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I'm here to present the monthly financials for the month of May --

MS. BELSHE: Lean into that microphone.

MS. CHOUGH: We began the month with a cash balance of about $779,000,000 and closed with $756,000,000. That decrease of roughly $23,000,000 is primarily attributable to a payment we made for quarter three to LA Up.

As a reminder, this is, as usual, a soft close, meaning that these figures have not been audited. They were internally prepared. At the end of the fiscal year, which we are upon, an independent auditing firm will conduct a hard audit. So my staff will be closing the books and working with external auditors and I'll come back to you in October with a report on the entire fiscal year for 2013.

And if you have any questions, Raul Ortega is over there.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you. Members of the commission, you've heard the report from our new chief financial officer. Are there any questions for her? Hazing is not permitted. That would be the domain of the state legislature for those who are presenting their initial bills. It is not permitted in First 5 LA.

Is there a motion to accept the monthly financial report as --

(Motion moved and seconded.)

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's been moved by Commissioner Fielding and seconded by Commissioner Figueroa-Villa.

Are there any additional comments by any members of the commission at this point in time?

Hearing none, please record a unanimous vote.

We'll move to Item Number 4, which is before us.

Sir.

MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and members of the board. I just wanted to point out two things in the Item Number 4, which is the consent calendar. One point is that, as you'll recall at the last commission meeting, there was a discussion around some of the countywide contracts, the new contracts that we were bringing forward to your consideration; and the question being, how do these align with the work we do in our Best Start communities.

So at the last board meeting, we continued two of those contracts. One was Peer support group for parents, and the second was the veggie voucher contact in order to do some of that work. Now that we've had the opportunity to conclude a successful retreat on Best Start establishing the Building Stronger Families framework,
staff continued to look at those new contracts to align that framework to the work of those contracts. So that work continues and we purposely do not have those two contracts before you today. And we will bring those back likely in September at the September board meeting. The other quick --

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: John --

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: A question for you.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: I can't hear.

MR. WAGNER: It was the two that were continued from the last board meeting where the peer support groups for parents and the veggie vouchers contract. And it's in ordinary to make sure we align those to the framework and the implications in the Best Start communities.

MS. BELSHE: And these are new contracts that would be coming --

MR. WAGNER: New countywide contracts.

The second item to call to your attention on the consent calendar is the compensation analysis study that we have before you. We -- as you'll recall, back in April of 2012, the board voted to authorize First 5 LA to conduct a solicitation for a compensation review, compensation study. This past February, I made a presentation on the RFP process that we were undertaking in exactly the four elements of the request for proposals process. We have gone through that process. We've gone through two reviews, and we have on the consent calendar our recommendation for the Hay Group. So there's a contract before you for $85,000 for the Hay Group, and it's a result of that compensation study.

Another issue that I think is really important to call out on this, is this one of the recommendations that came out of the Rose report that First 5 LA should conduct a compensation review every five years. The last one we have done and fully implemented goes back to 2001.

So if the board approves this contract, we would work with the Hay Group to come up with recommendations and those recommendations would again come back to the board. So that would be the process for the compensation setting, and we anticipate that would occur later in the year.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Antonio to highlight other agreements.

MR. GALLARDO: Thank you, John, and good afternoon commissioners.

In front of you, there is a consent calendar that for this month includes four new agreements and two renewals. The renewals are for work that's already undergoing, and the commission has approved in the past. It's just a process to renew the contracts on a yearly basis. On the four new agreements, John already spoke about the compensation study. And then out of the other three agreements, two of them are related to work that the commission has approved in the past.

I'd like to bring your attention to the contract that we are bringing for your consideration related to the work associated with the federal policy and the legal consultant. After a solicitation process, the staff is recommending contracting with Raymond Group, and this is to help us in conducting the strategy advice, providing policy support that is a complement to our comprehensive policy and associates efforts that we will hear more in Item Number 9 today.

If you have any questions, we'll be happy to answer them.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you both.

Members of the commission, we've heard from both the chief operating officer as well as the chief program officer regarding Item Number 4 and the agreements contained therein.

Are there any questions for the two speakers?

Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I am encouraged that we think we can be as successful in corralling Congress as we can with the State legislature.
I do know that we have a list of contractors that have submitted their names and they're on lists, but lots of then never get called. So what is -- what is the process and the procedure for those or qualifications?

MS. BOSCH: So I think you might be speaking about our pools that we have for specific types of work. So, for example, we as a pool, and they solicit once a year for anybody that wants to be in a pool for specific work. I mean, they can have any kind of qualification that is related to sort of an R-and-E type of work or program and planning. So we have different pools, HR pool. And usually the criteria is they've got to just have experience in the field. So they get in the pool. And then, as opportunities become available for work to be done, then there's usually a solicitation process to the pool. And then people can bid on that depending on what we're looking for as far as the specific need for that work. I mean, when you get in the pool, there's no guarantee for work, but we do solicit to the pool. Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: Yeah, but in terms of the -- many people are qualified in the work that's needed, but do they really know our communities, do they really know -- that's what I'm asking about more so, diversity.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think the larger question, if I may, that the commissioner is seeking to place on the table may be, what are the diversity policies that govern procurement and the range of activities in which First 5 LA engages; do such policies exist. And it might be useful, at the appropriate place and time, to have them submitted to the appropriate committee, presumably the executive committee perhaps for a review and update. This is in the context of some of the other work that we're doing in terms of bylaws, policies, and the like.

So there may be a response to that now. If it doesn't exist, it seems to me that we wish to invite this entity into the 21st century. Speak to the issue if you will.

Professor Bosch, is there an answer? I don't know that it's a legal answer.

MR. STEELE: I was just going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, exactly as you specified. Rather than give an incompetent answer here, I think perhaps it would be best to compile what we have and report back in the context of that discussion with the executive committee.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Excellent. That would be fine. All right. Is that satisfactory, commissioner?

All right. Then Commissioner Fielding did move the item before us. Are there additional questions?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Mr. Chair, I had a question about whether we're voting to approve all of the agreements or just the two that were discussed.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Browning seeks a clarification.

MR. WAGNER: The vote before you is the full consent calendar, so it's the four agreements plus the two amendments.

MS. BELSHE: Four new agreements and the two renewals.

MR. WAGNER: Two renewals, sorry.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: One follow-up question.

On the Rabon Group, how many solicitations did you receive? Were there more than one?

MS. BELSHE: We received seven.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Seven. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Additional questions or comments for staff on Item Number 4 and the recommendations contained therein?

Again, it's been moved by Commissioner Fielding.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Second.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Seconded by Commissioner Kaufman.

If there's no further discussion on the matter and if there are no objections, that will be the order and record a unanimous vote.

Commissioners, thank you very much. We can now turn our attention to Item Number 5. And I'll say just the -- following in the chair's report that early childhood education is a relatively fundamental component of First 5 LA's mission, but more importantly, early childhood education is important to our well-being as a society, which all of us I know no doubt understand and agree with; otherwise, we wouldn't be doing the important work that we are doing; you wouldn't be doing the important work that you do.

So it's just a question of how we intelligently and strategically, prudently advance the agenda for early childhood education. And I think we have a rather extraordinary opportunity along these lines presented to us by the President of the United States just to put down a marker that essentially calls for an investment, a wise investment, a defensible investment in early childhood education.
So in my capacity as chairman of the board, supervisors, you know, we -- we wish to affirm the work that First 5 LA has done and is doing and will continue to do, and no doubt do it on a more effective basis on a go-forward basis given the intensity of work and the clarity that is being brought to bear by staff and its leadership.

On Tuesday, the board did adopt a resolution that -- that is the board of supervisors, to effectively embrace President's initiative because we believe it's in our collective self-interest as a nation, as a society; and for entities such as First 5, there are significant advantages to be realized. I won't detail all of the data that no doubt you are familiar with about the issue of dropout rates and the clear deterioration of the quality of life absent the intervention that early childhood education represents.

So we just want to make the point that this is an agenda that is increasing support and it is appropriately viewed as a priority, a legislative priority for the County of Los Angeles in terms of the direction to our federal legislative advocates to get after this issue and support that initiative and do all that we can as the most populous county in the nation to hold the banner high for early childhood education.

The dollars that would flow pursuant to the President's initiative could be very, very substantial. It seems to me that we ought to be smart enough to act in our own self-interest in this point.

We will share with you a letter that we are circulating to each of the board members just so that you have a content of it. The motion will be attached for your consideration as well. I just want to cause that to be the thrust of the chair's remarks for the day, just an emphasis on the issue of early childhood education and universal preschool -- investment, investment, investment.

May I take the opportunity to indicate that, with respect to the agenda, we are going to reorder it just a tad. We're going to take Item 9 and 10 up earlier than has been indicated. So after we hear from the executive director on her remarks, we're going to move to Item Number 9, then Item Number 10 -- those are the substantial action items for the day -- and proceed accordingly. All right?

MS. BELSHE: Terrific. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and members and supervisor. Your comments, I think, are spot on and will be echoed throughout the course of today's commission meeting on a number of agenda items where the theme of the policy window and the opportunity that's been created by the President's leadership is really very timely here in California. So while the federal conversation -- or the conversation around quality preschool has been kicked off under the President's leadership, there's some really important near-term opportunities here at home where this organization has an opportunity to provide a lot of leadership. So I'm very helpful in opening context setting comments.

I'm going to be brief, and I want to talk with the board about two words. One word is pace, and another word is calibration or recalibration. And I just want to acknowledge -- I'm sure as you all looked at the board agenda and the issues before the commission, you acknowledge the pace and volume of work that has been undertaken in recent months because many of them are coming to bear on this and future agenda items. But the Best Start inquiry, the listening, learning, and leading effort are develop -- effort to develop a more focused public policy agenda. The work to scale, the implementation of our strategic partners -- strategic plan investment such as Welcome Baby and home visitation, this is a lot of very significant, complex, and substantive work that has been undertaken in recent months. And the product of that are some very substantive and, you know, heavy lifting agendas.

So I want to acknowledge both the staff as well as the board's investment of time and effort in terms of really rolling up our collective sleeves and digging into this vast array of very important work that is in my mind really foundational to our efforts to make a difference and to maximize the impact that we are having for children. So pace and volume have been significant in recent months.

So that's why my second work is calibration or recalibration because I want to acknowledge that, notwithstanding the pace and the volume and the important work that has been done that is foundational, I also want to say, this is not the norm and we need to be thoughtful in terms of how we calibrate our work going forward and acknowledging where are our priorities and how do we sequence. So this will be a scene you'll hear a time or two in my comments around Best Start in terms of moving forward with implementation of the Building Stronger Families framework, as well as some of my comments around the listening, learning, and leading effort, and some of the priorities or issues that have been identified and the importance of our prioritizing as an organization how to focus our work and move forward in a way that reflects both the board's bandwidth as well as the staff's bandwidth.

So, again, I want to commend the board and the
staff for really digging into some very difficult and important and sometimes long-standing issues over the course of the past number of months, but also acknowledging the importance of our kind of stepping back and calibrating workload both for the board as well as the staff, and that’s something that will be a subject of ongoing conversation.

So I invite any comments or questions on that. Otherwise, I would turn it back to the chair for what I believe is now Item 9.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much. Let’s turn our attention to the first action item beyond the retained issues of minutes and monthly reports, and that is Item Number -- monthly financial reports, and that would be Item Number 9.

So the staff who has a presentation, we invite you to come forward for the purposes of your presentation.

Ms. Lee. Thank you. Good afternoon, commissioners. We’re pleased to be in front of you again here today. Over the last few months, we’ve had the opportunity to share various aspects of the policy department’s work and share some of the background information that we’ve been exploring relating to policy and sustainability efforts, and we’re excited that today we will be able to share our plan.

A few weeks ago at the program planning committee, we were able to share this plan in great detail, and today we will do a very short version of that plan, as well as provide you some more information in terms of the two priority areas, our existing policy and advocacy resources, our sustainability plan, and highlight some immediate opportunities that we’ve identified through our planning process, and outline some of the additional resources we will need to proceed with the plan.

The first area on our agenda is to affirm the two priority areas for the policy and sustainability activities for First 5 LA. And we’ve identified those to be public funding or expanding public funding for high-quality early childhood education, and family strengthening programs and services. Sustainability has been a consistent theme with the agency. First 5 LA has engaged in a variety of activities to support the sustainability of its investments.

When we say we’re prioritizing these two issues areas, we’re not recommending that we abandon the remaining policy areas that we focus on. As you know, we have a ten-point policy agenda that we are very committed to can and our staff is continuing to provide leadership and advocacy work on. And we also have our 23 policy grantees who are working on the breadth of those ten policy issue areas. It just means we’re prioritizing those two so resources and time will be committee to those two areas.

The key themes in moving forward with our work on policy and sustainability, as we look at different opportunities as they emerge on the horizon, as we know policy work is very sporadic or unpredictable, so this is the approach we’re taking as we examine each of the issues as they arise, and one is to improve alignment and coordination with existing resources. First 5 LA has made substantial investments in a variety of areas, so our first step is to see what we already have available and see if we can align and coordinate those resources more effectively.

The second aspect is to work differently; to look around and say, what can we do to engage new or unusual allies. We currently work -- and our partner in the LA compact, which is a partnership with the LA Chamber, higher education, the City of LA and various other entities that are committed to improving education in LA, and looking at other opportunities to work with business and other types of groups.

And then the last is meant to identify what gaps might exist and what leadership opportunities are available for First 5. And if we all do that effectively, we imagine it will work really well. These are some of the resources that First 5 LA has already committed in terms of advocacy related to early childhood education. one of the investments is with LAUP, and they do a lot of great work in advocacy coalition building, public and political will building.

