

EFC PRIORITIES FOR FY 25-26

BOARD'S NORTH STAR QUESTION:

"Does this action help us achieve our priorities?"

Aligned with Approved Executive Director Year 2 Goals

This document should be reviewed at the start of every EFC meeting to ensure all decisions align with priorities AND support the ED's approved goals.

ONGOING COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

Maintained through regular operations until SCL fully withdrawn

- Monthly whistleblower complaint reporting to DDS (Article III) - reported to board monthly
 - State compliance meetings and written updates as requested (Article IV)
 - Monthly caseload ratio reporting to DDS and board
-

COMPLIANCE PRIORITIES

Must achieve to exit Special Contract

Priority 1: Fix Caseload Ratios

Aligns with ED Goal: "Meet average regional center caseload ratios and Special Contract Language requirement for IPP surveys"

Target Dates:

- By October 2025: Meet California average (Making good progress but didn't meet)
- By March 2026: Meet legal requirements (1:72 waiver, 1:48 under age 6, 1:70 non-waiver)

How We Track:

- Monthly tracking required by state

Red Flag:

- Any month where ratios get worse instead of better

Priority 2: Improve Consumer/Family Satisfaction

Aligns with ED Goal: "Meet... Special Contract Language requirement for IPP surveys"

Success Metrics:

- Achieve 15% response rate on IPP surveys
- Achieve 85% satisfaction rate or better
- Shows community relationships are improving

How We Track:

- Monthly IPP survey reports

Red Flag:

- Response rate below 10% or satisfaction below 80%

*** No regional center has had an IPP survey response rate above 5% ***

GOVERNANCE PRIORITY

Board-initiated response to address governance challenges that contributed to special contract

Priority 3: Maintain Clean Board Governance Record

Aligns with ED Goal: "Prioritize a Transparent Relationship Between the Executive Director and the Board"

Success Metrics:

- Written and board-approved governance policies and procedures for board operations, including clear policies that clarify: Board sets direction and outcomes; ED determines methods and operations
- Board Goals (Ends) created and posted on NLACRC website by June 30, 2026
- Zero substantiated whistleblower complaints about board conduct

How We Track:

- Quarterly governance policy development progress reports

- Board self-assessment on governance effectiveness
- Whistleblower complaint data (monthly)

Red Flag:

- Lack of progress on policy development after 6 months
- Role confusion between board and ED causing operational interference
- Any substantiated complaints about board conduct

MISSION PRIORITIES

Aligned with Board-Approved ED Goals

Priority 4: Complete Strategic Plan with Community

Directly supports ED Goal: "Complete development and launch of new Strategic Plan with updated Mission, Vision & Values"

Success Metrics:

- Partner in strategic planning process already underway
- Create strategic plan committee to achieve 50% completion by June 30, 2026 with the goal of completion December 31, 2026
- Integrate community feedback per ED engagement goals
- Address all compliance and mission priorities

How We Track:

- Monthly progress reports from strategic planning committee

Red Flag:

- Missing stakeholder groups or timeline slipping past June

Priority 5: Oversee Crisis Mode Operations as Funder of Last Resort

Supports ED Goals: Legislative Advocacy + Service Delivery Quality Improvements

The connection: When you can't hire more people (quantity), you make the people you have more effective (quality) through training, technology, and standardization. This helps manage the "last resort" burden even with constrained resources.

