<p style="text-align:center">Think Tank Meeting Summary
May 22, 2017</p>

This paper summarizes the proceedings and work of the second meeting of the ECEAP Expansion Think Tank. The meeting focused on refining recommended principles to guide ECEAP expansion and providing comments on draft maps outlining the steps and actions necessary to expand ECEAP into an entitlement program. The ideas below were offered by Think Tank members during the meeting to help guide DEL plans and strategies for ECEAP expansion.

I. Welcome

Kelli welcomed the group and introduced Nicole Lor, as the new ECEAP Expansion Coordinator and Svenja Hopkins, DEL ECEAP Program Coordinator, who is temporarily assuming responsibility for ECEAP contract management as Justin Chan is on temporary assignment with the DEL Racial Equity team.

II. *Guiding Principles*

Bea introduced the *Guiding Principles 2.0* that incorporated Think Tank ideas from the March 2017 meeting. As they are finalized, these principles will be used to guide ECEAP's expansion into an entitlement program. Each guiding principle has two parts:

- A brief statement of the characteristics that we want for ECEAP at entitlement; and,
- An actionable principle that can serve as a tool to guide choices and prioritization of the ingredients and actions needed to achieve these characteristics.

The principles will be used to identify and guide choices about what will be required to achieve these characteristics, such as adequate funding, a highly skilled and diverse workforce and an equity lens and tools. The interdependencies of the principles will need to be considered and balanced as we move forward.

Preliminary Decision: The Think Tank voted to recommend the *Guiding Principles v 3.0* to DEL with the changes made at the meeting - with the understanding that members will have the opportunity to review and confirm the final language prior to doing so.

A. *Comments on Guiding Principles*

Members made the following comments concerning the *Guiding Principles* in discussion and on worksheets.

1. Equity
   a. The following language was recommended and is included in the *Guiding Principles*: "Prioritize efforts with the greatest impact on closing gaps faced by culturally and linguistically diverse communities. These efforts should focus on removing barriers and building on the strengths of culturally diverse children, families and providers. Impacted communities should be consulted regarding identifying, developing and prioritizing approaches." (Note: income was intentionally not included here as it is considered a "given" since it is written in statue.)
   b. Equity is a P-12 issue and increasing P-12/school district collaboration would be beneficial.
   c. The principle should reflect that communities will be consulted in the decision-making.
   d. The workforce should reflect the populations served by ECEAP. Efforts to advance this should be data-informed.
   e. We will need mixed-income classrooms and a variety of funding streams to reach all children.

2. 90% Goal/Outcomes
   a. Gap closing is important and we do not want to back away from the goal.
   b. Shared measures and alignment are important. Add a footnote that kindergarten readiness is currently determined as meeting 6 out of the 6 WaKIDS domains.

    c. Reframe the principle to make it strengths-based.

    d. We need to innovate and look at new ratios and new models (for example part-day, full year or summer programming) to be successful.

    e. As new ECEAP providers and contractors begin delivering services, we need to monitor their program design and capacity, with special attention to smaller programs, to ensure quality.

    f. Recognize that the P-3 system is developing. We do not yet have a formal P-3 system.

3. Access at Entitlement

    a. Include vulnerable families as well as tribal entities and rural communities as examples of populations with unique characteristics.

    b. The term pathways used in the draft *Guiding Principles* needs to be defined.

4. Partnership and Collaboration.

    a. Change "support and partnership" to "partnership and agreement about the actions that we will take."

    b. Equity is a P-3 issue and increasing collaboration with K-12 schools would be beneficial.

    c. Include families and those with needed expertise as key partners.

    d. Being culturally responsive means that ECEAP programs need to reflect the communities that they serve.

    e. Pay inequity is a big issue.

    f. Be prepared to revisit regulations and alignment.

    g. Providers should reflect the communities that they serve.

    h. When we identify children with special needs, collaboration between ECEAP and the district is critical.

III. Maps

A. Introduction

Bea introduced draft "maps" for three of the big issues facing ECEAP expansion: workforce, facilities and right slot, right space. (Please see the accompanying introduction, definitions and maps that accompany this summary.) The maps are intended as tools to articulate and test the steps and actions that different players need to take, and the development work necessary to achieve our ultimate aim of having the right slot in the right space for all eligible children whose families choose to participate at entitlement. Each has:

- Steps. Sequenced "steps" toward expansion are shown across the top of each map.
- Actions. Actions required at each step are shown as noted in the map sections below.
- Key Issues. Key issues are highlighted on the reverse side of each map.
- Numbering. The numbering of actions (a, b, c, etc.) within each step is intended to facilitate discussion - not to suggest prioritization or sequencing.