We also have the early childhood education career development policy project. Many of you are familiar with the work that this group has done related to the ECDWorks Project as well as the partnership with the UCLA Anderson Forecast on the human index. These are additional investments for policy grantees working on early childhood education, as well as some of the coalitions and groups that our staff works with to promote early childhood education. And these are some of our home visitation investments related to policy.

Here you see the overarching sustainability goals that we’ve identified for early childhood education and home visiting. Today in the presentation that our partners from Cal Strat will be presenting will focus a lot on the short-term opportunities and goals that we’ve identified through our planning process. But we want to make it clear and help you see the bigger picture, that these activities are taking us toward the longer...
intermediate term goals and to our long-term goal, which is to realize public funding for high-quality, early childhood education and home visitation programs and to protect Prop 10 dollars for our population as well as to insure that early childhood is a high priority at the state level.

Now, I'm very pleased to reintroduce John Benton from California Strategies who's here to talk in more detail about our sustainability plan.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much, Stacy.

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members. Thanks for having me back. I'm joined in the audience by Joanne Kozberg from our Los Angeles office, and also Steve Cann. The other members of the team are up on the board there for you to see who we have on the team.

Quite a number of our partners and principles are involved.

In terms of what we've learned, we've reviewed this at prior meetings, but we can go through it briefly again here. Certainly, I agree with the chairman that the President Obama's focus on early childhood education has created a buzz up in Sacramento. There's a number of bills that we are currently working on up in the legislature that impact your programs, and we have been supporting those.

In terms of First 5 LA, we want to help you define your voice up there. I think that will be an important step moving forward. In terms of Governor Brown, he obviously remains an obstacle in this year's budget. He did veto five million of the 30 million for preschool funding that the legislature put in. And in that message, he indicated that it was one-time funding in his mind. So we've got a lot of work do to do with Governor Brown.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: You're referring to the governor as an obstacle?

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES: Yes, a challenge.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: So you've got it like that, huh? Yeah.

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES: I'm being diplomatic, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's one way to think about it. Proceed, sir.

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES: And then certainly, as we move forward in terms of the near-term opportunities, the local-controlled funding formula, which we've talked about in prior meetings, was the Governor's huge win in this budget this year. I think it provides us some opportunities to work here locally and at the state level.

with other early childhood education partners to include preschool and early childhood education in the discussion regarding what's going to happen with the dollars that are coming down for local-controlled funding. So we have some near opportunities in early childhood education.

On the home visitation side, we really have to start from ground up on that. This is not on the radar at all up in Sacramento. I had a meeting the other day in the Senate pro tem's office and a person who had been there for 20 years didn't know that California had home visitation programs. So there's a lot of education to do up there. Certainly, the Affordable Care Act, we had a Assemblyman Richard Pan, who is the chair of the assembly health committee. He gave us some great advice on how to use the Affordable Care Act and the moving from pay-for-procedure to pay-for-performance as a way to help accelerate the discussion on home visitation. So we're working on that. We're looking at adding some partners in talking to them in the hospitals with the insurers and large medical groups. Certainly, looking at alternative funding models that we want to look forward to, and we'll be exploring those. So the near-term opportunities for us in home visitation is to really look at -- at educating and building from the ground up a case for home visitation in the state.

In terms of the way that we have divided out and looked at this, we've categorized this is into strategic planning, which we're doing now, but that's ongoing. That will change as we move forward the process. Certainly, advocacy, bother her at the Los Angeles county level and also in Sacramento. We can't do this alone. So we're looking at developing coalitions and new partnerships and expanding into those groups that are not traditionally in this space. I was surprised to learn that the California Chamber of Commerce does not have a early childhood education platform. So we certainly need to change that.

And then we've got a strategic communications plan that will fold around all of these areas that will help us bring the level of the debate up on these issues and in different venues. And we have to make sure that we're redirecting and allocating resources smartly as we move forward in this policy agenda.

Back to the chairman's point, we need to leverage President Obama's positions and movement on early childhood education and home visitation. We have the rest of the 2013 session which here in California that ends September 13. So we've got about a number of bills, four or five, that we have participated in already in those and have a voice on those. We'll continue to do that.

On local-controlled funding, we will have both a
The strategy communications plan that we're looking at is how do we insert that we've got an election coming up in 2014 as we all and grass roots educational awareness for your issues in and then others across the street to form some grass roots we use some of your existing partners here in Los Angeles social media, the traditional media, and certainly how can what messengers we need. We're going to look at the talking about, we need to find what our messages work and coalitions in that regard.

We can't do this alone, and so we're looking at your existing coalitions. We think right off the bat, we need to make sure that all the counties First 5s are on the same page if we can, that we're working as one, as long as -- as well as with the First 5 associations up in Sacramento. Certainly, there's an existing early childhood education advocacy groups that we need to work with. And then in terms of home visitation side, we really need to build the coalition. That would be with hospitals, insurers, medical groups to start with and then expand to other areas. And both with respect to early childhood education and home visitation, we really need to move some groups that are really not in this space into that space. That would include some of the business groups, some of the labor groups, and even some of the public safety groups. A good example of the groups that are involved in childhood education, for example, are Mission Readiness, which is a national organization that has retired generals and other officers in the military who have figured that early childhood education is a top public policy priority for them. So there's a group that's not traditionally where you would think they would be on early childhood education, but they are. And I think we've got opportunities there to build other coalitions in that regard.

The strategy communications plan that we're talking about, we need to find what our messages work and what messengers we need. We're going to look at the social media, the traditional media, and certainly how can we use some of your existing partners here in Los Angeles and then others across the street to form some grass roots and grass tops educational awareness for your issues in that we've got an election coming up in 2014 as we all know. And one of the issues in our strategic communications plan we're looking at is, how do we insert early childhood education, home visitation possibly into the political debate so that, when our elected leaders are out making friends and meeting with folks outside of the public policy arena, how can they hear about these issues and understand that they're important to their constituencies.

Certainly, in the near term also we're looking at coordinating with the Bay Area council and Packard on their statewide campaign that they've already had some framework documents prepared for.

In the terms of immediate opportunity, I mentioned local-controlled funding formula. This is, in essence, a block grant of money that's going to come down from the state with very few strings attached to the local school districts. The state board is going to be developing a template for them to use on how to spend that money. At the end of the day, the locals -- local school districts will have to meet certain outcomes and accountability measurements. And we feel that certainly early childhood education, possibly home visitation have a role in allowing them to meet those outcomes and to meet the accountability objectives. So we'll be working both at the state level and at the local level on those issues.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your presentation. Stacy, any additional comments on your behalf at this point? One more? Okay.

MS. BELSHE: In closing.

MS. LEE: When we had originally budgeted for and imagined this work, it was primarily in these areas. First 5 LA for a while, the commission had asked for the staff to develop a relationship with a contractor to have advocacy presence in Sacramento, and we had been planning that for as long as I've been here, and to work on the traditional annual legislative agenda to build relationships with policymakers and to give First 5 LA a leadership voice in that region as well as traditional protection of Prop 10, which the agency has done consistently. So when we budgeted for that work, it did not include the larger sustainability goals and activities that have emerged over the past eight months, year in the way that we're thinking of it currently.

So in early childhood education, as John mentioned, we've identified local-control funding as an immediate opportunity. It's happening right now. Those templates are being developed. And we have the ability to go and advocate for the interest of early childhood education at both the state and local level. There are advocates working on this in the field. And we believe, if we can provide some coordination and some resources, that we can insure that the work that everyone is doing is...
more effective and has a better chance at having positive outcomes both through the state as well as the local school district outreach.

So we've estimated additional $489,000 for the local -- for the coordinating of the strategy as well as some small additional funding for those advocacy agencies to participate in those activities with us.

In terms of the technical assistance that John had mentioned, in order for us to be able to get the right information from the right people, we need some technical expertise in some weedy complicated policy areas such as Medi-Cal and Title 19. And those experts we estimate would cost about $40,000. And these number are for the remainder of the contract, which is eight months.

And, finally, in order to have a more targeted proactive communications program that focuses on the sustainability issues of home visitation and early childhood education, it be would be a $40,000 increase from the current contract.

That's it.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you for your testimony -- or your presentation now.

Members of the commission, if there are questions or comments you wish to pose to the staff in this area of policy manager and the entity doing the work in Sacramento, this is your opportunity to do so. Did I see your hand, Commissioner Kaufman.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I'm kind of have a request. Could you listen with both ears when you're talking to policymakers on what it would take in terms of the evidence or the proof or the suggestion, whatever level you want, that would allow them to support either early care education or home visitation, really home visitation. We have the opportunity to evaluate in various ways, to look at different outcomes. And I know that, for example, health care providers would look for a certain level of evidence; health plans might be different, employers might be different. So if you can listen to that as you're talking to legislators, executive branch, whatever, and make sure that you get back into us, that helps us to figure out how we do targeted evaluations so we can have the evidence that they need.

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES: Yeah, I think that's a very good point. And in fact, we just came out of a two-hour meeting with First 5 LA staff here where we talked exactly on those issues: Where are the data, the research that's needed, how do we transform that into the fiscal discussions that are going on up in Sacramento. So it's a very good point.

MS. BELSHE: And if I may, Mr. Chair.

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES: You should have been in

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Please.

MS. BELSHE: As a part of the budget that was approved by the board, there are resources available to First 5 LA in our community investments department to do some exploration along social impact bonds. We've talked about that just very briefly. But I want to underscore one of John's points, and I made this point before. Given what Cal-Strat has been listening and learning, and what we have been listening and learning as well, we do see Title 19 Medicaid funding as a very important potential funding stream. Indeed, it is kind of the mothership of public funding, but it does require a Ph.D. in science to truly navigate Title 19. So that is an example of an additional resource need that is a part of what John has just put on the table. We need that capacity and we need it timely.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you, Commissioner Browning. I recognize Commissioner Southard to follow. Sir.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Are these one-time costs, or would they be continuing during the next year after the eight months?

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES: Right now we see them as one time, but we think they will continue. So I mean, in terms of your budgeting cycles, we set them out that way, but I think they're going to be a continuous cost.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: This might not be a question you can answer, but would First 5 look to develop an in-house Title 19 expert, or is that something that you think is over and above what the current structure would provide?

That might be for you, Kim.

MS. BELSHE: It's a good question for us to mull over, Philip, in the near term. There are some firms that have very, very deep Title 19 expertise that is the nature that we need now. But as we think about alternative funding models for much of our work, it might make sense to have more capacity internally. But that would take more time to do, but we need some help now.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Noted. Additional commissioners? Commissioner Southard, please, then followed by Commissioner Dennis.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHDAR: A potential suggestion for looking at Title 19 and home visitation issues, it may be worthwhile to explore the postpartum/perinatal depression angle as a way of getting that. I think that has a good policy foothold and it -- it really is totally then Title 19 reimbursable, and I think it really speaks to people who have experienced that in their network.

CALIFORNIA STRATEGIES: You should have been in
COMMISSIONER RIDDLE-THOMAS: All right. A lot of admiration here, irrespective of your firing on the governor, we obviously have some commissioners who share the sentiment.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Is there another hand?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Mr. Chair, I would like to offer a motion with regards to what you submitted to the board of supervisors on Tuesday, hoping that we can get some alignment as a First 5 commission and be in partnership with, you know, your board fellows as we move an agenda that looks at investment in early care and education. Obviously, you and I share some of the same thoughts around ECE, and I want to make sure that is formulated into a motion that hopefully my colleagues can approve.

COMMISSIONER RIDDLE-THOMAS: You're in order, proceed, sir.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Let me hand out the motion.

COMMISSIONER RIDDLE-THOMAS: All right.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Simply stated, it is in essence a -- I mean, you all have the motion that went on to the board of supervisors on Tuesday. Simply stated that this is an alignment with that motion with intentionality of bringing our Sacramento and federal advocates to support the President's early childhood agenda.

COMMISSIONER RIDDLE-THOMAS: The item is before us. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. A lot of one direction instead of multiple directions.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: On the home visiting one, you. Commissioner Fielding.

I wonder if you explored getting support from the juvenile justice community and also from the law enforcement committee. There's some clear evidence that -- at least from several studies that you reduce the likelihood that someone is going to wind up on the juvenile justice system, that they're going to wind up in the criminal -- adult criminal justice system. You also have the substance abuse community, and we know that has impact multigenationally. So -- and I'm not sure that those are communities that really think about home visiting, something that it seems -- for them it may seem very remote to their day-to-day work, but there are probably persuasive ways and individuals who really believe the importance of those tie-ins that could be added to the part. Then you have some unlikely partners that I think could add strength to all of us that are traditionally very supportive.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Duly noted, Commissioner Fielding.
All right. Any further discussion on that matter?

Let me just simply indicate that there was reference to social impact bonds in the presentation that we heard earlier and then there was a conversation about -- initiated by Commissioner Fielding on the issue of probation and the related activities. The board of supervisors, there is exploration of leveraging social impact bonds. A lot of work is already under way in that regard. It would seem to me that perhaps First 5 might want to take advantage of some of the work that is being done there. They should begin to explore how this could be a useful tool for this agency.

And Yolanda Vera, who is here, can help you know who the right analysts and so forth are and you can benefit from that work and add to it as you deem appropriate. Okay?

Any additional questions or comments? The items are before us. These are action items; that is to say we will treat Commissioner Dennis' motion as an amendment to Item Number 9, if that's acceptable. Is there a motion to adopt Item Number 9 as amended?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Move.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's been moved by Commissioner Fielding. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Seconded by Commissioner Browning.

Is there any further discussion on the item?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I have a question.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: You have a question, Commissioner Tilton?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Yes, I have a question.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Please.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: Thank you. I am unclear what -- how specific the President's support for home visitation is. I understand the early education. I know in program and planning, we were struggling with the kinds of evidence and the kinds of foundation we would lay to support home visitation. I believe it is incredibly important for a whole lot of reasons, and it spans a very broad spectrum. Certainly, talking about post partum depression is critical. But home visitation can be life saving, it can be a lot of things, it can be viewed as only visiting new babies, or it can be seen as something that is integral into all of the programs for children zero to five.

