

**Agenda Item 12**
July 6, 2016

DATE: June 23, 2016

TO: Children and Families Commission of Orange County

FROM: Kimberly Goll, Executive Director *Kimberly Goll*

ACTION: Receive follow-up report to June Planning Meeting

SUMMARY:

The annual planning meeting for the Children and Families Commission of Orange County was held in June. The meeting was primarily focused on the recent assessment of the Commission by The Bridgespan Group and their findings and recommendations to increase the Commission's impact over the next several years. This report provides an overview of the planning meeting discussion and next steps.

DISCUSSION:

The Strategic Planning Session notes (Attachment 1) summarize the discussion from the June 1, 2016 Commission Planning Meeting. The recommendation to post the video shown at the meeting, which highlights the Commission's investments in programs that are improving children's outcomes, was carried out immediately following the meeting. The video will be incorporated into future presentations and briefings, and the cost to translate into multiple languages is being evaluated. The remainder of the meeting focused on a report from The Bridgespan Group.

This past spring, the Bridgespan Group conducted an assessment of the Commission's progress toward implementation of recommendations made in Bridgespan's 2008 assessment. The aims of the 2016 assessment were to identify strategies for continued and increased impact on children and families in Orange County and provide guidance on ways to leverage the Early Development Index (EDI) data. Mike Perigo, a partner at The Bridgespan Group and the head of education practice, led the work in 2008 and again in 2016. Mr. Perigo presented Bridgespan's findings and six recommendations at the Commission's planning meeting on June 1, 2016 (Attachment 2).

Mr. Perigo commended the Commission for the significant progress made on the 2008 recommendations. The 2016 recommendations were presented as guidelines, not imperatives, building on the existing foundation over the next several years. Using the guidelines and responding to the Commissioners discussion, staff identified five immediate follow-up actions that will be the focus over the next six to twelve months: identifying core programs; the program renewal process; expanded use of EDI data; sustainability planning; and commission staffing and resources.

- *Core Programs* – Define and establish criteria to evaluate all Commission funded programs and determine which programs should form the core of continued and future funding.
- *Program Renewal Process* – Convene Commissioner review panels to guide the upcoming program renewal process. The program contract terms end on June 30, 2017. Programs will be reviewed using the core program criteria, and recommendations will be presented no later than February 2017.

- *Early Developmental Index (EDI)* – Explore opportunities to expand the use of EDI both internal to the Commission and as a summary indicator for young children countywide.
- *Sustainability Planning* – Pursue supplemental financial resources and fiscal leveraging programs as identified in the Business Plan, including, but not limited to Intergovernmental Transfers (IGT), Pay for Success, Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA), and Targeted Case Management (TCM).
- *Commission Staffing and Resources* – Assess staffing needs and work load demands to best address the vacancies created by recent staffing transitions and the evolving direction of the Commission, which focuses on data expertise, catalytic investment, and long term sustainability.

The work to address these five critical action items has begun and will continue throughout the summer. Regular updates will be provided to the Commission members through each stage of the process. A comprehensive report on the implementation status will be presented at the next Commission meeting in September 2016.

STRATEGIC PLAN & FISCAL SUMMARY:

There are no funding actions proposed for this item.

PRIOR COMMISSION ACTIONS:

- June 2016 – Conducted Annual Planning Meeting
- April 2016 – Received update on The Bridgespan Group’s assessment of the Children and Families Commission
- February 2016 – Adopted resolution authorizing agreement with The Bridgespan Group for an updated organizational assessment and recommendations

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Receive follow-up report to June Planning Meeting and provide direction to staff.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Strategic Planning Session Notes
2. The Bridgespan Group Recommendations for Moving Forward

Contact: Kelly Pijl

Children and Families Commission of Orange County Strategic Planning Session, June 1, 2016

Discussion of the Commission Video

Commissioners reviewed a short video describing the Commission's accomplishments within its priority areas of focus. Commissioners then provided the following suggestions:

- Put the video on YouTube
- Share with other Commission-related agencies so they can put it on their website also
- Work with Early Learning Specialists to show the video to their District's school boards
- First 5 Association may be interested in using the video as part of their legislative briefings
- Explore closed-captioning in Spanish and Vietnamese

Kim Goll shared that there is an opportunity to repurpose segments of the video and go deeper into priority areas (e.g., create separate 3 to 6-minute segment focused on oral health. Then, for example this segment could be shared with related organizations such as USC pediatric dentists/program graduates).