B. Workforce Map

1. Comments on the Introduction.

    a. The *Workforce Map* shows actions for:

        ■ **ECE Professional Actions** - Actions that a student or current staff member (teacher, coach, instructional leader, family support worker, etc.) would take - from searching for a career through their education, hiring, retention and advancement - as an early childhood professional.

        ■ **DEL & System Partner Actions** - Actions that DEL and system partners (communities, SBCTC, CCA, ESD's, regional entities, contractors or others) would need to take at each step.

- ▪ **_Systems and Policy Development_** - Development and changes needed to attract, educate and retain an adequate number of skilled ECEAP teachers and staff.

b. At the end of some statements, the map step and action number associated with comments are noted. The following abbreviations are used.
- ▪ P = Provider
- ▪ SPA = System partner actions
- ▪ SPD = System and policy development

2. <u>Comments on Definitions.</u>

a. Add a definition of "qualified staff" referencing the *ECEAP Standards*. Include family support staff in the definition.

3. <u>Comments Steps.</u>

The following comments were offered on this section of the map.

a. It is important to note that the steps are not necessarily linear.
b. Consider broadening compensation to make it about support.

4. <u>Comments on Actions.</u>

The following comments were offered on this section of the map.

a. Market early childhood development as a career. It is being discouraged in some areas. (SPA & SPD)
b. Add more intentional effort to encourage staff advancement (e.g., encourage assistant teachers to become lead teachers). (3r.)
c. Add Action. Encourage parents to become teachers and staff. Create a pathway through community colleges (Could be a system comparable to Running Start) and partnerships so that parents interested in pursuing early childhood education careers are also exposed to Head Start. (Yakima Valley Community College offers stackable courses and brings the classes to high school students. Early results are showing that students are more successful. (SPA & SPD)
d. Look at compensation equity across different types of providers (district, private and non-profit) People in the community are doing the same work for vastly different levels of compensation. (SPA) *NOTE: This idea will be forwarded to the Early Childhood Workforce Council.)*
e. Emphasize family home child care providers. Are different methods and tools needed? (SPA)
f. Add family support staff to the definition of early childhood professionals. Add a focus on family support staff throughout the *Workforce Map*.
g. Make it easier for ECE students to access financial aid and academic advising. Seattle Community Colleges now have teachers help with these supports (from Dominique). There, teachers work with a cohort of students to advance:
  i. SPA, d (financial aid) and SPD, h, i & j (access to stackable credits, accessibility of coursework (e.g. distance learning) & competency assessment and equivalency.
  ii. Mismatch of scholarship and course offerings.
h. Expand scholarships and financial aid to pre-service workers (currently they are available only for Early Achievers. (SPA, d)
i. Align workforce and educational and professional development requirements for Early Achievers, ECEAP and Part B and C to increase ability to staff integrated classrooms. (Add to SPD)
j. Idea: Build more feedback and accountability into the teacher and family support student teaching/practicum process. How do we resource this? Might there be a stipend or STARS credits for leader teachers? Could there be a mentor teacher? (SPA, g).

    k.   Add culturally and "linguistically" supportive workplace. (SPA, j).

  5. <u>Comments on Issues.</u>

The following comments were offered on this section of the map.

    a.   Idea: Reduce barriers to the workforce's ability to move out of poverty such as ways for small providers and child care family homes to offer benefits to staff. Another example could be to provide opportunities for ECE professionals to receive forgivable loans and other types of non-compensation incentives.

    b.   Add: We need to find ways to help early childhood professionals be and feel more valued. Consider marketing as a method to increase respect for ECE professionals. Look at the NAEYC Power to the Profession Initiative.

    c.   Add: Forecast ECEAP workforce needs and availability. Consider partnering with and sharing resources to do this with OSPI.

    d.   Add. We need to recognize that the workforce mostly comes from similar backgrounds to the families that we serve. (ACES, poverty, etc.) and be responsive to that in our education system and program administrative approaches.

    e.   Explore different pathways for staff who have education/degrees similar to ECE but not the currently required degrees. (#6)

    f.   Add culturally and "linguistically" responsive workplaces to the title and throughout. Broaden the description to note that the workforce should be reflective of the communities that ECEAP serves. (#4 and throughout)

    g.   Add. Early childhood professionals are not on the list of acceptable career goals for TANF recipients as the field does not provide a living wage. Support and compensation for the field must be addressed.