So do we need to understand more specifically what we're supporting here or, as I'm willing to do, support home visitation rather universally?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. I think it's reasonable to assume that our advocacy can be specific or it can be comprehensive in nature. To the extent that it is our priority to focus on home visitations, and that is a piece of this puzzle that may or may not be missing, there's nothing that would prevent our legislative advocates from raising that issue should we so instruct. Obviously, what we want to do is maximize the -- our ability to impact the initiatives that have funding implications.

So I would wish to say, if it is deemed that it's not there or if it's underdeveloped, that we instruct, should it be the will of the commission, our advocates to help develop a more well-articulated or even robust home visitation agenda. Is that acceptable?

MS. BELSHE: A good example of that, if I may, Mr. Chair, is in the Affordable Care Act, there was funding appropriated for home visitation but not in the context of Title 19 and Medicaid program, but rather through a separate, discrete, capped appropriation. So it's a very important statement of support by the federal government in the context of federal reform. Is it as far as we would ideally like to see federal support of home visitation to go? No. Does the President's additional proposals to expand support for home visitation represent another important step forward potentially? Absolutely. But that's where Title 19, I think, is so important because it is such a significant funder of services to millions and millions of Californians. So I think the direction we take is to pursue any and all opportunities and possibilities here at home and federally recognizing the importance of evidence-based programs.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes. And add to that by any means necessary.

All right. Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: One of those by any means could well be to get another insurer to say this is something we want to pay for independent of the federal reimbursement issues. I think particularly of Kaiser. And if we can make a persuasive case, I would hope they and potentially other health plans would have an interest in adopting that even before, even if it was before we had this done on a broad federal or federal/state basis.

MS. BELSHE: And we'll have an opportunity, Dr. Fielding, to speak to that very specific opportunity in the context of Barbara DuBransky's presentation on our implementation of Welcome Baby Home visitation and some of the considerations related to specifically to the inclusion of a Kaiser facility.
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much. If there's no further discussion, the item is before us, has been properly moved and seconded. Are there any objections to the item as has been brought to our attention by staff, that would be Item Number 9 as amended?

Seeing none, please record a unanimous vote.

Shall we then move to Item Number 10? And I -- a note that we have several persons wishing to be heard. It would be mine to take them up top. There are approximately 30 such persons and growing. The Chair wishes to say that we are going to close the public comment portion with the names having been submitted. There's no objection to that, that will be the way in which we'll proceed.

Obviously, sir, you did not understand me. you bring one more over here. That was Ms. Belshe. That was not me.

All right. So we're going to ask for public comment.

MS. BELSHE: You want -- COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes. And proceed accordingly, and then we'll have an opportunity to have the staff make its presentation and we will then proceed.

Phillip Sangany. Isabelle Engo, Jenny Zywot, Tinan Engo. Ladies and gentlemen, you should be coming forward. Amos -- Amos that's about the best I can do right now with that. I'm being -- Antonio Garza, Alice Morris-Winston. Don't be bashful. Come forward. We're going to try and do this with an appropriate amount of efficiency. Adriana Fernandez and Linda Kaufman in that order.

Please proceed. Staff -- well, hello. Do we have any security here? This young lady's approaching us. She might have something up her -- Hi, there. What is your name? Good afternoon. Wait a minute, young lady. I don't blame you. I want her to go right over there and use that microphone. If there's staff here --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is (inaudible). I am five years old and I made this banner. When I grow up I want to be an astronaut. And please give funding to LAUP children.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We want to give you a microphone, okay? Would you like a microphone? You sure?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And are there any questions or comments? COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Are there any
Now, Isabelle, you have no right to take over the meeting. So it's like that? Yeah. We're off to a good start now.

Next speaker, please. Let's see if you can follow that act.

AMOS: Good afternoon. I'm also a single father.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Your name, sir?

AMOS: Amos.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Amos. All right, Amos.

AMOS: Yes, I'm a single father of two children, and they're pretty much the same age of that child that was here. And the way she was saying, you know, at that age, they learn a lot. And all these programs that you have at schools are being successful helping kids, especially at that age, you know, when sometimes parents work, they don't have any time to take care of them. So they do. Schools do and helped a lot. And if we want to have like a good students in the future and good citizens, I think those types programs got to keep it going. We need to have it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony. We'll take the next speaker, please.

MS. MORRIS-WINSTON: Amos is a parent at the Jeffrey Foundation LAUP program, has two daughters. One has gone through the program.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Your name, ma'am?

MS. MORRIS-WINSTON: I'm Alice Morris-Winston. I was anxious to let Amos be represented. Anyway, we find that LAUP has been an integral part of the mission of the Jeffrey Foundation, which is to provide specially programs that are for low-income parents. We do actually work with special needs as well as inclusion. And these two daughters Amos', one has gone through the program and is starting first grade, then we're going to have -- or kindergarten, I mean. Then his little one comes in and starts LAUP next year. We hope that there will be funds to continue the programs that are serving the community. We've graduated hundreds of them in eight years and, hopefully, we'll be in the loop again. It's a matter of -- as Rob Rienier once told me when he visited our center, this is exactly what we were trying to do with this program, is serve the low-income working parent, helping parents continue to keep jobs. Thank you again.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you for your testimony. We'll take the next speaker, please.

MR. GARZA: Good afternoon. My name is Antonio Garza. I am a preschool teacher for Hacienda La Puerta Unified, and I would like to urge you to please accept LAUP's requested budget. Our children need quality preschool program like the ones provided through LAUP. They need the culture that believes in them and in their potential. They need opportunities to discover, to invent, and to dream. The demands that are being placed on our young children when they enter kindergarten can best be met when children are given a strong foundation in preschool. In Hacienda La Puerta Unified alone, we have had over 1400 preschool students go through our ally of programs. That's 1400 students who have had a better start in school and who were given a chance to succeed. I urge you to please accept LAUP's requested budget. Please continue to foster a culture that values the importance of early childhood education. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony and for your brevity. We take the next speaker now followed by Grace Castro, Marcella Bailey, Maria Ramirez, David Crippins, Cecilia Iella, Casey Dalton, Lindsay Evans in that order, please.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Good afternoon. I'm Adriana Fernandez as Valley Industry and Commerce Association, representing over 370 businesses in the county that have created over 100,000 jobs. As a business organization, we understand -- we are witnessing the gap between education and the workforce. In order to protect the future of our region and our economy, we must ensure that children have access to quality education and that starts with preschool.

The year the importance of quality preschool has been recognized in an unprecedented manner as an important component of society's future and social and economic success. Everyone in this room understands more than most what the benefits of preschool are to our children, our families, and our communities. And everyone in this room should understand the consequences and implications that cutting even just one seat will have on our children, our families, and our communities.

If First 5 LA -- or I'm sorry. If First 5 LA cuts preschool services that ensure children are ready for kindergarten, then the message and mission that it has committed to for over a decade is null.

I want to thank First 5 LA for creating LAUP and for continuing to fund quality preschool in our community. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. Next speaker, please.

MS. CASTRO: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Grace Castro, and I -- I don't oppose, but what I am here for is to stay that I was in the family task team. I also was in the workforce task team when LAUP was first created. So I've been here since it started, which was a
big dream. I believed in it. I still believe in it. But
I also was a family child care providers when I was
selected. I had been doing it for six years. My thing is
that it has to do with administration for the funds need
to continue. It's for the children. And I think we need
not to forget that. And I think administration has taken
over.

I've had a sour taste experience with LAUP and --
sweet and sour I should say because I'm here for the
children. I am a teacher and I am dedicated to this job.
But I was bullied by LAUP and I was actually threatened
not to use this word, but I am going to use it, because it
has been in my chest for -- since -- since Saya Yella went
to my house, the CEO of LAUP because if they have a
support system and the money is going to LAUP, I think
things should have been done more different.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Ma'am, we thank you
for your testimony. And your time has expired. There's a
clock that gives indication of the length of time that you
have. There are additional remarks you wish to make, we
would be glad to hear them, but I would respectfully
request that you submit them in writing so that we will
not deprive you of your opportunity to be heard but I wish
to cause everyone to conform with the specified amount of
time that's being allotted.

MS. CASTRO: Thank you so much.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Did you bring g a --
MS. CASTRO: I did bring them.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.
Excellent. Thank you.
MS. CASTRO: Thank you very much.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Indeed. Next
speaker, please.
MS. BAILEY: Hello. My name is Marcella Bailey.
I'm currently with the Hispanic Scholarship Fund. I've
spent the last 22 years with Sony Pictures Entertainment
as the chief information officer and also served as the
manager for LAUP. Our job there is to make sure
that corporate America just really understands the
importance of early childhood education, be a beacon for
corporate America and just making sure that we know that
it's an investment in a child's life that will then yield
great returns.

We always have challenges in finding qualified
applicants, specifically in the field of technology and
engineering and math. This is an area where people are
actually being paid six figures, but people within Los
Angeles are not qualified. And it really starts with early
childhood education. It starts with that solid
foundation that you've heard over and over again. So
MS. EVANS: Hello. My name is Lindsay Evans. I'm from Un Mundo De Amigos Preschool in Long Beach. We've been an LAUP provider in five years, and in that time, we've served over 700 children. The children in my program have gone to kindergarten with the foundation they need for a lifetime of success.

Preschool isn't just about the kids. It's about the family as a whole. At Un Mundo, we believe in educating the whole family. We have a comprehensive program which includes parenting classes.

I'm encouraging you to accept the LAUP budget proposal today. These children need you. Their families need you as do thousands of others. Let's not let them down, please.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony. We'll proceed to the following speakers.

Ms. Barella: Hello. I'm Edna Barella. I'm the program director of Aprieta Child Development Center. Our program has served over 700 children. We've been an LAUP provider in five years, and in that time, we've served over 700 children. The children in my program have gone to kindergarten with the foundation they need for a lifetime of success.

Ms. Crippins: Good afternoon. My name is David Crippins. And as a member of the community for the last 40 years, I've seen the difference that investments in early education can make. I stand here before you as chair of the LAUP board, and I have my fellow board members here as well. But more importantly, as a member of this community who cares deeply about the future of our children, I urge support of the LAUP budget request of 64.6 million for fiscal year 2013 and 14, which guarantees that 10,760 children will receive quality preschool education.

LAUP is now being modeled statewide and across the country. You should feel proud. On behalf of 70,000 children and another 40,000 yet to be served under the existing contract, I wish to thank you for your investment and leadership. Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you, too, sir.

Thank you so much. Next.

MS. DALTON: Hello. My name is Casey Dalton. Hello again. I'm from Happy Bear School. And we serve 96 children a day with free preschool. We're considered in the city of Van Nuys, zip code 91405. We are one of the pop schools.

I just want to touch on a few things of how -- we all know how wonderful the program is, but how reducing at any level, any amount of either children's spaces or any amount of funding to the providers would be detrimental at this point, that the way we -- we were given a commitment from LAUP, and one that we hold them to and trust that they'll follow through with. And I know that First 5 -- and that was that we would have funding. We gave up our summer so we would have funding through 2016. And I personally as a provider, and I know others have as well, made financial commitments and agreements with both teachers. And I'm not talking about contracts. I'm talking about trust and an investment in time and an investment in training. And then there are also the contracts and the leases signed and the Xerox machines and whatnot. But it looks like I'm off.

But I just want to tell you that I look forward to working with John as far as tapping into the resources that already exist. We're here and our doors are opened as far as showing this model. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

Next.

MS. EVANS: Hello. My name is Lindsay Evans. I'm from Un Mundo De Amigos Preschool in Long Beach. We've been an LAUP provider in five years, and in that time, we've served over 700 children. The children in my program have gone to kindergarten with the foundation they need for a lifetime of success.

Preschool isn't just about the kids. It's about the family as a whole. At Un Mundo, we believe in educating the whole family. We have a comprehensive program which includes parenting classes.

I'm encouraging you to accept the LAUP budget proposal today. These children need you. Their families need you as do thousands of others. Let's not let them down, please.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony. We'll proceed to the following speakers.

Ms. Barella: Hello I'm Edna Barella. I'm the program director of Aprieta Child Development Center.
Aprieta has been an LAUP provider for five years, and in that time, our center has served 653 children. Currently, I have 144 children and families enrolled for project year '13-'14, and 127 on my waiting list. The numbers continue to grow every year. In fact, I have 119 children and families on my waiting list for program year '14-'15. Every year, I have to turn away hundreds of families from preschool because there is not enough space available.

It is shameful to continue to add to the waiting list by reducing the amount of children LAUP serves. The cost of investment for preschool services upfront versus later educational problems, challenges and costs in getting children ready for learning will be a less cost later for delayed learning, discipline, and juvenile problems resulting from lack of upfront costs.

Please select option one and do not reduce the number of children in preschools by reducing LAUP budget.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: Are you from Aprieta Del Barrio?

MS. BARELLA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All Right. Thank you very much for the clarification. Sir.

MR. MONTERRO: Good afternoon. My name is Alexander Monterro. I'm the executive director for the South Bay University Child Development Center and a member of the Hawthorne School District board of trustees.

First, on behalf of the Hawthorn community, I would like to express my gratitude and thank you for all you have done for the LAUP program since 2005. Today we are here to ask all of you to continue funding LAUP on it's currently level and strongly urge you to sustain the number of children served by LAUP.

As LAUP center and a member of the Hawthorne School District board of trustees, we have three centers that serve a total of 430 children in our LAUP program every day. LAUP provides -- LAUP provides and the networks are not just preschool sights. They promote and provide service that implement the core mission of the First 5 LA commission. We offer these children and their families a wide range of service that go beyond preschool, such as health nutrition, meals thanks to the California Free Lunch program, free vision screening in partnership with UCLA, free dental screening in partnership with local dentists, health screens in partnership with several providers such as Leed Company of Mary, social service through the DCFS, Dede Hush, Richstone Family Center, et cetera.

