

ECEAP Contracting Work Group 05-22-17 Meeting Summary

A. Distribution of Administrative Functions and Underlying Capacities

Garrison gave an overview of the *ECEAP Functions and Capacities Survey Summary*. To explore the best way to distribute functions and the capacities needed to perform them well and to identify ways that a preferred distribution of functions could be implemented, Garrison presented the table entitled *Potential Distribution of Administrative Functions across the ECEAP System*. This table was developed using the survey results, which suggested that functions should be distributed across a continuum. The table makes some suggestions about distribution and notes the capacities that might be needed at each level to succeed.

Work Group members worked at tables to consider the following questions:

- *Is there a strong need for the functions noted in the “regional” to be performed regionally as opposed to be DEL statewide or by the contractor? If so, what is the most compelling rationale?*
- *Are there “core” functions and capacities we should require at each level? If so, which?*

Work Group Members Agreed

Work Group members requested that the *Potential Distribution of Administrative Functions across the ECEAP System* document be shared electronically so they can offer more detailed comments. Members agreed to the following guidance regarding potential regional functions and required capacities.

1. There are benefits to addressing most of these functions through a regionally customized lens (whether performed by DEL regionally or another entity).
2. Tensions among contractors about where to expand, how to recruit, and other overlap issues can best be mediated by DEL (the appropriate role needs to be determined).
3. Some ideas would save money where there is currently unnecessary duplication (like replacing individual development of marketing materials with a more coordinated approach), while others would improve the relevance and accuracy of our actions (like more accurate forecasting and expansion planning through regionally-focused analysis).
4. Some functions would be more effective if focused regionally (like collaborations used by PSESD and partners to coordinate engagement, recruitment and enrollment of families).
5. Regional expansion planning functions (forecasting, provider recruitment, ERSEA, etc.) need to be part of community conversations among diverse stakeholders. Whichever agency performs these functions must be well-positioned to do so (skill, credibility, capacity). Regional and local views are needed to avoid situations in which there is a high local need obscured by looking at a larger unit (e.g., county). DEL could help regional entity/contractors to access additional data to enhance what the *Saturation Study* forecasts.
6. There should be “required” threshold capacities at regional, contractor, and subcontractor levels.

Open Questions

1. What is the opportunity cost of creating/empowering an additional entity/layer?
2. Where will funds for new functions and another layer come from?
3. How can process delays inherent in having another layer be mitigated?
4. What about a liability pool (health insurance, liability insurance) – the ESD’s might be able to expand their existing liability pools

B. Considering Regionalizing Functions

To explore benefits and implications of regionalization, Garrison provided maps of current regions in DEL and DSHS Children's Administration and encouraged work group members to consider two questions that would drive how regionalization would happen

- *What is the organizing philosophy (maximum size by geography or principle by population) of a region to be able to get the benefit of regionalizing functions and not be unresponsive to local needs [e.g., rural vs urban] - and be feasible given limited funds?*
- *What are the benefits and challenges of having DEL regionalize services vs. a newly charged regional entity?*
- *How might we start if we were to start?*

Work Group Members Suggested

Organizing Philosophy:

- Regional boundaries should be drawn in ways that add value.
- Boundaries should be drawn in ways that effectively allow people to come together in the geography/grouping that makes sense for them to plan service expansion and sustenance (even if within a larger geographic boundary).
- The structure should be responsive to those close to a regional boundary to not create unnecessary travel or complications (e.g., PD provided from different locales for different purposes)
- Functions that provide economies of scale (to free up funds for other work) should be assigned regionally.
- Functions should not be distributed in ways that make direct services delivery more difficult.
- Tribal nations may have different government to government considerations. [Note: DEL is currently working on a separate effort with tribes around this and other issues.]

Who Should Perform Regional Functions (DEL or other entity?):

- DEL:
 - Can act as an impartial mediator
 - Reduces conflicts of interest that might otherwise result
 - Does not increase administrative and indirect costs, while adding regional responsiveness
- Other Entity:
 - Question: If the regional entity saves money, will it be able to retain and repurpose it?
 - Question: What is the business model for a regional entity? Can it charge fees to contribute to sustainability?
 - Question: How would DEL ensure that each regional entity has adequate core capacity to perform functions? What if one or more regions has no such entity? Could regions be treated differently with regions where there is a strong regional entity assuming responsibilities that in other regions might be performed by DEL? Is this more/less efficient as it would be more complex?
- Other Questions/Ideas:
 - Can who perform these services vary by region?
 - For some functions, perhaps DEL, a region, or a current contractor might perform the function for all (e.g., an organization with great graphics and marketing skill might create customizable marketing tools for all)

- How many people would make up a regional team?
- How will we estimate costs/funding and FTEs to perform these functions at whatever level?
- Are some functions better performed by the same person by with a state AND regional lens?

How Might We Start?

- Start small and build
- Start with already regionalized functions (e.g. coaching)
- Start with core regionalized functions, with communities prioritizing others

C. Improving the Contracting Process

The Work Group considered improvements to the ECEAP contracting and amendment processes suggested so far. DEL is currently reviewing the attached revised suggestions for feasibility and sequencing.

D. Monitoring Small Sites Effectively

Work group members were asked to share any ideas they had about efficient and effective ways to monitor small sites effectively.

1. Hold monthly calls with subcontractors like those that PreK Specialists hold with contractors.
2. Require small sites to have a part-time liaison as a point of contact.
3. Provide sites with a self-monitoring tool and process to reduce the number of contractor monitoring items.

E. Meeting Evaluation

Worked well	Change next time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pipe cleaners ● Facilitation at tables around documents ● The amount of time was good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bring our lunches ● Hold a portion of the meeting with the Think Tank