

## Oversight and Coordination Committee

### Early Learning Council

James, R. Thompson Center, 100 W. Randolph, Suite 16-100

June 29, 2011

10:00 am- 12:00 pm

#### Participants

**Chicago-** Paula Cottone, Marsha Engquist, Gloria Harris, Dan Harris, Tom Laymen, Kathy Penak, Sylvia Puente, Christine Ryan, Ellen Schumer, Teri Talan Judith Walker Kendrick

**Phone-** Lindsay Blough, Lauri Morrison, Gail Nelson, Andrea Sass, Kay Henderson

**Non-Participating Members-** George Davis, Ida Butler, Mary Ellen Caron, Barbara Castellan, Erin Cetera, Ellen Chavez, Rhonda Clark, Paula Cottone, Dina Evans, Karen Freel, Eric Gershenson, Kathy Goetz Wolf, Barbara Grace, Theresa Hawley, Michael Johnson, Jamilah Jor'dan, Cindy Mahr, Janice Moenster, Lauri Morrison-Frichtl, Gail Nelson, Carolyn Newberry Schwartz, Marcia Orr, Martha Owens, Gina Ruther, Naomi Samuels, Linda Saterfield, Ellen Schumer, Adele Simmons, Unita Sims, Sara Slaughter, Joyce Thomas, Laurel Walker, Katie Williams, Cindy Zumwalt

#### I. Welcome

- a. Took roll call
- b. Introduced Kim Collins as new committee staffer

#### II. Approach to Revisit the Hard to Reach Component of the SAC Grant

- a. Started discussion by asking if the committee agrees or disagrees to move forward on proposed Hard to Reach strategy
- b. Reviewed original proposal that was turned into the federal government
  - i. Pilot approaches on reaching hard to reach families that have not already been tried
  - ii. Goal: to identify barriers and change policy
  - iii. Agreed disabled, homeless, and second language learners not included in this proposal
  - iv. Focus on parents that have access to programs but choose not to use them
    1. Supposed to be a learning experience for programs across the state
    2. Not an opportunity for six sites to use money to do something they already wanted to do
  - v. There were administrative barriers to getting the RFP out
  - vi. Committee will review proposals
  - vii. October 2008, The Early Learning Council passed a resolution to devote money to hard to reach children
- c. Pilot vs. Not

- i. Agreement that RFP should be broad
  - ii. Community organizations may be best suited for the sites
    - 1. Do not limit to early childhood only- may allow partnering
  - iii. “Hard to Reach” should be defined by the site applicant
- d. Discussed definitions that exists for “at risk”
  - i. CPS- low income, 2<sup>nd</sup> language learners, disabilities and homelessness
  - ii. ISBE-(must have more than one) poverty, 2<sup>nd</sup> language, parents incarcerated, social service involvement, parent does not have high school degree, teen parent
- e. Action’s work with COFI sets a good framework
  - i. Through interviews of 5000 families developed recommendations
    - 1. Shared with Chicago Public Schools
- f. Concerns rose that this proposal does not address the lack of facilities and slots in Latino communities.
  - i. Facilities work group will address those concerns, this grant is focused on reaching the families that have access but choose not to use the quality early childhood programs.
    - 1. Englewood had no full classrooms because young moms felt disenfranchised because of lack of connections to church and community
      - a. Passed out flyers, knocked on doors and now attendance is up
        - i. Not sure what worked but something did, this grant will allow the workgroup to find out and evaluate what works.
- g. Should have a Evaluation of the chosen sites
  - i. Look closely at policy issues and evaluate them
    - 1. Evaluate why programs have challenges keeping children
    - 2. Participation requirements
      - a. Proof of income barriers for parents
  - ii. Sites may not have documenting ability
  - iii. Have one group evaluate and one coordinate pilots
  - iv. Universities could do evaluation
    - 1. Individual sites should have ability to choose university
      - a. Could keep costs down and build collaboration
  - v. Documentation may be better than evaluation
- h. Sites should not be limited to only Pre School For All
  - i. Include child care, Head Start, QRIS participants
- i. There is no additional money in the grant to provide technical assistance to the sites
  - i. COFI asked Grand Victoria to help with TA
- j. Link with current home visiting projects
  - i. Do this instead of home visiting- can use this money for something else
  - ii. Home visiting is a model that is already being used

- k. Pilots need to be replicated
    - i. Should be within current budgets
    - ii. Sustainability is important for all projects
    - iii. RFP should require the site to spell out cost effectiveness
    - iv. Committee should not only look at pilot proposals that do not require additional costs
    - v. Budget should not drive the program, programs should drive the budget
  - l. Shannon will be in touch with co-chairs about moving forward with drafting of RFP
- III. Discussion on Data Committee’s Key Policy Questions**
- a. Items that should be included
    - i. Community
      - 1. Too broad to tackle now
    - ii. Home language of the family
    - iii. Highest level of parent’s education
    - iv. Early Intervention
    - v. Trauma
  - b. Should align with kindergarten readiness
    - i. Kindergarten readiness will become universal
      - 1. Current ISBE SIS program has a placeholder for kindergarten readiness
      - 2. New indicators for birth to three
    - ii. Services provided should be included in school enrollment data
    - iii. Federal government requires transition information for IDEA
- IV. Input to Strategic Planning Process**
- a. How do recommendations by the ELC and committees get implemented
  - b. Focus on broad constituent group
    - i. All high quality programs
  - c. We need a clear mission on the broader early childhood system
  - d. Governance
    - i. Need right committees
    - ii. Need right structure to make sure moving forward correctly
    - iii. Relationships with state agency councils and ELC
  - e. How do committees share information?
  - f. Vacant buildings inability to be converted to childcare centers
  - g. Oversight and Coordination will have to figure out mission after Strategic Planning
- V. National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand Discussion**
- a. If we pay to go deeper we already know the answers to these questions
    - i. COFI already did this oversampling
      - 1. Eligibility requirements are a large barrier
    - ii. Should not spend Hard to Reach money on this project
      - 1. Do not know enough to say no
- VI. Process for Committee Recommendation Implementation**
- a. Discussed during strategic planning agenda item

**VII. Adjournment**

- a. Will have to meet more frequently to discuss the RFP