C. Facilities Map
  1. <u>Comments on the Introduction.</u>
    a.   The *Facilities Map* shows actions for:
- **Provider Actions** - Actions that a provider (contractor, sub-contractor or other - TBD) would take, from considering facilities renovation or construction, through project completion.
- **System Partner Actions** - Actions that system partners (DEL, Department of Commerce, etc.) would need to take at each step. (This may be determined in legislation.)
- **Systems and Policy Development** - Development and changes needed to identify, fund and complete the right facility development projects in the places where they are needed.

    b.   At the end of most statements, the map step and action number associated with the comments are noted. The following abbreviations are used.
- P = Provider
- SPA = System provider actions
- SPD = System and policy development

  2. <u>Comments on Steps and Actions</u>

The following comments were offered on these sections of the map.

    a.   Acknowledge the need for multi-use facilities to be able to serve children and families where they are. (Provider 1a, SPD,1c, & e).

    b.   Define clearly how decisions will be made about conditions in communities (feasibility, etc.) (SPA 1 b &c)

c. Develop geomapping tool to see locations of eligible children and potential facilities. (SPA & SPD 1c)

d. Utilize variety of data to make decisions to inform need including Google maps. (see 1-c above) (SPA, a & b).

e. Prioritize projects based on short-term needs with an eye to growing the facilities fund (need to be successful and get some wins). (SPD,1i).

f. Need to create space for innovative models (at the contractor and site level) and ways to offer ECEAP beyond traditional facilities (add to issues list, too). (P c).

g. Add "across partnership entities" to Provider-e so that the requirement to secure facilities matching funds is not all on the provider.

h. System partner actions. Highly important, strong emphasis needed on this action, particularly the local partnership element as there are so many entities and components involved in this work.
   ▪ *DEL guidance* about what local entities and steps should be involved would be helpful.

3. Comments on Issues.

The following comments were offered on this section of the map.

a. To understand the need for facilities, we need a local-level community-based focus with key partners and all voices at the table using data to get clear about where slots are needed. (#'s 1, 3, 4, 9)

b. Continue to define the role of DEL, Commerce and CDFIs in providing TA and supports. (#2)

c. Be sure to call out public and private in addition to state and local partners in considering ownership interests. (#5)

d. Add something about the importance of managing the fine print, intricacies, etc. (#5)

e. Emphasize the importance of aligning state, county and local building codes and permitting processes. (#7)

f. Cost allocation will be key. (#8)

g. Add: Need to continue to formalize WaKIDS throughout ECEAP expansion and strengthen P-3 partnerships. (#9)

h. Add fiscal sustainability. Where does the money come from to sustain initial projects? What are the issues to consider here (traffic impact fees, maintenance, parking, etc.)?

D. Right Slot, Right Place Map

1. Comments on the Introduction.

a. The *Right Slot, Right Place Map* shows actions for:
   ▪ **Contractor and Provider Actions** - Actions a new, or continuing contractor or subcontractor would take from considering ECEAP to providing high-quality ECEAP services
   ▪ **System Partner Actions** - Actions that DEL would need to take (in concert with communities, contractors, regional entities or other system partners) at each step.
   ▪ **Systems and Policy Development** - Development and changes needed to attract, identify, prepare and support new providers in providing high-quality ECEAP services.

b. At the end of some statements, the map step and action number associated with the comments are noted. The following abbreviations are used.
   ▪ P = ECEAP contractors and providers
   ▪ SPA = DEL/System provider actions
   ▪ SPD = System and policy development

2. Comments on Steps and Actions.

The following comments were offered on this section of the map.

a. Add a Step – create a longer runway ("Explore interest and fit of ECEAP with business plans"). Focus on interest and readiness (i.e., trends, community need assessment, affiliation of providers) and building of specialization and capacity (in communities and individuals). (P2, SPA,2 , SPD)

b. Establish a readiness system focused on more readiness steps with supports along the way. (SPA,2)

c. Utilize community convening approaches, like the *Rural Home Visiting Model*. (SPA, a)

d. Add Action. Drive saturation study to be more locally sensitive so that we know where the children are now. (SPA, a)

e. Sequence/align demand, expansion, interest in tackling expansion, and assurance that the right model slots will be available at the right time. There is a mismatch between planned expansion and legislative decisions. Potential providers ready to build/expand a certain model might not be awarded slots for that model in the necessary timeframe. Perhaps the forecasting tool can help align legislative requests and expansion plans. (SPA, c)