So if you see, LAUP is not just preschool. It's a one-stop center and, therefore, LAUP serves 10,700 childrens and their families. It is this commission priority of being champion for our children. Please do not reduce LAUP funding or reduce space because for every child you cut out of this program, you are failing your mission of being champion for all children. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony and our regards to our colleagues on the board of education in Hawthorne.

Ma'am.

MS. GORSKY: Good afternoon. My name is Dasha Gorsky. I'm a parent ambassador for LAUP. I'm a parent of 10-year old twins who attended the LAUP site in Little Tikes Daycare in Long Beach. My twins would not have been able to go to preschool if it wasn't for LAUP because I'm a middle class family and we don't -- we don't qualify for anything, and LAUP you don't have to qualify.

So I'm grateful for the LAUP program that provided my children with math, literacy, socialization skills, and to be ready for kindergarten. My boys were given an academic advantage, being able to go to an LAUP facility. Both of my boys are doing very well in school. I have one who is GATE identified and passed the math -- the state math test, totally maxed it. And I'm sure it's because of the LAUP -- the schooling that he got.

I ask to you please accept LAUP's budget requests so all the children are the future. So please consider it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you. Sophia Leon, Rhonda Marie Devall, J.D. Kennedy, Stacy Martinez.

If you would please come forward, ma'am.

MS. MORGAN: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. My name is Helen Morgan. I am the superintendent of the Hawthorne school district, and very proudly have two sites in our school district of LAUP. I can speak from my educational experience and my daily experience that LAUP has had a huge impact in our district for our families, for our teachers. If I talk to any kindergarten teacher, they can tell you which children in their class attended our LAUP programs. It's a quality program that's making a difference in the lives of our children.

Our school district serves a population of approximately 91 percent of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, a very high number of second language learners, and LAUP is bridging the gap they may experience. If it weren't for this program, they would definitely come to kindergarten with a disadvantage. Our kindergarteners are doing great. We have a full-day kindergarten program in our district. Our students are
being prepared for the future. And we appreciate all that
you have done and encourage you to continue do it.

Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

We'll take the next speaker.

MR. PRICE: Hello. My name is Simon Price from
the Palmdale/Lancaster area, the upper area of the LA
county. And I represent Bird's Nest Learning Academy. I
just want to share my experience with having three
children, two of which were not able to go to that academy
that we had to spend the money outside of our budget to
get them to preschool so they could be prepared for
kindergarten, and one that did. The thing that we've
noticed the most is that we have a loving environment for
our kids with a low ratio for student-to-child (sic)
ratio, which allows them the interaction they need for
learning. They've made new friends. They've allowed us
to engage the community in a way that helps them to
function more outside than inside of the school to build
more connections. They've had wonderful field trip that
have promoted our children to want to continue on to and
to go into higher education, to reach those goals they've
said. And my child is now prepared for kindergarten. He
can now add and count, identify letters. He can make --
he can sound out words and read, and he learned important
social skills that allow him to work well with
others for the rest of his life.

Thank you very much for your time.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your
testimony. We'll take the next speaker.

MS. LEON: Good afternoon. My name is Sylvia
Leon. I'm a non-LAUP preschool teacher. I have taught
for 34 years in LA Unified School District. The last
year, I had the pleasure of being awarded LAUP preschool
teacher of the year. So this is how I got to know the
organization.

I'm here to today to advocate for the families
that I have worked so closely with for so many years.
They need your help. They need your help to break the
cycle of poverty, which is at the heart of the achievement
gap. LAUP insures that the children of our community have
the readiness skills and concepts needed for the rigorous
kindergarten curriculum that awaits these children.
Kindergarten is not what it used to be. It's very, very
tough.

Children who are not ready for kindergarten are
and those same children who are not ready for first grade
and those who will not make -- meet the academic standards
later on. Without high preschool programs in our
community, the achievement gap is going to widen to an
achievement Grand Canyon. So please accept LAUP's request
for their budget. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Glad I graduated from kindergarten when I did. It could
have been a problem.

MS. CHUEVI: Hello. My name is Rhonda Marie
Chuevi, and I'm from Kids-n-We preschool in Redondo Beach,
and I'm one of the newcomers to LAUP. I've been with them
for a little over a year. And I can't tell you what an
impact that they've had at my family child care. It's
been amazing. The parents in my area are so, so grateful.
And to get -- give a break to us, what the one woman said,
for middle-class family, to be able to get a break to take
their children to preschool and get a discount is amazing
to them. And they're so grateful and their more than
willing to do anything that you need in your school.

And for -- I think we need to keep our heart
where it should be, and that's with the children. This is
about kids. This is about the impact that we're going to
have on their life. And all of us that do this job, we're
role models to these kids every day. And LAUP has given
us the best of the best for us to do this work.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you.

I'm going to ask that Sydney Kanlager come
forward followed by Cindy Riding and we'll hear from Adera
Ragy, Umberto Lopez, and Sameta Gibbons in that order,
please, sir.

MR. KENNEDY: Good afternoon. My name is J.D.
Kennedy. I represent Congressman McKeen, and I'm
currently the commander of the new Hall of America Legion
in Santa Clarita, both of which strongly oppose any cuts
to the service of children in LAUP by decreasing
enrollment in the LAUP program.

Access to quality preschool is a necessity for
many active-duty families and the demands of military
service are tough with frequent deployments, standing
duty, training, unpredictable work schedules, and long
hours. These demands affect not only our enlisted, but
the families too. Military spouses often workout side the
home, continue their education, and play the role of a
single parent. Families in the Armed Forces often rely on
quality preschool as an important part of their support
network. And for children in military families, quality
preschool is a safe and culturally-sensitive environment
where they can learn, grow, and achieve the skills needed
to transition to kindergarten and beyond.

For young developing children, quality preschool
offers a foundation that is a stabilizing contrast to the
stressful demands of military family life. Children whom
attend quality preschool are less likely to drop out of high school and more likely to graduate college. I'm out of time, but I'd like to submit a full, written comment to you. Congressman McKean and the American Legion strongly oppose any cuts to LAUP.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you very much. We thank you for our testimony and our regards to the congressmen.

All right. Take the next speaker.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Hector (inaudible). I'm the executive director of Mother's Club Family Learning Center in Pasadena. We serve the most neediest families in northwest Pasadena through a two-generation learning model. We are an LAUP site. I urge you to approve the LAUP budget at its current levels. And the visual I'll give you with respect to all the comments and impact that LAUP does have in our communities. This year we graduated or promoted 21 kids.

That's the number of kids we serve through LAUP. But over 250 family members attended. That is just an amazing picture and impact, and I would not want to take that experience away from any of our kids and our families.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

MS. MARTINEZ: Hi. My name is Stacy Martinez.

I'm a parent of three children, but two have served in the LAUP -- or got LAUP services in Arleta. I cannot tell you how much it's helped my family. My youngest son is going to, hopefully, be able to attend, and I would hate to think that he would not be able to because the spaces were cut.

They provide socialization, everything that they've already mention, and I'm assure you're aware of it. And, again, my daughter just graduated kindergarten and she eased through it because of, I believe, the LAUP program. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you. Next speaker, please.

MS. KAMLAGER: Good afternoon, Chair and Commissioners. My name is Sydney Kamlager, and I'm the district director for Assembly Member Holly Mitchell of the 54th Assembly District. I'm here on her behalf to encourage you all to support this budget. She would say that it's a sad day when we have to plead with our own to support this kind of budget and not make additional cuts.

And we know that quality preschool and the programs coming out of LAUP work.

A recent article came out not too long ago reiterating a study from years ago that says that working poor children hear 32 million words less than children from well-off families by the time they enter preschool.

And we know that, if they're in a quality preschool setting, those numbers don't happen.

As chair of budgets sub one and health and human service, as chair of the California Legislative Black Caucus, and as the former executive director of Crystal Stairs, she would say that not supporting this kind of budget and making cuts is inexcusable. Especially considering now she's in the legislature, she would also say that now the State is coming into a surplus and has begun to reinvest in critical social services, safety net services, and early education services, we should be doing the same at this level. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you for your testimony. We give our regards to the Assembly Woman indeed.

Sir, please come forward.

MR. LOPEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Umberto Lopez. I represent a wonderful organization by the name of PACE. And my son, he's four-years old. He's transitioning into kindergarten this year. I just wanted to tell you basically what the program did for me and my son. I'm a single father. It did everything, absolutely everything. I grew up in Los Angeles. This is my backyard. To be specific, on Pico and Vermont. The only thing promised to me growing up was prison. Okay. I'm so thankful. I was lucky enough to come back, get back, and get some. And the reason why I did it was because of PACE. They provided more than I could express right now.

But I want you to know that it really does to these kids, it builds them, it builds schools, it builds homes, it builds communities, it continues to build.

I just started in September. I can't even begin to tell you everything I've done.

Thank you. Thank you very much. I hope that the budget passes. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

(Applause).

MS. GIBBONS: Hi. My name is Sametha Gibbons, and I'm the site supervisors at Kids-R-Us Community Childcare Center. And our program is a part of the LAUP network and has been for six years. We have served over 200 children. And being a part of that network has allowed us to provide children in our area a quality program that helps to give them a great advantage when they start kindergarten. Many of our parents come back, write, call, and tell us the great things that their children are doing. I'm asking that you approve the budget that LAUP has submitted to you so that those children that are still in that area have that same
advantage that the children in our program have already had. I thank you your time.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I thank you for your testimony.

We'll take the balance of the speakers, which are Stephanie Cohen, Marcella Bailey, Fellow Pastor, Susan Telebian, and Jeffrey Wallace. The final speaker on the item will be Delilah Iella. In that order please, thank you.

MS. RIDING: I don't know if we're in order or not. I know I'm the next speaker.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: You are in order.

MS. RIDING: Thank you. My name is Cynthia Riding. I'm the executive director of Kid's Corner Preschool and the Van Nuys Civic Child Development Center, both LAUP schools. We've been providers since 2004, and we were lucky to be part of the pilot program. We've graduated 1,300 children out of our LAUP programs, 71 percent are now on the LA Unified School District magnet program. Currently, we have 302 at one school on the waiting list and 168 at the other.

It's shameful. We feel so bad that I have to turn away children every single year because there isn't enough space for every four-year old in LA county to go to preschool.

I just want to leave you with a motto of LAUP.

It's not just for kids. It's for families. It's for communities. It's for the county of LA, the State of California, and our country. Please vote not to cut the budget. Let First 5 lead the way and show them how to do it right.

Thank you so much for your support.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Adera (inaudible). I'm the mother of three children. Cutting this program, it's going to affect everybody, especially families. I'm a single mother. My husband passed away of cancer in '07. And they provided support all the way. My kids are doing very well. My youngest is in the gifted program. And it will be sad to take away this program for many other children to take the opportunity to get this education. And I just want to say that because some families cannot afford a high education, and this was a great opportunity for families. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you. All right. We acknowledge the applause, but we want to proceed accordingly.

MS. PASTOR: Good afternoon my name is Rachelle Pastor. And I apologize you cannot read my writing. I'm with PACE, Pacific Asia Consortium Employment. And Umberto is one of our parents, one of 2,000 parents that have at PACE. Although it's not primarily LAUP funded, it's important for our community, our children to continue the funding as is. With the cuts we're seeing in Headstart, with the cuts in sequestration, with the cuts we've seen at the state level, I don't feel that this is the time to start cutting more slots in preschool. So I urge you to support the LAUP budget as submitted. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

MS. COHEN: Hi, there. My name is Stephanie Cohen, field representative for Assembly Member Richard Bloom, District 50. I'm here on behalf of the Assembly Member to request that you approve budget option Number 1. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Our regards to the Assemblyman.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dr. Susan (inaudible), and I'm honored to be here, first of all, on behalf of families, children that we serve at Jeffrey Foundation. I'm children program director there and also I'm an educator.

I have an opportunity to work with high-risk, at-risk children who actually deal with homelessness, deal with a lot of social emotional issues on daily basis. And my --

I myself, I am proficient only and I learn from them every day of my work.

At our site, we do provide services to our children through LAUP program and we are honored to serve underserved children in District 2. So on behalf of everybody who work with me, all the families, Mr. Amos and all the families who are like Mr. Amos' family, I'm asking to you please support the LAUP program. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Final speaker, please.

MR. WALLACE: Good afternoon. My name is Jeffrey Wallace, and I serve as the senior program officer of the Los Angeles Urban League, a 92-year old institution who is committed to community development and transformation through service delivery and advocacy.

Today I rise as a voice of 60 percent of the fourth grade boys of color in LAUSD that cannot read at proficiency. I rise to arrest your attention about the 50 percent of adults above the age of 25 who have not received their high school diploma. And last but not least, today I rise to advocate for LA universal preschool and the actual model of systemic social change that has proven its effectiveness in addressing the achievement gap that currently plagues the thousands of underserved
services and in the existing contract that we modified in 2009 to have us go through 2016. And so we've been working on that path and we have brought in additional dollars or leveraged the dollars to bring in more services to LA county. So it's important that you realize that the dollars you've invested have already yielded, outside of the First 5 LA dollars, an additional $92,000,000. Very important.

In addition, through the work in collaboration with First 5 LA through Math America, we have results that are evident in all of our upcost studies from 2007 to the most recent, 2011-12 since -- because we don't have the last year results. But in addition to the preschool children and through the emphasis in addressing the workforce issues through the workforce consortia, we have now touched over 8,000 people that are working with our youngsters besides LAUP children. And we've done that with our partnership with LA County Office of Education, with the resource and referrals, with ECE works, which is advocating for the policy changes in terms of what we do, through the work in terms UCLA and their school of -- the Anderson school.

