support that we need, and I also want to say to Armando that this was the best presentation in telescoping the results into what was very palatable, very clear, and exactly what you I think we needed; so congratulations to both of you.

I personally support the framework. I think it's a reasonable framework.

You know today and any day where we have to make difficult decisions can be a day of sadness for everyone. And the people who are sad, we have to share and empathize, because it's sad for us as well.

And you don't want to fund things that aren't working. On the other hand, what's our role and part of what is to try models who have the opportunity for stability for a long time. Much longer than originally intended when they were originally fundnd was with the
understanding that they would be sustainable.

I am not complaining that it's been hard to get sustainability, but let's go back and that is the sense that we started with.

And not even the good programs, they're not necessarily easily scalable, and we have as a commission opportunities costs which means dollars we spend on this we can't spend on other things. We have a clear rationale for what we want to invest.

So I think despite the anxiousness of the -- and seeing the smile on those children's faces, it's time for difficult decisions.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: I just want to go back to Kim's remarks regarding the three programs that the staff is suggesting that we support, because the tragedy is that we go into C I and because as a result they have the ability to -- to learn.

And my only caution is that -- or my question was that the litmus test done for the remaining programs that are earmarked for sunset, because if not, we -- we are -- obviously, on the hot spot.

If we didn't -- basically, we made a decision late in the game that we wouldn't extend these programs
based on their ability to relate to head start, to leverage federal dollars, and so do we use that same litmus test on the remaining programs?

And if we had, we probably should do it justice. And I'm not suggesting that we halt anything, but that's going to come back and hit us if we don't.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you for the opportunity to clarify.

The modification of the recommendation was a function, frankly, of my better understanding.

The policy decision that the commission made was a year ago around school readiness initiatives; so I will own this late breaking change. It is not a function of trying to pretzel a policy to get to a certain end, but rather my coming late to understand that those 17 grantees were not all implementing evidence based models from which the Best Start communities could choose, but rather 14 of the 17 were.

So then as I probe well, they will tell me about the three.

So the policy decision was either to support these, SRI, school readiness initiatives that are implementing one of the four evidence based models with these SRI dollars.

And so with that policy clarification, and in the
context of the president's proposal frankly to expand
early head start you know, my engagement with the staff is
to say rather than -- I mean this is a lot of money to be
leaving on the table but most fundamentally the Board's
decision as specifically grantee specifically as it
related to the SRI to leverage significant federal funding
so so consistent with that policy we could fund it in the
context of another year of SRI funding.

It just -- this is really leveraging this home
solicitation model. It's about leveraging significant
federal funds to support an evidence based mold; so that's
why we're recommending and we can talk about the suggested
amendment to this motion that you all direct us to work
with these grantees to see how to make that work if you
maintain a policy that the Board already establishes.

Does that help?

MR. DENNIS: It really does. And I think the
public rationale will help as we move forward and come to
a vote because those questions will come back and not us.
And then I think that rationale helps what we need to
do.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm really struggling. I think
everybody has some degree of that struggling. When I look
at sunsetting SRIs and sunsetting family literacies, we've
been honing them down over the years from 37 down to 17, and lowering down each family literacy got and they were still able to survive and thrive.

And sometime get outside money. I don't know the exact proportion of outside money. But and so on one hand they're not self-sufficient. They've not reached their adulthood and moved out of the home.

But there's still needing some help with the parent organization. So that they can continue to thrive and grow. And I think we all agree that they're doing good work so that's the harder part of it.

I know it's not a cost effective model and literacies are expensive economic leaves way down stream, and those sort of things; so I don't really know what do do.

It seems to me I listen to everyone else is around the table, it doesn't seem funding those organizations that have been suggested to be sunsetted. I don't know what the compromise is there. Do we fund them at half the amount or two thirds the amount? Do we continue on again expecting additional matching revenue in some way?

I know we've gone down that path in the past and had trouble with it. Not just with them but with other partners.
It just seems that to throw this baby out with the bath water, completely -- though I know we have promise -- not just seems to me to be too harsh.