Discussion of The Bridgespan Group's Report

The Commissioners then received a detailed presentation from The Bridgespan Group. Bridgespan offered six recommendations to the Commission for moving forward:

1. Use the Early Development Index as a summative indicator of progress
2. Sustain the catalytic orientation to investment
3. Accelerate the transition from funding programs to building sustainable services
4. Continue to bring supplemental financial resources to bear
5. Leverage the Commission's reputation and non-financial assets
6. Use the Early Development Index to guide the allocation of the Commission's own resources

The Commission's discussion focused on recommendations #1 and 6 (taken together as they both relate to the Early Development Index); recommendation #3; and recommendation #4.

Recommendations #1 and # 6 (Early Development Index - EDI)

It was noted that the EDI costs the Commission about \$300,000/year (at current level of data gathering and use)

The Commissioners suggested the need for a process for expanded use of EDI data

It was also suggested that the Commission explore shared costs for EDI data

- Who are potential agencies to share costs?

The group asked whether EDI should be considered a "core" program?

Another question was raised, “Should we create access to EDI data via a technology platform for cost-efficiency?”

A suggestion was made to repackage the information with an eye toward different key stakeholders

Recommendation #3: Transition Funding from Programs to Sustainable Service

Bridgespan recommended, and then the Commission discussed at length, the need to:

1. Identify specific core programs by name
2. Aggressively figure out a pathway for sustaining these core programs and for weaning non-core programs (and maybe eventually the core programs as well) off Commission funds

There was also much discussion about how the Commission should identify Core Programs. It was agreed that:

- It will take at least 6 months to identify core programs; the timing should be coordinated with renewal cycles
- It will require significant commissioner involvement/discussion
- The process of defining “core programs” is as important as the definition itself
- Possible criteria for Core Programs:
 - Demonstrated outcomes (consider data/desired outcomes both EDI and Commission Evaluation of outcomes achieved)
 - Orientation towards improvement
 - Programs the Commission is proudest of
 - Critical programs/needs
 - Preventative in nature
 - Greatest difficulty finding sustainability
 - Length of time needed for transition
- It was suggested that programs of lesser need be transitioned as soon as possible, perhaps with co-funding opportunities

Recommendation #4: Supplemental Financial Resources

The Commissioner’s first asked about who is currently staffing the work to secure other funds? The response included:

- Advocacy – First 5
- National Groups
- Local Staff

Commissioners then asked if additional Commission staff is needed to secure additional funds – either a dedicated staff member or The Olin Group?

Per Bridgespan, they were not necessarily recommending changing the number of staff or percentage of staff and resources, but rather the focus and use of competencies and relationships. They suggested taking advantage of existing partners and their knowledge.

Defining “Catalytic”

The commissioners, executive director, and Bridgespan representative also spent time discussing what is meant by “catalytic,” which includes a range of concepts:

- Scaled to the opportunity
- Could be large dollars invested for large impact
- But could also be non-dollar focus or a smaller scale
- Could be leveraging technology

Additional Questions/Considerations Raised

- Does the Commission have enough/the right staff in place to further a catalytic approach?
- Possible use of data (Artificial Intelligence) learning to predict/prevent 0-5 needs/issues; data match approach
- There are changes in funding; taking the time to identify core and non-core programs gives the Commission time to understand funding changes
- Bridgespan recommendations are guidelines for several years, not a 12-month imperative; the imperative is to start the process
- The Commission should advocate for any taxes/revenues generated from marijuana sales to go to existing organizations like the Commission
- Is there a benefit to hiring Bridgespan to conduct an assessment that could be useful for all commissions (statewide)?
 - Builds Commission reputation
 - Important for philanthropic organizations
- Parallel organizations that are known as policy institutions but that “also make grants?”
 - Pew
 - Kaiser
 - Stanford

We offer six recommendations for the Commission moving forward

1

Use the Early Development Index as a summative indicator of progress

2

Sustain the catalytic orientation to investment

3

Accelerate the transition from funding programs to building sustainable services

4

Continue to bring supplemental financial resources to bear

5

Leverage the Commission's reputation and non-financial assets

6

Use the Early Development Index to guide the allocation of the Commission's own resources