So there's a lot that has been done through the emphasis originally of LAUP as a preschool program through the workforce. But ultimately what you see here today is some of the people that spoke are parents. Parents like Tasha who have children that are ten-years old who are advocating in their local communities, their local representatives that every child in LA county, in the State of California, and in the nation should have access to high-quality preschool programs. For me, it is important. Because we are looking at the state and the federal dollars that are being addressed in terms of the President's proposal and through legislators like the representatives that we had here to address the needs of zero to five. And you do have a model program in serving preschool children.

I urge you to support our original budget as submitted because it is about positioning and it is about investing in the sustainability of LAUP beyond 2016. I also can tell you that we are ready with our board to come back as you've asked in October with a plan in terms of what we would look for in terms of a multiyear plan that we utilize the $580,000,000 that were allocated in 2004 and take us through 2017 so that we would add one more year at a lower rate, but we would -- our board is committed to come up with a plan as an independent board to give you the idea of how it is that we're going to continue to meet the current contract needs but also to
look at a future sustainability to address your concern and ours. There are no more -- there are no more concerned people than these individuals about the sustainability of the LAUP as our board as equally as you are.

So since First 5 has invested in LAUP, you have accomplished more than what I believe we had thought we would accomplish in 2009 where it was thought it was the time to begin dwindling down. We have continued to thrive. We have continued to meet our performance-based elements in our contract. And so I urge you that this is not the time to think less. This is the time to think more because I truly believe that our present thoughts determine our future. And I happen to think big and I happen to believe that we're going to be serving more children, not necessarily just with First 5 dollars from this county, but from state, federal, and other dollars.

So thank you very much for your attention and your commitment to children because it is on behalf of them that we are here today. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

All right. I would like to call on the staff to come forward with the report. That does close the public comment portion of the agenda.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I want to offer some opening comments and thank the many people who have come in and spoke, including members of the LAUP board as well as Celia, all of whom spoke very eloquently to the power of preschool, the power of quality preschool which I think speaks very directly to what First 5 LA is supportive of and has really provided a significant investments of financial resources and energy in terms of supporting the creation of LAUP and supporting it to do all the good work that it has done for many years and we hope will do for many years to come. And the, indeed, the story LAUP has to tell in our judgment is the terrific example of the kind of story we need to be bringing to Sacramento, bringing to Washington in terms of how what we've tried to do is to request that LAUP provide us, this board and staff, with a forecast or a plan for how to maintain a higher what we've called sustainability fund balance that would enable it, at the close of the current time, when the contract's slated to end of Y15/16, to extend that contract for an additional year through 2016/17. Two points I want to emphasize here: Number one, the intent is for LAUP to develop the options and come back much like what we just heard Celia Iela speak to.

Further, the intent of this forecast is to inform decisions in the future.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Just a moment on that because I want to push through this some of this. Is there any resistance to that latter point that was just made by the executive director in terms of a sustainability plan going forward coming to our attention by the board of LAUP? I think it makes eminently good sense to cause that to happen. We need to be date certain about that. It would seem to me that it's reasonable to have that come to our attention no later than 60 days from now. No later than that. And it would seem that, if we can get that piece of business off the table, we would speak to some of the stated concerns about accountability and trying to look forward to what sustainability looks like, and more importantly self-determination.

MS. BELSHE: So just to be clear, supervisor, the idea of LAUP working with us to develop a plan or some options for how to maintain a higher First 5 LA fund balance to extend our support for an additional fiscal year. That's what I had just spoken to and I think what Celia spoke to as well. That's something we would want to work together in terms of what are the options for maintaining sufficient resources within that $580,000,000 to extend support for LAUP for an additional year at some level.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Beyond the currently funded '15/16 scenario. Is that not correct?

MS. BELSHE: For an additional year to '16/17.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: So the issue is to invite LAUP to participate in and lead the effort to talk about what life looks like beyond '15/16. That's essentially what is being put on the table. I want to be very clear about something now. At this juncture, the extent of time that LAUP has on the books for First 5 LA is fiscal year '15/16. All of us should be clear about that. Suggestion here is to talk about how that might move beyond that point in time. But...
it is not to be interpreted that there is any formal
determination by this board at this time that it will be
beyond '15/'16. We're trying to talk about how we can get
beyond that and inviting a conversation that is
collaborative in nature that might facilitate that. And I
wish to see the beginning of such a document appear before
the board no later than 60 days from this conversation.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Is there a motion that's
needed?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes, it is.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Is there a motion that's
needed?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: I'll so need.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Move and seconded.

Any further discussion on that?

Commissioner Kaufman, please.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: It's really just a point
of clarification. Kim said one thing and you didn't say
exactly the same thing. So to clarify, does that mean
that the amount of money that is available between now and
the end of '14/'15 I think it's 180 million.

MS. BELSHE: Before the end of '15/'16.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: End of '15/'16. No
additional amount for the conversation between now and two
months from now would added to that, or is it that so that
it would be to extend that total amount of funding in some
method to the fourth year, or is it additional funds could
be available?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I want to be clear
about what I said and I do not believe that the executive
director spoke to this. The extent of the determination
of First 5 LA funding of LAUP goes to '15/'16 as is. What
we are essentially attempting to do is invite a
conversation that potentially looks at what life might be
beyond that point in time. But at this juncture, there is
no determination in terms of allocation of resources that
would facilitate that. Is that clear?

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I let me say it in my
language.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Speak your language
of a pediatrician. We can all get that.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: LAUP and First 5 LA would
come back in, let's say, 60 days with LAUP's proposal of
how they could extend one more year, which may or may not
include additional First 5 LA funding for that fourth
year. Is that what you're saying?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: You try your
language; I'm going to use mine. I'm more comfortable
with what I'm saying.

There is an existing allocation for First 5 LA
resources to LAUP that takes us through June 30th, 2016.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Correct.
recognizing that LAUP is but one of a number of financial
responsibilities we have, and this board and future boards
have some very important and difficult fiduciary
responsibilities regarding the allocation of resources
today as well as into the future.
So, Aleece, maybe you can focus your presentation
principally I think on the budget year issue, which will
be the most important for the board members in their
considerations.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Before doing that, I
want to get back to, in the interest of clarity and
efficiency, your point two, which is the environmental
scan. It would seem to be that the discussion about early
care, universal preschool is broader than the
right -- LAUP.
Ms. Belshe: Absolutely.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I want to make sure
that what we are embarking upon is a conversation that
looks at the various elements of early childhood
education, universal preschool, and bring it all together
for the board's evolving consciousness and increased
commitment to the advancement of early childhood education
as a robust component of the work of First 5 LA. It is
not only robust, but coherent. There is a coherence.
Now, what I'm seeking to clarify is not looking
exclusively at LAUP, but all of the pieces as I indicated
to you in our conversation earlier. I'm not sure that
that's what you said, but that's what I would like to
recommend that we do.
Ms. Belshe: And thank you for the opportunity to
clarify. And Aleece can touch -- get into this in a bit
more detail, but the intent is to look at the continuum of
services zero to five. So recognizing four-year olds,
obviously, is the focus of LAUP's work, but we have an
interest not only in four-year olds and quality preschool,
we're also interested in child care and the infant and
toddler population. So looking at child care, looking at
preschool, looking at the continuum of services and
supports with an eye towards services providers, provided
population served, gaps that may exist to then help inform
our role, our contribution, not just in terms of services,
but in terms of workforce, in terms of quality
improvement, in terms of policy and advocacy, because at
end of the day, the aspirations of this board and the
board of LAUP in terms of extending the reach of quality
preschool, not just to the children served by LAUP today,
but to the tens of thousands of children who today are not
being served. That solution rests not with First 5 LA,
that solution rests with policy and advocacy change at the
county, at the state, and the federal level. It's one of the
reasons why this board has been so clear about the
importance of policy and advocacy, and has invested the
funds that it has to date and additional resources going
forward. So it is looking at that full continuum
supervisor.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: So this is not an
LAUP-issue specifically.
Ms. Belshe: It's a broader issue. It's really
the --
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: So I think we ought
to break it out accordingly.
Ms. Belshe: That's why I said that we had three
separate decision points that we were bringing to the
board today.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yeah, but the item
before us is specifically related to LAUP. And I want to
make sure that all of us are tracking the issue that LAUP
is not the only point of interest or initiatives related
to early childhood education, universal preschool. I
think all of that has to be on the table pursuant to this
environmental plan in the interests of coherence.
Ms. Belshe: Absolutely, supervisor. And the
board memo under Item 10, there are three specific
recommendations which Aleece will touch on very quickly.
One relates to the budget; secondly relates to this idea
of a sustainability plan or a forecast which the board
just took action on; and third is to direct staff to plan
and execute an environmental scan of LA county early care
and education landscape.
So it is absolutely not specific to LAUP, but
rather is looking at broad LA county early care and
education environment.
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Can we have a
clarification?
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Please, because I
don't want to move --
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Does that include
home-based care?
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Home visitation
anybody?
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: No, home-based care.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Home-based care.
Ms. Belshe: In terms of --
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: The scan.
Ms. Belshe: Yeah. I think we're going to need
to look at the whole picture. I mean, with board --
general direction and support from the board, we're going
to need to sit down with a lot of folks and really kind of
scope this out but the intent is to bring a comprehensive
view of the continuum of services and supports that young
children zero to five have access to or don’t in LA county.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Members of commission, that simply makes good sense to me that we do that so that we know what we have and we know what we’re doing. And some of those things may need to be updated, they may need to be reintegrated. There could be a number of things that could happen with this particular aspect or component of the agency’s portfolio. It seems to me that a presentation on that is not warranted. This is common sense as it relates to what we need to understand about who we are and what we are doing.

And the Chair will entertain a motion pursuant to the executive director’s recommendation to proceed with the environmental scan for early childhood education and universal preschool for First 5 LA. Is there such a motion?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: So moved.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: It’s been moved by Commissioner Browning, seconded by Commissioner Southard. Is there any further discussion or clarification on that issue?

Let me be clear, this is not a LAUP engagement; this is a First 5 engagement. All right.

MS. BELSHE: What I would suggest then is that so that we know what we have and we know what we’re doing.

MR. CHAIR: Mr. Chair, is to ask Aleece to focus specifically -- this.

MS. BELSHE: I apologize.

THE COURT: There needs to be an action on this because we want to formalize it. Okay?

MS. BELSHE: You’re right.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Are there any other questions or comments or points of clarification on this?

Seeing none, please record a unanimous vote.

Now, we have one item before us. You’ll have to forgive the unconventional or improvisational pursuit of the Chair, but there is method in my madness.

So, Aleece, do your best and do it in short order. I think the board has more clarity than might have been reviewed in past commission meetings. So, of course, today, we’re focusing on the budget. You may review the proposed matrix as Attachment A in the packet, and I would be happy to address questions on it after the presentation.

This slide outlines the budget proposed by LAUP for FY13-14 and the sources funds. This year’s proposed budget is approximately $4.9 million more than last year’s. The 4.9 million represents increases in provider payments due to shifts from subsidized to unsubsidized classrooms and increases in providers’ ratings, as well as investments in IT and communications to support sustainability.

This slide presents a budget forecast through 2016 as proposed by LAUP assuming adoption of the $64.6 million budget. As proposed, approximately 12.5 million would remain at the close of FY15-16, the scheduled close of the current master agreement.

Staff are providing today the commission with three options for the budget here. The options represent either stable funding or increased funding in comparison to FY12-13. The first option is to approve the proposed FY13-14 LAUP budget of 64.67 million including the $49.9 million augmentation request. If the Commission selects this option, staff would like further direction on one key consideration, and that is the use of performance incentive fund. LAUP currently has an $8.3 million earned carryover from previous years. The $4.9 million augmentation request could be funded either from the performance incentive fund or from the sustainability fund. And I would just note the use of either fund results in the same withdrawal from the overall allocation.

Option two is to maintain the FY12-13 budget. I’m sorry. Have the FY13-14 budget be maintained at the FY12-13 level, which is $59.8 million. If the Commission selects this option, LAUP would likely need to reduce services and, therefore, staff would need direction from the Commission regarding budget prioritization. It would likely require modification of the current requirement for a minimum service level of up to 10,760 children. Unless otherwise directed to prioritize sustainability activities, policy and advocacy, and/or development of alternate business models, LAUP would have flexibility to structure the budget within the $59.8 million amount.

As discussed at prior commission meetings, there -- as well as today, there are significant operational and communication challenges with reducing seats -- spaces either through mandated reduction or by allowing attrition.
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within the budget year. These include commitments already
made to parents, commitments made to providers and even
legal commitments made to school-based classrooms as well
as geographic equity in regard to services.

Option three is to approve the FY13-14 budget in
an amount to not to exceed $63 million.

With key considerations on budget priority, staff
are requesting commissioner input on the key
considerations regarding budget priorities. The staff
recommendation for the fiscal year 13-14 budget is option
three. The $63 million is over three million more than
last year's LAUP budget and recognizes that there may be
opportunities to tighten within the proposed budget to
increase operational efficiencies to generate non-First 5
LA revenue and potentially to renegotiate cost with LAUSD
given recent changes in the state budget.

Staff recommend this budget and recommend giving
LAUP flexibility in budgeting, but also prioritizing
sustainability activities, specifically policy and
advocacy and the development of alternative business
models.

The next recommendation is related to the glide
path plan, which you've already taken action on, as well
as the environmental scan. So I would just highlight that
the action being requested at this time is for the level
of budget year support and any budget year prioritization
that the commission wishes to direct.

So for next steps, with the decision at today's
meeting, staff will work with LAUP to execute a contract
amendment effective August 1st with the revised budget and
performance matrix. Some key activities as part of the
executed contract will include staff from First 5 LA and
LAUP continuing to work collaboratively on aligning our
policy and advocacy work toward affordable quality
preschool, developing the glide path plan as you've
discussed for future consideration and development of
alternative business models.