So when we get around to voting I'm going have an that you can vote down or vote up that some of that money gets given to those groups.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Noted and Commissioner Kaufman, you have just prophesied, because we are at the point of voting unless there's some resistance that the chairs impulse.

MS. AU: Just in response to Neil's own comment, I do want to recognize LA unified school district. I think their presenter had said that LA unified had subsidized a million dollars or more for -- for family literacy.

This is, again, another good example of a large established institution that has embraced the -- the positive outcomes that family literacy has achieved and have now incorporated it.

And I think we really need to again be very intentional in trying to move the lot of the grantees that have established good outcomes so that the parent entity will embrace them and continue to provide for them so the program will continue.

So congratulations LA unified.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: You're not allowed to listen to Commissioner Kaufman. He gets a lot of people in trouble.

MS. AU: I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Any more disruptions?

MR. KAUFMAN: We're going to vote on each of them separately?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's the plan.

With that in mind, Item Number 1 on this matter is partnership for families.

Maybe we should read it into the record so everyone's clear.

It's to extend funding for nine lead agencies and respective -- respective collaboratives for 12 months in the amount of 1,687,000 to align with DCFSs title for waiver notifications and end anticipated contracting date of July 1, 2014.

The federal RE waiver are expected to conclude in year '14.

That is the recommendation on that item.

Is there a motion to adopt that as proposed?

(Motion moved.)

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: So moved. Seconded by Commissioner Figueroa-Villa.
Members, for the record, Madam Secretary, please call the roll on partnerships for families.

THE SECRETARY: Linda Au?

MS. AU: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Boeckmann?

MS. BOECKMANN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Browning?

MR. BROWNING: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Fielding?

MR. FIELDING: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Figueroa-Villa?

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Ridley-Thomas?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Southard?

MR. SOUTHARD: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Swilley?

MS. SWILLEY: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Motion carries unanimously.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Let's move at this time to the next item, which would be healthy births.

Madam Executive Director?

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair, I'd like to suggest, if I...
may, a friendly amendment to healthy births, if I may.

    MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: You may.

    MS. BELSHE: The motion before you is to extend funding in the amount of $2,000,050 to maintain the best Babies until family strengthening programs roll out in 2012, B, C, and the LA baby network of and the 12 month extension.

    And the amendment we would like to suggest for the Board's consideration is to added terms or until Best Start Welcome Baby and select home visitation are contracted whichever is sooner.

    And second sentence would be extend six best baby collaborative for six months or until Best Start Welcome Baby and select home visitations are contracts whichever is longer.

    This is language that is consistent with the approach the Board has taken in the past to maintain a little bit of flexibility here and not require us to keep coming back.

    We would hope the commission would consider a friendly amendment to provide a little bit of running room by adding that whichever is sooner. Actually whichever is longer.

    MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes, you did indicate two operative words, both continuity and flexibility.
All right. Healthy births as amended before us.

Is there a motion to be entertained in that regard?

(Motion moved.)

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Moved and seconded.

If there's no further questions, Madam Secretary, please call the roll on healthy births as amended.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Au?

MS. AU: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Boeckmann?

MS. BOECKMANN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Browning?

MR. BROWNING: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Fielding?

MR. FIELDING: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Figueroa-Villa?

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Ridley-Thomas?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Southard?

MS. SOUTHARD: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Swilley?
MS. SWILLEY: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Motion carries unanimously.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very kindly.

Third recommendation pertains to school readiness.

Madam Executive Director.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There are two suggested amendments for Board consideration.

First is to include language along the lines similarly adopted as part of the healthy births recommendation in terms of acknowledging whichever is sooner relative to the 6 or 12 month extension of relative to standing up the home visitation programs.

The second amendment is along the lines that I touched on a moment ago, a recommendation that you all direct staff to work for three grantees using funding through the school readiness initiative to implement the federal early head start program effectively directing us to restore and develop options for one year support through First 5 resource mobilization opportunities and direct staff to present a recommendation to the commission at it's April 14th meeting.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Right.