Success Metrics:

- Receive quarterly reports on increasing burden as other funders cut services
- Track ED's strategies for managing slashed budgets with increased needs
- Support ED's 10 legislative advocacy engagements with 40% measurable outcomes
- Monitor impact on consumer homelessness and employment

How We Track:

- Quarterly "crisis mode" reports from ED showing funding pressures and responses

Red Flag:

- Critical services at risk or increases in consumer homelessness/job loss

Priority 6: Protect Operational Flexibility from PRA Impact

Supports ED Goals: IT Infrastructure Development + Financial Stewardship

Success Metrics:

- Preserve current administrative spending priorities despite new PRA requirements
- Document PRA's true cost burden for advocacy with ARCA CFOs and DDS
- Leverage new IT Director's systems to minimize PRA's operational disruption
- Build coalition with other RCs facing same unfunded mandate

How We Track: Quarterly reports showing:

- PRA request volume, complexity, and staff time required
- Real costs of PRA compliance (for advocacy documentation)
- What administrative investments get deferred/cancelled due to PRA
- IT automation progress reducing manual burden

Red Flag:

- PRA costs forcing cuts to training, technology, or other administrative investments
- Staff burnout from PRA duties added to existing workload
- Unable to pursue improvements due to PRA resource drain

Board's Advocacy Role:

- Connect with ARCA CFO to document statewide PRA impact

- Partner with other RCs to present unified data to DDS showing true costs across all RCs
 - Advocate for PRA funding or relief before January 2026 implementation
-

ALIGNMENT WITH ED YEAR 2 GOALS

Service Delivery & Coordination

- Strategic Plan (Priority 4)
- Caseload ratios (Priority 1)
- IPP surveys (Priority 2)
- IT/Database improvements support PRA readiness (Priority 6)

Legislative Advocacy

- 10 advocacy engagements support "funder of last resort" preparation (Priority 5)
- Document funding gaps for advocacy (Priority 5)

Consumer & Family Engagement

- IPP survey improvements (Priority 2)
- Strategic plan community input (Priority 4)
- LAUSD transition sites & community feedback loops

Board-ED Transparency

- Board orientation redesign (Priority 3)
- Quarterly EFC updates on all priorities
- Clear governance boundaries

Financial Stewardship

- Admin cost management for PRA (Priority 6)
 - Emergency fund management (Priority 5)
 - Quarterly financial training for board
-

DECISION FRAMEWORK FOR EVERY BOARD ITEM

Before voting, ask:

1. Which priority AND ED goal does this advance?
2. Could this harm any priority or ED goal?
3. Is this the best use of resources?

Color Code System:

- **GREEN:** Directly advances a priority AND supports ED goals
- **YELLOW:** Neutral or needs more analysis
- **RED:** Could harm a priority or conflict with ED goals

MONTHLY EFC DASHBOARD

Priority	ED Goal Alignment	Current Status	Trend	Risk
1. Caseload Ratios	Service Delivery	[actual/target]	↑ ↓ →	  
2. IPP Satisfaction	Service Delivery	[%/85%]	↑ ↓ →	  
3. Board Governance	Transparency	[#complaints]	↑ ↓ →	  
4. Strategic Plan	Service Delivery	[% to 50% goal]	↑ ↓ →	  
5. Last Resort Funding	Legislative	[#denials/\$]	↑ ↓ →	  
6. PRA Readiness	Financial	[advocacy progress]	↑ ↓ →	  

KEY BOUNDARIES FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The ED has freedom to achieve these priorities but CANNOT:

- Allow any priority to go "red" without immediately notifying EFC
- Miss any state-required reporting deadline
- Exceed 15% administrative cost ratio
- Make changes that violate Special Contract Language requirements
- Deviate from board-approved Year 2 Goals without board approval
- Commit board to public positions without board discussion

WHAT SUCCESS LOOKS LIKE - AUGUST 31, 2026

- **OUT of Special Contract**
- Meeting all caseload ratios consistently

- 15%+ IPP response with 85%+ satisfaction
 - Zero new governance complaints
 - Strategic plan launched and being implemented
 - Legislative wins protecting funding
 - Smoothly handling PRA requests
 - All ED Year 2 Goals achieved
-

QUARTERLY REVIEW QUESTIONS FOR EFC

1. Are the ED's actions advancing both priorities AND their approved goals?
2. Where are we seeing the best alignment between priorities and ED goals?
3. What obstacles is the ED facing that the board needs to address?
4. Do any priorities or ED goals need adjustment based on new state/federal requirements?