With that, I'd be happy to take any questions.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much
for your presentation. I want to acknowledge the work of
the staff and the effort that has been put into bringing
this item forward. We do realize that there is a
considerable amount of work that goes into trying to get
things clear and, furthermore, to get them right.

Members of the commission, you’ve heard the
presentation of the staff. We've already disposed of
two-thirds of the items to be considered, and let me
rearticulate them as I understand them: The first of
which is to build in an accountability component that
speaks to clarification of the status quo with respect to
the overall allocation of LAUP funding to terminate at the
close of the fiscal year in 2016, referred to in part of
as a glide path. A collaborative effort between LAUP and
First 5 LA should, in my view, have implications for
sustainability, as often referred to self determination
because, as is indicated, these resources are -- are set
to terminate at this point in time. So what does the
future look like and we will hear back at least
preliminary within some 60 days on that matter.

It seems to me that the second item that we
landed on is the environmental scan for the entire agency
on early childhood education and universal preschool.

That's being pursued solely of the First 5 LA staff with
input, should it be deemed appropriate, among the various
stakeholders that are a part of it. There are ten or so.
I would recommend bringing them, talking about it, and do
what needs to be done. And it would seem to me that we
need to anchor that in terms of a timeline. I didn't
specify that before.

What's reasonable, madam executive director, to
have that completed?

MS. BELSHE: Consistent with the two words I
began with of pace and recalibration, I'd like to give
that some careful consideration and come back to the
board.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

MS. BELSHE: Prayerful. That's how serious I am
about it. So appreciate -- we want it to be information
that can be useful to this and future commissions. We
want to do it right, want to do it well, and we'd like to
come back with an informed assessment.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. So I'm
going to request that at least a preliminary look at that
-- and it doesn't have to be a completed work, but no less
than 60 days in terms of plan of -- the work plan may look
like if it needs to be exhaustive. And it probably is a
useful idea to have periodic updates until it is done.

It's not necessary to have it fully perfected before the
board gets to see it or gets some input. We can talk
about that for the 60 days would be the first teeing up of
it for our consideration.

Now what's before us is the budget itself. The
Chair would wish to move option one, essentially, in light
of what we've already done in terms of accountability with
glide paths and looking at environmental survey, though
the existing agencies tried to get this done in a way that
respects the accountability quotient that we are
articulating and cause First 5 LA to understand that LAUP
realizes what it needs to do and the way it needs to be
25. Stewarding the First 5 LA resources. If you think of it, I've been, I think, Commissioner, is there a second to this motion? It's been seconded by Commissioner Fielding and a question by Commissioner Figueroa-Villa.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: I could support option one if it's really clear to us that it's within the budget that ends 2016.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Let it be clear.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: We keep using additional or take away, and the public seems to think that we're cutting their funding when it really is within their allocated amount --

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: -- ending 2016.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: So a useful clarification. I want everybody to understand that this is within the existing allocation of LAUP resources. There is not an increase in those resources in terms of the overall amount of money. It is essentially a little more being requested at this point in time for the upcoming fiscal year.

Commissioners clear on that point?

All right. Properly moved and seconded. There was one question. Any further discussion on the item, we're prepared to entertain it. Points of clarification as well.

Commissioner Kaufman, please.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I've been, I think, struggling as everyone has come to any of these meetings has noticed with how to do this. Clearly, I don't think anyone on the commission would disagree that LAUP has done a wonderful job educating children and that more children being -- receiving high-quality preschool is everyone's goal and we want it not the only for this year but we want it for five years, ten years, and 50 years from now; and that we created LAUP so that it could demonstrate to whatever was necessary how to go from 10,000 to 75,000 because that's about what the number we always talked about. Maybe it's down to 68,000 or whatever of kids who don't have access to quality preschool because of circumstances. That's a lot of times -- that's seven, eight times the number that we're talking about. That's 500 million a year, 400 million a year. It's not 60, 63, 65, 59. It's a major change. And we've gotten close, unsuccessfully, with initiatives and others, and we struggled.

First, LAUP has done a remarkable job at stewarding the First 5 LA resources. If you think of it, we've extended what was 500 million over five years, I think, into 580 million over ten or 12, whatever number it would be. I know we ramps up. And, Celia, the graph you showed really shows the way it got up there and now in the last five years we're 10,000-plus kids each year. And each year you've spent less than you could have as far as I remember. That meant you saved money, you did things that we carried over to the next year. So I really respect that and understand that.

However, we've got a problem, and that is we can't find out how to get $60 million a year or $70 million a year come three years from now. And we certainly don't know how to get five or 500 million, which is what's necessary for universal preschool for all kids.

So whether we approve 64.7, 64.67, or 63, or 60 is not, to me, the fundamental question. The fundamental question is there's $204 million left in the LAUP budget out of 580. If we spend it according to the plan that's here of 64, 63, and 63, there will be 12 million left as I read it for the following year. Twelve million is not 60 million.

How are we going to survive?

One way, clearly, is for LAUP to figure out how to lower its cost. I don't know how to do that. It's totally in your shop. You've done it before. And I trust and expect and will monitor the trust and expect that you'll do it again, and that you'll come in under budget of 64, you'll spend less than that because you'll realize your future family's budget is based on how much you don't spend this year. Just because you have it doesn't mean you spend it.

But you also need to raise money. You also need to find out how to get grants that are not 50, 100, 200,000, but a million, two million, five million for evaluation, for IT, for other things, for public policy change. We need to see that. And that's what I need to see two or three months from now to recognize that it is going to happen because nothing would be worse than three years from now, you've got 12 million -- 12.5 million to cover a $60 million budget. That's unacceptable and that's cruel. You think it would be cruel today to cut a few million. Image 30 or 40 or 50 million in four years.

So I reluctantly agree to whatever amount my fellow commissioners support. I'm certainly not going to be the lone voice or vote against funding, but I really want to see a very specific and detailed expectation and plan of how you're going to spend less than your total amount that it could be, how you're going to generate additional revenue, how we're going to change public will and public policy, working together because, otherwise, I fear we'll be in worse shape a few years from now as even
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you, Commissioner Kaufman.

Any additional questions or comments? Commissioner Fielding, please.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I think LAUP has done a wonderful job, and we all would love to see LAUP for every kid. There's just no question about it. I do think that, at some level, it needs to be -- you know, parents need to contribute and over -- on a sliding scale. But I think it's a wonderful model and I think the stars, you know, give you something to aspire to for everybody in the field.

I think there a couple of things that are hopeful: One is that the economic climate is much better now than it's been over the past year, that the State has a surplus and we have an executive director and board that is really attuned to the needs to work really closely and are increasing our allocation for working to inform the elected leaders at all levels of the importance and essentiality of this service. So that really, I think, gives us reason to be optimistic. But on the other hand, we can also be wrong and, despite our efforts, may not work, and that -- that would be I think a very, very sad day. But on the other hand, you know, if we -- if we looked at it as this has to come above all, we then say, well, we're not going to worry about nutrition in kids other than through preschool, we're not going to do Welcome Baby, we're not going to -- you know, we're not going to do all the other -- we're not going to do Best Start in those communities. All those because there's just not enough money to do all of them. So this is critical.

I'm glad we're increasing our allocation on the side of advocacy because I think that's where it is now. And my hope is that we can be successful.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. I think good stewardship and prudence means that we have to be candid about fiscal realities, but it doesn't mean that we have to be without hope and/or will to redefine circumstances, thus the emotion that was unanimously adopted from Commissioner Dennis.

Let's just say that the President is successful. That potentially is a game changer, not just for First 5, but for ECE beyond the confines of First 5. So should we simply rely on that? Absolutely not. Thus, the accountability discussion that we have engaged in.

Now, at some point, there will need to be an adult conversation about who owns the future in terms of early childhood education, and it might have to be nose to nose. The message today is, First 5 LA is inviting and calling upon LAUP to essentially step up on the question of how you see life beyond June 30, 2016. Just straight talk, ladies and gentlemen. Board chair is here. Members of board are here. The record will reflect this conversation with clarity and hopefully integrity so that all of us are essentially on the same page. And everyone's comments and input has to be recognized accordingly.

Any further comment on the matter before us?

I'm going to ask that the secretary call the roll on the Chair's motion to adopt option one as it relates to Item Number 10.

SECRETARY: Philip Browning.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Aye.

SECRETARY: Jonathan Fielding.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Aye.

SECRETARY: Sandra Figueroa-Villa.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: Aye.

SECRETARY: Neil Kaufman.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Aye.

SECRETARY: Marvin Southard.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: Aye.

SECRETARY: Dwayne Dennis.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Aye.

SECRETARY: Mark Ridley-Thomas.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Aye.

SECRETARY: Motion passes.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much accordingly.

MS. BELSHE: If I may, Mr. Chair, I would like to acknowledge Aleece Kelly who has been with First 5 since 2008. And I am really happy that Commissioner Art Delgado is not here because Aleece has been stolen by Lao and she will be joining Lako -- she'll be leaving First 5 in about a week and a half. But just really want to acknowledge her tremendous leadership and contributions to First 5 LA in a number of capacities, and most recently working with LAUP. So thank you so much, Aleece.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Ladies and gentlemen, we do wish to respect your time; therefore, Items Number 7 and 8 are going to be continued to our next meeting.
regularly scheduled meeting and the balance of the agenda will be taken up at this point in time and the -- we're going to turn the chair over to Commissioner Kaufman.

MS. BELSHE: So Barb.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: May I ask that you exit very quietly because there's still work to be done?

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Commissioners, and what the Chair and I discussed was spending our remaining half an hour on items 11, 12 and 13. And it's really item 11 that is one of those time sensitive and really fundamental issues that speaks to implementation of a key aspect of our current strategic plan, Welcome Baby and Home Visitation. This has been the subject of quite a lot of discussion and P and P, and we want to tee up an action item in September. So Barbara finally, yes. Well, Barbara has spoken a lot --

MS. DuBRANSKY: I feel like I won the lottery.

MS. BELSHE: I was kidding her saying, well, we'll just have to have an August board meeting. I'm kidding, kidding, really kidding.

MS. DuBRANSKY: I plan to be somewhere tropical by then.

So really quickly, the objective today is this is an informational item, and the intent of the discussion is to build upon the previous discussions that you've all had around both sustainability as well as the evaluation components of Best Start and, of course, most of all the scale. We're going to close with considerations that we are taking into account and making sure that you all feel these are the considerations that we should be looking at in deciding the scale of the investment.

Just as a reminder, we always like to share the definition of what we're talking about when we talk about family strengthening, which includes both universal and targeted home visitation programs, and the policy decisions that you have made along the way that have gotten us here to this point in terms of implementation.

Staff has projected program costs for the family strengthening investments if we were to see increased hospital participation at a relatively steady pace. Finance staff has demonstrated in this visual how these program costs would impact expected revenues. As this represents total program costs, staff presented to sustainability strategies intended to stem the growth of the cost to the commission over the past several board and P and P meetings. The cost seen here as well as in the scale option slides are conservative worst-case scenario costs. Several factors that we will be able to quantify in the next six to nine months will help us refine these costs. Most of the factors will bring the cost down things like late enrollment, attrition, average number of high-risk families, and non-Best Start population and declining birth rates and various training and material efficiency that are being implemented at in time.

Factors driving the cost up will include annual cost of living adjustments as well as baseline regional cost of living refinement effective the per child select home visitation projections.

Jumping to our implementation status. This reminds you of -- you've seen this a few times of the nine new hospitals participating in Welcome Baby, along with the data you see in the second bullet also relates to the pilot. So the ten together are achieving this penetration in Best Start and non-Best Start births. And then to remind you where the hospitals that are working with us are located across the county. Looking at this as a way we look at our Best Start communities on a regional level because they plan together at regional level. Obviously, they are impacted at a regional level.

This just show you where the distribution of those hospitals that are currently participating. And you can see the red cross in the center of the county there is our pilot, and the remaining blue crosses are the new hospitals that are actually in training and ramp up at this time.

So as we get into the option targets, the options, the real discussion that we want to have is around how many hospitals will be eligible to participate in Welcome Baby. And the information that's being provided to you on each of the scale slides that come up are indicated here. So one is target penetration. What this tells you is the number of births at the hospitals that would be participating in that option are delivering, which doesn't necessarily mean the number served because we don't expect everyone to say yes to the program.

So the second bullet tells you about how many families would be served with a take-up rate of 80 percent, which is comparable to similar programs, and the estimated peak annual cost that that would represent.

So as we look at these options, there's several considerations: One is the financial impact; how much the commission's revenue will this cost as we ramp up and particularly at the peak level. And then equity. When we chose the 25 hospitals, they were selected to achieve a semblance of equity across the Best Start communities, an average of 80 percent penetration in the Best Start communities. And this was reflective of the fact that we know from research that, if you want to have a community-level impact, you need to reach the at least 70 percent of the population. And because of these
investments were looking to insure that children were
ready for school and that children were safe from abuse
and neglect, particularly as well as its impact on some of
the other outcomes in Welcome Baby program that we wanted
to get to that level in each of these communities.

So those are the two considerations that
fluctuate a bit more within each of these options. But we
also remind — want to be reminding everyone that we are
also looking at whether or not we have a sufficient number
for -- a sufficient number of participants for evaluation,
which we do across all the options. We basically hit that
with our ten and actually earlier than that.

Then the fourth one is how this affects our
chances of being able to procure other dollars through our
policy and advocacy work. Obviously, the simple way to
say it is, more hospitals, we got to find more money. So
each one -- each option that adds hospitals becomes
progressively more challenging in that area.

Okay. So let's start with the 25 hospital
option. This is the option that the board approved last
June. And as I just mentioned, the rationale as to how we
chose to those 25. The reminder here is that it creates a
penetration into the county of 54 percent and 80 percent
into the Best Start communities. One of the key
indicators here to look at is the 60 million annual number
there and what that penetration rate is into the budget,
84 percent.