It's before you. Any questions of the Executive
Director regarding that amendment?

I see none. Therefore, I suggest that we are ready to vote.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'd like to add an amendment.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. I'm listening

MR. KAUFMAN: A point of clarification.

If the SRI to those that are sunsetting, I assume it's just the six not the three, what would the total amount be if the SRIs were extended? If the Board were to vote to continue to support the six SRIs that are implementing evidence based models that have been chosen by the 14 Best Start communities?

MS. BELSHE: It would be just over $800,000.

MR. KAUFMAN: Total?

MS. BELSHE: Total amount of eight, the six school readiness initiatives that are -- are implementing not been chosen by any of the 14 Best Start communities.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'd like to make a motion that we extend for all six of those, the $800,000 in the same way that prior original memo -- amendment. Excuse me.

MS. BELSHE: Point of clarification. The original memo?

MR. KAUFMAN: The original motion. So the motion that's there has the amendment that all 14 be extended rather than the just --
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All the --

MS. FICEK: So the 800,000 is also for a

six-month budget, for those six SRI grantees.

I just want to make sure that's clear.

MR. KAUFMAN: 800,000 for the six that have been

recommended not to be extended?

MS. FICEK: Right. That represents a six-month

budget for the recommendation that are continuing. A six

month recommendation. So --

MR. KAUFMAN: Tara, it would be a six month

contract or recommendation is what you're saying? 800,000

reflects a six month budget?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Members of the commission,

with respect to the recommendation of Commissioner

Kaufman, it seems to me that the particular rational

parameters have been set forth.

I'm not sure that I've heard a compelling

rational to deviate from that that would obviate that

similarly advanced; so, therefore, unless we can figure

out why, I would hope that we would proceed with the

recommendations that are before us.

But having said that, I respect the right of

members to vote as they find.

Having said that, it would require that we have a

federal parliamentary --
MR. STEELE: That would bifurcate the matter so that the Kaufman amendment got full and due consideration. And perhaps we should proceed with it first and then proceed do the balance.

Is that acceptable? We vote on the amendment first? The Kaufman amendment?

MS. AU: Vote on the amendment first.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's the aspect because school readiness initiative as it as proposed is essentially the main motion in rather than trying to take it all move through it in a way that's clear to everyone.

Is that acceptable? All right. If that's the case on the Kaufman amendment and Commissioner Kaufman, if you would like to restate it because we are about to vote on it.

I think need a second for --

MR. STEELE: Not as an amendment; so there's no second needed at the moment.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. So if you'd like to restate it for purposes of clarification. And then we'll --

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm sorry.

MR. STEELE: He's asking you to restate the amendment.

MR. KAUFMAN: That the six sunsetting SRI
initiatives not be sunsetted, but rather receive six months of funding at the rate that they're presently being funded, which is equal to $800,000, approximately.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

All members clear with that in mind?

MS. BELSHE: If I may, so is the amendment that rather than these eight, these six SRI programs implementing models that haven't been selected -- rather than having them sunset entirely, there would be six months of funding and then they would sunset?

MR. KAUFMAN: Unless they come back to us again.

MS. BELSHE: Important point of clarification. So we would likely be having this exact same conversation, potentially. So you're suggesting that as a trend. Just a point of clarification.

So the motion by the vice chair is rather than have these six grantees sunset effective June 30th, they would sunset six months later, December 30th.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. I note Commissioner Figueroa-Villa who wishes to be heard.

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: I just wanted to -- it was $2,000,000. It's up to two -- it's almost $3,000,000.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Any other questions in the way of clarification?

Let's proceed to the roll call to the current
The Chair recommends a no vote in this instance.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Au?

MS. AU: No.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Boeckmann?

MS. BOECKMANN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Browning?

MR. BROWNING: No.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Fielding?

MR. FIELDING: No.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Figuroa-Villa?

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: It went through the budget finance committee. No.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Ridley-Thomas?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: No.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Southard?