f. Providers need more support for start-up. (P, h, SPA, g)

g. Consider separating current and potential contractors/providers maps. (P, c)

h. More practicum options (and state and system support). (P, 2, SPA, 2)

i. We need a way to know family needs and preferences regarding preschool options (Perhaps there is a way for them to self-declare during subsidy application (note: subsidy applications are currently done through DSHS), survey current ECEAP families with younger children, add to Child Profile, or learn through their peers). The methods will need to be flexible since parent needs and interests may change. (SPD)

j. Sabbatical/substitutes to allow family child care home providers to explore and prepare to become an ECEAP provider. (SPD, l)

k. We need to figure out how best to prepare for fluctuation in populations and family demand (yet desire for full enrollment) for ECEAP and Head Start, particularly in small communities. Consider tiered eligibility between Head Start and ECEAP. (SPA, a)

l. Consider expanding the role (and paying) of parent ambassadors to include recruitment of families. Focus on places where likely eligible families are (domestic violence shelters, WIC centers, La Raza, etc.). (SPD)

3. Comments on Issues

The following comments were offered on this section of the map.

a. It is important to retain Working Connections Child Care eligibility to maintain current full-day and extended-day models. (#7)

b. Different economics of child care and family child care homes drive different decisions. (#6)

c. Create system/ incentives to spur affiliation, which might allow DEL to realize efficiencies. (#10)

d. Bonds initially backed by private investors such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and other foundations. (#5)

e. A longer time is needed for exploration and preparation to expand thoughtfully. (#6)

f. Current saturation study does not address: (#3)
   i. Needs of high demand communities within low demand counties.
   ii. Broader sets of issues in communities (e.g., drug abuse rates).
   iii. Situations where there is no other child care in the community (perhaps it should rate rural and remote differently).
   iv. Other capacity (e.g., Seattle Pre-K, Tacoma School District's Title I preschools).

      g.   We need a way to reach prioritized populations that are not reached in other institutions (for example domestic violence, child welfare or homeless shelters) like families living in cars and moving around (particularly in rural areas). Relationship/peer connections is a good way to reach these disconnected families. (#3)

      h.   Provide more funding, technical assistance and coaching to help ECEAP contractors work with licensed child care, especially child care family homes. (#10)

      i.   More support is needed to help family child care move along the continuum from licensing to Early Achievers rating to becoming an ECEAP provider. (#3)

      j.   Look at ways to provide flexible year-to-year and sustained capacity. (#3)

      k.   Local community planning and service coordination (also manage full enrollment requirements). (#10)

IV. Other

Additional comments are summarized below.

A. *Suggested Additions to Think Tank Membership*

1. Redouble efforts to include families in the Think Tank.
2. Add more higher education representation.

B. *Comments for DEL*

1. There is a concern regarding the disconnect between the data preschool teachers are seeing and the data that kindergarten teachers (curriculum-based?) are using to determine kindergarten readiness.
2. We need cross training with ECEAP and kindergarten (and beyond) teachers on TS GOLD® and other topics to strengthen the P-3 system. The *P-3 Framework* and tools are useful, but alone they are not enough to achieve alignment and progress for kids, families and professionals.
3. It will be important for DEL to communicate clearly about shifts in structure and roles as changes take place, including the transition to the Department of Children, Youth and Families.

V. Meeting Evaluation

Participants offered the following ideas about what worked well and what could be changed to help the meetings be more productive.

What Worked Well	What Could Be Changed
Materials sent ahead of time.	Time was short. We could make the meetings longer and perhaps have a brown bag lunch with the Contracting Work Group in-between the two meetings.
Use of PowerPoint slides to orient us to content.	Consider subgroups working in the meeting to cover more material.
Facilitator adjusted well.	Do we have the right mix of people? Consider additional invitations.

VI. Next Steps

1. <u>Guiding Principles</u>. We will incorporate today's comments into the next version of the *Guiding Principles*. The updated version will be included with the *Meeting Summary*. If substantive comments are received, we will work towards agreement by e-mail. If no substantive comments are received by within five working days, the *Guiding Principles* will be forwarded to DEL for consideration and action.
2. <u>Outline of the *ECEAP Expansion Plan*</u>. We will e-mail the *Expansion Plan Outline* to Think Tank members for their comment as we did not get to this during the meeting. Thoughts about the audience, the proposed structure and whether there is anything unnecessary or missing would be helpful.
3. <u>July Meeting</u>. The July meeting will be held on July 19 at the Red Lion Sea Tac Hotel where the May meeting was held.