This shows you where all 25 hospitals are. You
see the distribution as would be expected very close to
our Best Start communities.

So our second option, this represents current
status plus four letter of intent respondents that came in
— responses that came in May. Just as a reminder, the
letter of intent was the way that we offered a strategic
partnership to the 24 hospitals that we added to the pilot
hospital last year as eligible. This represents 59
percent of the commission revenue at peak. There are two
of the hospitals within this option that really address
equity issues in two of our communities, and that is
Valley Presbyterian and Sentinella. And those -- there
are two hospitals that will be at at this point in time
below 40 percent penetration. And that would — as you
can see here, there's a 59 percent average in the
communities at this point, but we would have two hospitals
following a bit below that -- or two communities falling a
bit below, and that would be Metro and (inaudible).

This option also includes Kaiser, Baldwin Park.
In fact, that has been mentioned before is Kaiser is
obviously a target in our policy and advocacy work.
So we wanted to make sure that the commission is aware
this hospital is included and represents an opportunity to
have that program be present in that system.

And here's another map just again so you can see
what the distribution is.

The simple way to explain option three is, it's
exactly the same as option two. We just removed one of
the four hospitals that applied. And that is because that
one hospital didn't — we couldn't say that it really
impacted equity across the communities. So in finding
that in our analysis, we created an option that removed
one hospital from the list of respondents.

And, finally, the last option is our current
status. These are the ten hospitals that are contracted
with us at this time. As you see, they’re reaching 20
percent of the births countywide and there is an average
penetration rate of 50 percent. There's a little bit more
of a fluctuation in terms of equity across the
communities. Forty-eight percent of the commission -- it
represent 48 percent of the commission revenue in fiscal
year 20.

So in this case, returning to equity really
quickly, there are five communities that would fall below
40 percent and two that would fall below 30 percent. And
this map gives you an indication of where they are.

Finally, there is an additional element that we
would want to consider in a recommendation and this could
be considered an addition to any of the options that have
been before you, and that is the inclusion of Martin
Luther King Community Hospital. It's expected to open
late 2014. The labor and delivery unit is expected to be
relatively small and will likely represent a shift in
market share from the nearby hospitals; therefore, the
cost of including MLK Community, though it can't be
specified at this time, is expected to be minimal.

And, finally, we just want to come back around to
the key questions here. So are the criteria suggested to
frame and inform the consideration of this scale the right
ones. Again, mentioning cost, equity, policy and
advocacy, and evaluation. Are there ones that we’re
missing that we should be considering. Should they be
considered equally.

Questions 2 through 5 here, you've discussed
quite a bit in other meetings, and we feel like we've
gotten a lot of really substantive feedback in this area.
Obviously, we've talked even today about the policy and
advocacy direction that we're taking and that the board is
clearly supporting. And we have also gotten a lot of
positive feedback around having a robust evaluation in
this area. So we're really looking at getting feedback
on, are these the right criteria and wanting to use that
information to prepare to come back to you in September for a recommendation.

And if you want to refer back to the criteria, you can go to slide 9. If you want to be able to just read them for yourselves again. And this is the reason why I'm really here, just so I can show a picture of my exceptionally beautiful child.

MS. BELSHE: Barb, why don't -- so we -- just as we enjoyed seeing Wyatt, Aleece's son, at the end of LAUP presentation, we're delighted to see your son, Barbara. Much as we think your son is adorable, can we see the criteria again?

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I thought you wanted the criteria for what made him adorable.

MS. DUBRANSKY: I knew I should have put his picture on that page.

MS. BELSHE: Too much words.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So to clarify, today's not an action item; it is a discussion to give comment or information, advice, or suggestions to come back in September for the final?

MS. BELSHE: That's right. And as Barbara said, we're principally interested in getting feedback on the criteria; how we think about evaluating the different scale options; are these the right ones; are there others we're missing; how do we think about waiting.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Before we get into discussion, if I could just bring up Kathy Shriner who wants to do public comment, which is -- I think she's the only one on this item. Let's hear from her first, and then we'll discuss. Thank you very much.

MS. SHRINER: Thank you. I'm a member of the guidance body from Panorama City and neighbors, and we're one of the communities that would be greatly disadvantaged if the commission were to adopt option 4 and just stick with the ten hospitals. So in our situation, the two hospitals that are currently in the program, Providence Holy Cross and Northridge, only serve 23 percent of the births in our community; whereas, Valley Presbyterian that would be added under options 2 or 3 serves 41 percent of the births. So if Valley Presbyterian is included, then we would get to 64 percent. But otherwise, we would only have 23 percent and we're already a communities that's underserved in terms of preschool and early childhood. So to have this kind of program really helping the parents to become their child's best first teacher. And we're also a community that has issues of child abuse and neglect, and this program is very core to trying to prevent child abuse and neglect. So we really ask that you take a look at the individual communities and how we're affected by these various options.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much. That will be the subject of the September meeting, to see whether they're included, correct? Thank you.

Dr. Fielding,

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: In addition to the criteria, I have some other kinds of questions.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Up a little closer to the mike.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I'm sorry. I'll swallow it.

How close are we to having evaluation data that would help us understand the overall impact of this on child safety, health, development, and the like because it seems to me we can't really talk about this -- these criteria in isolation.

MS. BELSHE: So one of the first things that I always like to do is separate the pieces because we call this the family strengthening and investment, but we actually have two types of home visitation here. In terms of the intensive home visitation, we will obviously be doing an evaluation to insure that we are implementing the program to fidelity which would allow us to expect the outcomes that have been well documented for those programs. So that's one aspect, and I think in some senses we can essentially prove that now as long as we are doing the program at the same quality level.

MS. BELSHE: Welcome Baby, as you've heard, already had quite a few promising results coming out of its evaluation, its last publication if the evaluation being two months ago. There are -- as Haley, who's not with us today, can speak to a little bit better, there are some results that we are seeking where we are just at the tipping point of having a significant difference between the population we serve and the comparison group which some improvements to the design that we've been able to document and actually begin to implement with our current evaluator will help us with getting better understanding of what our impact is in those areas, some of them health related. As you all may recall as well, there are some areas where the county is doing so well that it's really hard to make that comparison, like insurance making -- we're doing pretty well as a county. So Welcome Baby doesn't have quite as much of a room to have an impact.

But I would say that another two years would help because we're then able to collect more data from a longer period of time on the children that have been in the program so far. I don't know --
that are paying for their healthy babies and deliveries?

Should we expect the accountable care organization in
which the hospital might be part of it and it’s using it
both to recruit valuable patients in quotes because
mothers and children are actually the driver for many
hospitals and health plans for -- they’re good customers
to have. There’s a lot of business side to this that we
have not taken advantage of. I was going to say the word
exploit, but I don’t necessarily mean it that way. It’s
really a partnership, and it seems to me that the better
we have partnerships with our hospitals we’ll have
partnerships with health care provider organizations with
ACOs, with health plans, with employers and others. It
become a signature product or program that people would
pay for. That’s the way to make it so that we never get to
40 or 50 percent of our total amount as we get to higher
and higher amounts.

So I think right from the beginning I think we
can put some of the business planning into the criteria
and maybe meet with the business development people from
that hospital and say, how is this good for your business,
how is this going to help you raise funds, how is this
going to help you pay for more -- make more profit or more
dollars for your nonprofit. I think it is a part -- I’d
like to see that kind of interest and discussion that be

attract mothers to their program. And actually in the
case of Metro, they’ve even had parents say, went to a
doctor to make sure I could deliver at that hospital.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: That, to me, is what’s
most important. I mean, let’s be crass about it.
Hospitals like money, I’ve heard. So we if in fact effect
them, either positively or negatively, they would have a
strong financial incentive to have this program be able to
use the First 5 insignia and Welcome Baby and the like.
So I think we should explore that as carefully as we can
and understand, you know, for the hospitals that currently
have it. Let’s say -- I guess another option, which I’m
not proposing, would be to say, you know what, we really
want to maximize our penetration in Best Start communities
and we’re not going to continue to fund some of those and
some of the other communities and see whether the hospital
are willing to pick it up. I’m not suggesting we do that
because they’ve invested a lot and they’re wonderful. But
we need to think of all the options here, not be limited
in our perspective of what we can do or what we might do
by simply these criteria.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I just want to follow up
on that to go even a little further. Should we, for
example, as part of criteria, expect a match from a
hospital? Should we expect them to bring the health plans

that bring the health plans

example, as part of criteria, expect a match from a
on that to go even a little further. Should we, for
hospital? Should we expect them to bring the health plans
principle for consideration that might be aligned
to what's being suggested, which is leveraging opportunities.
And by that, I mean, for example, LA County Department of
Mental Health is applying, along with a number of other
partners, for a federal challenge grant for implementation
of the ACA that involves using community input in five
communities that happen to all be Best Start communities
as we discussed. And there may be opportunities then to
link these kinds of activities with the activities that
would be supported in the grant in ways that would engage
the community substantially. So there -- as you make
these decisions and depending on where the hospitals are,
there may be opportunities to reduce the cost because
other people are investing in the same kind of thing.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: I'd like to add a

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Any other -- Deanne.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I think the Welcome Baby is

fertile ground for a whole lot things, a whole lot of

things that we haven't talked about. Certainly in terms
of child safety, I'm extremely invested in making sure
that these programs include safe sleeping and all kinds of
safety issues as well as shaken baby prevention, etc
other, which is being piloted at Harbor. In addition,
I'm wondering if the hospitals are interacting with each
other at all, if they're sharing information, if there's a
-- you know, a critical mass that's developing that will
result in more than just isolated programs and how well
that also connects to the community.

We have a program for perinatal risk, and we had
12 hospitals represented from the birthing centers.
Nurses in the birthing centers attend. And they are
extremely excited about learning from each other and also
about utilizing their relationship and their connections
and their ability to assure that these children leave
healthy and safely and that there is some sort of
follow-up that's meaningful and connected to the state of
the -- the state of the knowledge that's been developed.
So I really want to connect with this considering
that we now have 52 hospitals in LA that we're connected
with. We have a contact in the birthing centers of every
one of the hospitals in LA county. They're not all going
to be applying for this, but they have people that are in
a directory that indicates that they are going to be
keeping track of what they're doing in terms of child
safety.

MS. DuBRAINSKY: And child safety is a key
component of the program, including safe sleeping as well
as -- you know, home visit is obviously an optimal
approach to making sure that the whole environment in the

The other part about hospitals is that all
nonprofit hospitals have to do community benefit plans.
They need to, according to the Affordable Care Act, they
have to even do more than they have in the past. So
that's another benefit that they can accrue when they're
able to serve more of their community.
So look forward to September. You got enough
from us for today.

Next item is Item Number 12, and Mable will be
presenting to us on approving action item to approve the
program expansion -- extension expansion of the Family
Child Care Higher Education Academy.
And you have minus one minute, but we'll go over
a few minutes. And we do have some public comment on it,
so please.

MS. MUNOZ: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Staff
introduced the Family Child Care Higher Education Academy
at the June commission meeting as an information item.
And today we're here for an action. The presentation is
similar to last month's but has been adjusted to address
commissioners' questions and comments.
Staff is seeking approval to extend and expand
the FCC Higher Education Academy through August 2016 in
the amount not to exceed $2,125,000. In addition, staff
is seeking approval to incorporate both the program and
Second, because the program offers hands-on support services, it is well positioned to transition its participants to other first 5 LA workforce investments which is in direct support of building a comprehensive professional pathway for providers.

Third, it offers an opportunity to provide a continuum of services for FCC providers and increase their preparation to deliver high-quality ECE in another Best Start community. This is in alignment with the 2012 Best Start community assessment where communities such as Compton, Northeast Valley, and Wilmington expressed the need for high-quality child care as a priority. In addition, as stated in the 2011 LA county child care and development -- development needs assessment, high-quality FCC can help fill the short-fall of center-based spaces which was also noted as a high priority for most of the Best Start communities.

The proposed allocation of $750,000 per year allows the program to serve an additional 50 providers, 30 of which will be at another college. Service expansion rather than site duplication allows the program to capitalize in administrative functions at East Los Angeles College without the cost and time needed to fully scale the program at another sight.

In closing, I want to know that, while staff is seeking approval for 2,125,000 to extend the program for the next three years, the first year of this allocation was approved through the programmatic process back in June. Therefore, we're requesting an additional 1,500,000 to support the last two years. If the recommendation is approved, staff will work with LAUP and the Eli Foundation to incorporate the program and budget allocation into the ECE workforce consortium contract.

Now I'm happy to answer any questions.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: What's the cost per?

MS. MUNOZ: Per participant?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Yeah.

MS. MUNOZ: It's about 3,000.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Over what period of time is the average participant involved? Over what period of time is the average participant involved in the program?

MS. MUNOZ: Most of the participants have been involved for the last two years. So the -- they served about 140 providers the first year. And the second year there were a little over 200, maybe 215. And most of them were continuing participants from the first year.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: And so this number, this is for 12 months?

MS. MUNOZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: So the average is then for $5,000 per.
Every year is about 3,000.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Yeah, but if most of them are staying for two years, then the cost per participant is closer to $5,000.

MS. MUNOZ: For 24 months.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Right. That's what I was wondering. That's not cheap. That's certainly cheaper than most universities.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Any other questions or comments? Move for approval. Is there a motion? Second?

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: No, I had a question.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Hold on. Is there a second for the motion?

Okay. Now we can have a question, then we'll get public comment.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Is there a cost to the provider? Do they pay anything for this?