MR. SOUTHARD: No.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Swilley?

MS. SWILLEY: No.

THE SECRETARY: Amendment fails.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

As to the main motion as amended, it is before us.
Madam Secretary, please call the roll.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Au?

MS. AU: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Boeckmann?

MS. BOECKMANN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Browning?

MR. BROWNING: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Fielding?

MR. FIELDING: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Figueroa-Villa?

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Ridley-Thomas?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Southard?

MR. SOUTHARD: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Swilley?

MS. SWILLEY: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Motion passes unanimously.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Let's move family literacy.

Madam Executive Director?

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, another effort friendly amendment.
The motion before the Board is to extend funding for 13 grants and one technical assistant contract for 12 months.

The additional language we would suggest or until Best Start community plans whichever longer in the amount of 1.6 -- 1,631,720 in order to enable in or serving the Best Start community, sunsetting grantees as of June 30th, 2013, or are not in or serving a best start community.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. The item is before us that is on family literacy.

Are there any questions or comments?

Commissioner?

MR. KAUFMAN: I'd like to structure an amendment identical to the last one. So asking again the question of what the total amount be to extend, those seven sunsetting SRIs.

MS. FICEK: 660,470.

MR. KAUFMAN: For what amount of time?

MS. FICEK: For the --

MR. KAUFMAN: For how many months?

MS. FICEK: That is a 12-month total.

MR. KAUFMAN: So 700- for amendment to the motion that we extend the seven recommended for sunsetting for another year for -- at the amount that was mentioned.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.
Your minds are clear with respect to this item?
Are there any amendment to family literacy coming as a part of the staff recommendation?
I think we note technical amendment, did we not?
MS. BELSHE: That was the motion I had introduced with the technical amendment, the vice chair has now, after, offered similar to the school readiness. And Craig McNeil is recommending that the board approve the staff recommendation and continue funding of all family literacy initiatives regardless of their placement in our service to --

MR. STEELE: That we don't have an original motion on the floor yet; so I think Commissioner Kaufman's original motion -- and there has not yet been a second on Commissioner Kaufman's --

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That can be done.
Therefore, members of the commission, what is your pleasure? To second Commissioner Kaufman's motion?
There is no second.
The Chair, hearing none, I'll call for a second again.

Seeing that there is no second or the lack of a second, the matter before us now is family literacy recommendation from staff.
It is before us. Is there any --
(Motion moved.)
(Motion seconded.)
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Moved and seconded.
Any need for further clarification or discussion?
Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Au?
MS. AU: Yes.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Boeckmann?
MS. BOECKMANN: Yes.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Browning?
MR. BROWNING: Aye.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Fielding?
MR. FIELDING: Aye.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Figueroa-Villa?
MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: Yes.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Kaufman?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Ridley-Thomas?
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Aye.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Southard?
MR. SOUTHARD: Aye.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Swilley?
MS. SWILLEY: Yes.
THE SECRETARY: Motion carries unanimously.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Item Number 5, which is the
neighborhood action counsel recommendation.

Madam Executive Director?

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair, the recommendation is to extend support for an additional year the neighborhood action counsels recognizing the anticipated role they will play in the community capacity building activity with Best Start.

This will be an item we may need to come back to. But for now, our recommendation is to move forward with the expectation in the level funding in the coming budget.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

(Motion moved.)

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Moved and seconded.

Thank you very kindly.

Is there any discussion or points of clarification that any member of the commission would wish to pose?

MS. AU: Just one. Is there an opportunity to -- if we wanted more NAC's to be created in those Best Start communities, will we be able to have them come back and ask for the additional resources in order for that to take place?

MS. BELSHE: Thank you for your question, Commissioner Au.
This is really intended as a placeholder community building. We anticipate that that strategic -- once we bring the clarity and specificity to our goals, we will need to return to. So that's why we're suggesting for now anticipating sustaining at this level. It's loose in detail in terms of scale and -- and scope. Beginning to entertain other alternatives.

MS. AU: Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. That closes the discussion on the matter.

Madam Secretary, if you would call the roll?

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Au?

MS. AU: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Boeckmann?

MS. BOECKMANN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Browning?

MR. BROWNING: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Fielding?

MR. FIELDING: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Figueroa-Villa?

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Ridley-Thomas?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Aye.
THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Southard?
MR. SOUTHARD: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Commissioner Swilley?
MS. SWILLEY: Yes.

THE SECRETARY: Motion carries unanimously.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very kindly.

I think that disposes of Item Number 8 in its entirely.

That is done on this item.

The clock nears 5:00 o'clock, and I don't know about you --

MS. BELSHE: May I make a recommendation?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes. Assuming it's the right one. Yes.

MS. BELSHE: Okay. This could be a career-ending decision or suggestion.

Mr. Chair and members of the commission, I'd like to make the following recommendation, that we carry Item 9 for our next meeting in April that will give us an opportunity to also bring some more purposeful attention and discussed earlier today around how we evaluate assess progress and public policy.

Item 10 I also recommend we carry over the Board carry over until April.

But I would like to acknowledge Andrea Wellness.
She's one of -- of our super smarty pants colleagues. This was going to be her swan song presentation. She is leaving us at First 5 LA.

I have to regret that Andrea wasn't able to make her presentation.

Worry not, she's going to have an opportunity to shine as you have done so well here. But this is an item that we recommend carry over until April.

Item 11, Mr. Chair, continuing on -- I suggest the members continuing on the theme of time is not our friend. Item 11, can also be carried over for consideration at the April meeting.

Item 12, we need to take an action item; so we would ask that that take a few minutes of the Board's time.

And then finally Item 13, Bronwyn Mauldin is another one of our super smarty pants. And today is her last day. She's already out of here. So she's clocked out at 5:00. Oh my word. I hope she's upstairs listening.

Bronwyn, I want you to know how we value your many years of contribution and value. And I'm sorry you're not going to be with us to make this.

Let's thank Bronwyn for her services at this time.
So Mr. Chair and members, if you concur, if we can turn to Item 12.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Let me suggest that there is a speaker on Item 10 who is here as the executive director of LA; so Ms. Peters, if you would like to come forward and be heard, and we will continue the balance of the agenda with the exception of Item 12, and with the exception of adjournment. Thank you.

MS. PETERS: Thank you very much.

I was afraid I was going to have to come back.

I'm part of the breast feeding task force for breast feed LA. We propose and support the well-being of children and families in Los Angeles by doing outreach education and advocacy.

I want to let you know that our organization supports the staff's recommendation on this item. We are requesting that there is an extension of time with resources for the cycle one hospitals in the baby friendly process.

In addition to First 5 LA, the county department of public health is also supporting these hospitals to become baby friendly.

The -- during the CDC funding renewed as it was called in LA, we supported the three and education to those hospitals and they achieved the baby friendly
designation. And if my county can do it, anybody can do it.

And what we learned from that work -- what we learned from that work is the county can do it with some technical assistance. And these hospitals that -- that are in this consideration for the extension have had the benefit of the new counsel. Finding the new CDK funding to the transportation grant; so what we learned in renew we are now looking to more CTG funding; so we in our organization have gotten very close to these cycle one hospitals during the last nine months since we've had the CTG funding, and I can tell that you the items that Andrea, super star there, has placed forward as their significant barriers.

They do need a little extra time to achieve the designation. I'm confident she will with time, and I would like to let you know that I support the staff's recommendation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: We appreciate your testimony. Members, we will now move to Item Number 12. It is before us. The staff recommendation on spending.

Is there any discussion on item number 12?

(Motion moved.)

(Motion seconded.)
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's been moved and seconded. And if there are no objections, I call that we record a unanimous vote.

Thank you. Well done.

MS. BELSHE: I got to take a page from your book. He's good.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Well done. All done. There are no cards for public comment.

At this point in time, therefore, at 5:00 o'clock sharp, we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

(The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.)