MS. MUNOZ: They do not. They might pay university fees, but the program tries to -- they have a lending library to bring down the costs of textbooks and some of the contextualized cohorted classes are provided free to the participants.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: You know, I guess I'm increasingly feeling that, if people don't put any money up for anything, that it doesn't have the same perceived value. And I think there should be sliding scales, but I for one am concerned about -- I'm not saying it should be a lot, but it needs to be something that's meaningful to the individual. So I'm personally not in favor of fully subsidized programs. And I have the same concern about LAUP, which I didn't voice today. Even though it would be small and on a sliding scale, I just think that we shouldn't be setting up models or perpetuating models where we don't ask anything on behalf of the participants.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: I concur.

MS. HELSHE: One approach we could bring is to come back. There is some time sensitivity, I believe, to this pending action. If the board is supportive of moving forward along the lines that staff have outlined, the motion perhaps could be amended, directing us to come back with perhaps some additional information about what we know about the income profile of participants, and that might be helpful in informing the extent to which some type of financial contribution might make sense. But I -- it's an important point, Jonathan, that you're raising. It's one that, as you note in your comment about LAUP, really is an organization-wide, granting contractor-wide issue, and I would really hope that this would be a data informed consideration by the board.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I would hope that coming back one could have -- suggest what might be a possible -- a possible approach of doing that, working closely with the college. I'd be very much -- I would offer that as an amendment.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: I think so.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: We'll come back to the wording in a second.

Duane.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I just like to comment on what you said, Jonathan. I don't disagree that perhaps there needs to be investment on behalf of the participants. But one must understand that these participants by their very nature, they're child care providers, many of whom are making somewhere in the neighborhood of 12, $13.00 an hour. So I would suggest that, if we're looking at investment, perhaps the investment could be in-kind and maybe we could have these providers work actually in child care centers doing volunteer work or doing internship work as opposed to having them having to pay out of their pocket.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I'm certainly open. I'm not suggesting what it should be. I just think it has to be something, and whether it's in-kind or whether it's nominated in dollars or something else, I don't have a strong feeling. I just think somebody needs to feel, you know, I helped pay for what I got.

COMMISSIONER SOUTHARD: I guess I disagree in this way. The investment we're making in these providers is really just a down payment for the larger education that they will necessarily have to invest themselves in order to achieve. So if they're moving from this to an AA to a bachelor's degree, they're already doing that. So that's it seems to -- so that's number one.

Number two is, sometimes we spend more money in trying to collect money than it's worth in the money we collect. So I mean, having done some of these kinds of programs, so anyway that -- I think I disagree.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I don't know that it has to be money. I mean, as was suggested --

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: If there could be some kind of internship --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Could be something.

Could be internship or volunteer.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: That's what I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I wasn't saying it had to be -- I just think it has to be something.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Inherent in most programs, there are internships. You do have providers who actually
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: As quickly as possible; Fielding brought up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Something that Dr., back, so we still have five.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Five votes. We need five regarding participation -- I don't want to use the word fee.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Participation contribution.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Participation contribution by

MS. BELSHE: And with some options.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Is that okay?

And then I hear that -- other than that, the motion seems to be pretty well accepted. We have --

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: Repeat the motion.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Yes. Actually, I want to do public comment first. So we have about ten people who want to make public comments.

MS. BELSHE: How many comments do we have? we're about to lose our quorum.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I know that. That's what I was about to tell people. I saw the supervisor do this a few years ago. If what you're going to come up and say, yes, we think you should support the program, we know that. If you have a comment that you think would clarify or help us to better understand, then please come forward.

Otherwise, the record will state that, if I read your name, you were going to come up and say, I support the motion. So Dr. Molina Zapada, Maria DeSimon, I think, excuse me, Reid, Truvia --

MS. BELSHE: If I may, Mr. Chair. We -- Craig, if you can -- we're about to lose Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER BROWNING: I'm going, too.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have six at the moment.

Commissioner Browning came back.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Five votes. We need five people.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commission Browning came back, so we still have five.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Something that Dr. Fielding brought up.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: As quickly as possible; otherwise, we'll lose the vote.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I was the evaluator for the program. I want to clarify that the participants did pay tuition or their fees as well as paying for books.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I was not aware of that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So that, they did do.

What the cost really is about are all the ancillary services associated with supporting monolingual non-English speaking students. A lot of tutoring, a lot of translation work, a lot of intrusive advisement that had to go on in their primary language. Those are supports that typically higher education institutions are not providing.

And the other point that I want to make in support of this program is that family child care providers tend to service the zero to three population more than they service preschool, and that is where parents go for the zero to three. And these are providers who are providing the services in the language of the families and in the culture of the families that often are not available to them in other places. So this is a unique subgroup within the workforce that needs to be supported.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Thank you. I'm very supportive.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I'm going to make a comment here. Unless someone wants to oppose the motion, we're going to give you a chance to do public comment in a minute. But the rules state, if my commissioners leave, we can't vote and that means that it would not pass. So I would like to read the motion, call the motion, and then receive the public comment. And as many of us who will stay will.

The motion says that we approve continued funding in the amount not to exceed 2.125 million to implement the Family Child Care Higher Education Academy for additional three years, September 1st, 2013, through August 31, 2016; authorize First 5 LA staff to incorporate the FCC HEA program and allocation into the Los Angeles Universal Preschool ECC workshop consortium contract, and execute the contact amendment effect December 1st, 2013. and Number 3, instruct staff to return with an explanation and a series of options, if necessary, for participant contribution to the -- to be able to participate.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: Second.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, motion is passed unanimously.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Let me just say that I asked a question whether there was -- you know, whether these were subsidized, whether there was any, and I was told that there was no cost on behalf of participants. So that's why I made my comments. But if they're already are significant contributions, I'm not suggesting more.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Staff work will be even easier.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: -- something in the game.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: That's great. So call up, please, the people who want to make public comment, and if we could set the clock at one minute. And if you have something that you'd really like us to know and understand, please don't be bashful. Come forward and introduce yourselves.

MR. ELDER: My name is Robert Elder. I was hired as the technology specialist serving the Cohort Number 4 for Project Vistas. I was there to provide tutoring services for the development presentation of electronic portfolios. We had the opportunity to create a template in MS Office suite. And after converting massive amounts of paper and linked evidence into PDF, Word, and other media formats, that commitment of hours over a period of months was several of the providers taking their personal time in addition to their duties in their businesses and beyond their classes on weekends, late night sessions. We've been able to provide the basis for a product-oriented picture that provides a look at a combination of their reflective thinking tied to their lined evidence utilizing the NA (?) preparation standards as the organizational framework.

As a demonstration of their tech competency with technology, they've made drastic improvements --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Great to hear it.

MR. ELDER: -- over a period of months, and we'll be able to demonstrate in a product oriented --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: That's great. Thank you so.

Next. And please state your name.

MS. SANCHEZ: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Minerva Sanchez. This is my mother, Bellia Sanchez. And we are a part of the Vistas program together. I think it's a great opportunity for us both to have gotten our AA degree. Without this program, it would have been very, very difficult since our work hours are very extensive. Most of the time, the children under our care do not leave until 6:00, 6:30 in the evening. So it gives us a chance to attend Saturday classes, which otherwise we probably would not have had the opportunity to take. And most of the time we get home at 11:00 at night. We are more than willing to do the work. It's very hard like I said, but Project Vistas has given us a different outlook. Now, we feel we're able to offer a higher quality education to the children in our communities which most are very low-income children. And we're very grateful for the program.

And like other speaker said, we do pay for some of the fees and we pay our student fees. So for about two classes, we're talking about $420. So there are fees we pay.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much. We really appreciate you comments. Keep up the good work.

Our kids need it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Juana. I'm a provider, too, also a student from East Los Angeles College where we have the Vista program. And this program help let several group of providers to reach our goals of being more professionals. Thank you for listening to us today. And we already start making the difference in the life the children in our communities because, if go to school and be prepared, how can we teach children and prepare them for their -- their going to kindergarten and thinking about going to college and the university. So I just really want to show you, you know, less children in preschool is less opportunity in education. I made it myself this morning because I want to -- and this is -- we made a positive impact in our communities. And also, I bring some pictures, you know, like we do with children and also we work with parents.

You know, ever month we have meetings and information also workshop with parents. They can interact with children doing activities. And one of my goals is this children have their own space in their houses, so I visit the houses and encourage the parents to put a little table for them to continue like an extension of school at their houses. So it's very important to us continue being educated, be more professional and administrative.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

Appreciate the comment.

Next please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, again. My name is Rhonda Marie Touve. I am from Redondo Beach, and I was here earlier with the LAUP. I happen to be one of the people that was asked to be -- well given the opportunity to be part of Project Vista. Because of my area, I do not get it for free. I do pay for everything from the college other than the books that they've been able to give to us, which has been a help for me, especially having to pay the fees that I do pay. So some of us are paying those fees.

And because of LAUP and having the opportunity to
be with Project Vista, it has increased my knowledge. I went to high school and when I went to a college class, it was 32 years. And 20 years I was in this profession, and now I have the opportunity to go to college, and it completed the whole puzzle. And it's just been really a great opportunity. And like the others said, the hours are very helpful. Saturday classes are very helpful.

But I just wanted to make it clear there are some of us that are paying and we don't take it for granted.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

Appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is (?), and I just wanted to let you guys know that we are very grateful that we have classes on Saturday, that we have learned a lot of technology to provide good quality for our children at home, for our communities so the children can have the opportunity to move on from college and university. And I'm just very happy you guys, please, hear and listening to us, and thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much. Next please.

MS. GONZALEZ: Hi. My name is Julia Gonzalez, and I'm part a large group of women's who work hard different times and they some are open 24 hours a day a week and some five days a week from 6:00 to 6:00. I'm talking about to my college, the children care providers.

We all have the same goal, to prepare and become better child care providers and give our childrens who are in our care with the best quality of life, physical, emotional, and academical.

I also want to thank this great program that's completely focused in helping us with all kinds of research, support, tutoring, books, and accessible hours to study. Thank you very much because it is a part of successful. And we are the first group of child care providers to get these master title. Thank you very much for all your bases and please continue us. There are still many children care providers is needed.

That means coming through with the help. Will you help.

Last month, 45 women graduate in East Los Angeles College with an AA degree in child development.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

MS. NORTA: Hello. My name is Helen Norta. I belong to the same group of providers, so I provide child care from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. And having that kind of schedule is really hard. One process one is called to care providers program to improve our quality care and our professional engagement. So we find the Vistas Project the opportunity to classes during the nighttime, Saturdays, Sundays. They provide us also with technical support, computers, iPads, also materials as books, printouts. We really like our job. We really love the children. We're here for the children and for our community. So working with the children in giving the quality care. We also work for our community.

So we feel that the first years of the -- any child is the most important in their life. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much. I want to thank you all for staying so long and all the good work that you do. We appreciate it.

We have one other item, I think, Item 13.

Armando is going to --

MS. BELSHE: I've never seen him move so fast.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: He's going to give us something to file.

MR. JIMENEZ: I'm going to go into auctioneer mode and I don't want to be the one standing you between the wonderful LA freeways, so I'll be very quick.

This requires no action. This is a receive and file for the fiscal year 2012-2013 quarter three, progress report.

Just let me basically say that the first quarter and the second quarter we talked about progress, both with expenditures and activities. This specific quarter three report focuses on expenditures only. To minimize confusion, the report is on page 346 in your packet, and here are the highlights. This reports covers expenditures for the period of July 1st, 2012, to March 31, 2013. And bottom line, at this point in time at the end of quarter three, 58 percent of the budget was expended.

The category of prior strategic plan year was successful in meeting the expenditure goal. Outside of that, the overall 27 of the 62 initiatives on the list on that page fell significantly below. We're underspending, which represents 44 percent of the initiatives that we invest in. The reasons for the delays -- or the low expenditures are similar to those reported in the first quarter report, which are delays in contracting, delays in implementation, and the delays in invoicing.

Despite that, I wanted to say that, with Kim and John's leadership, one of the things that's exciting is, in the quarter one report, we identified a program improvement plan. Actually those activities have been accelerated and expanded or organization-wide. And we've actually accomplished some, I think in my mind, some major activities and milestones, one being the alignment between individual program scopes and the overall work plan that was just approved in June. The other was, we conducted a time and resource study that the entire solicitation process that's currently under review. We looked at the
time it takes between the commission action and the time a
check leaves our organization.

The other was conducting a survey of grantees and
contractors to find ways to actually assess and improve
the current processes we use to interact with the
agencies.

And that's the end. If you have any questions,
I'd be happy to answer.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: One question I would have
is, in October, I presume that would mean we get the
report for the entire year. Is that a time when we should
pause and look and see how we did, what things we've
learned, what new policies and procedures might make
sense, because on the expenditure side, we know that it is
always a challenge to spend things efficiently. So right
now, it's still interim. Does that make sense? And
that's the time it would happen, October?

MR. JIMENEZ: Usually, what we've found is that
there's a two-month period between the end of that
particular quarter and the time in which we reconcile the
invoices.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So August 1st, September
1st, which means October is a reasonable time.

MR. JIMENEZ: I would actually say November would
be a more accurate time to have that. I would probably
look at the finance folks.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I'll leave it to you all
to decide when. And then I guess the other question is,
does it come to the full commission first or should it
come to the executive committee? We could put that in --
take that offline to figure that out.

Okay. Great.

Comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I hate myself because I'm
late to a retirement dinner, but just I wanted to say,
Armando, thank you so much for all the great work you do.
I do want to talk with you. I would like to discuss at
some point your outcomes on the various categories of our
goals, particularly the safety one because I think we need
to rethink how we identify progress or how we evaluate our
success there.

So can you make a little note that we need to
talk about that? It was in our packet. I spent over an
hour with my entire operations committee yesterday
analyzing the findings and promised that I would bring it
top today, so I brought it up.

MR. JIMENEZ: It's a great actually teaser for
what we hope to bring soon to the commission which is an
updated accountability and learning report, which we'll
talk about more.
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