

HB 516 Workgroup: June 8, 2017 Meeting

Notes From Small Discussion Groups

FORMING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF  
PREK EXPANSION IN MARYLAND

Topic 1: Governance – Create Local Plan, Program Decision Making,  
Monitor Implementation of PreK

**Option 1 -**

MSDE – should govern, there has previously been issues with school system collaboration with child care providers- should/needs requires MSDE oversight.

County – collaboration locally

PreK Supervisor → Instructional specialist → Cluster Model → local ECAC or Principals/PreK teacher/community based programs

Counties could send proposals to MSDE for all plans and get approval so the plans would be completely locally planned.

**Option 2 –**

Regional office → Boards per county with all stakeholders – these two groups would share financial responsibility.

PreK Expansion model – LEAs, local ECACs report

MSDE varied models based on LEAs – LEAs would create a plan to submit

IEP students should be added to plans

**Option 3 –**

Key Idea – LEA must be included in MOU with local ECAC required to take a role in evaluating PreK and reporting to state ECAC.

MSDE as oversight with a partnership with LEA – LEA is a bureaucracy and takes a long time to get decisions and answers.

Can't do it without LEA as oversight. Taking the money out of the LEA would be a disconnect.

It does create a layer but there is a lot of focus on local control.

LEA needs to develop a plan with MOU process and MSDE should guide the plans and monitor the plans to expand capacity funding mechanism and streams.

MSDE should be required to monitor (It falls under general supervision of LEA).

Make it a charge that local ECAC must take a role in evaluating the local PreK programs and report back to the state ECAC to do the reporting.

#### **Option 4 –**

Local – Create a group, maybe from existing ECAC people.

Monitoring – state level oversight.

Build on existing Title I relationships already in place with non-public schools

Concern that public school systems may not want to be the ones to pass on funding (management, etc.)

In the legislation – very clear expectations, language to require school systems to work with non-public and community based- minimum percentage. Need professional development.

If school system is involved in governance, then they may want some say in program decisions. Will everyone accept EXCELS as the measure of quality?

Monitoring is already in place: accrediting body, licensing, Maryland EXCELS, school system/school board

Solid MOU in place between all parties, connection to LEA Master Plan that is already reviewed by MSDE. PreK must have maximum and minimum requirements, consideration of administrative costs in each region. Making sure school system is meeting Kirwan Commission requirements.

#### **Option 5 –**

Local collaborative group with representatives from private preschools, community based child care, Head Start, public school, etc. → plan approval by MSDE. PreK students will apply at their home elementary school and then be referred to a placement.

Create paid positions within each county for administration – size of county would determine number of staff needed. Because of differences in each county, they would best know how to determine needs of county/distinct area.

The group/person to determine child placement should be a new position.

## Topic 2: Funding Flow – Funding Model, Accountability

### Option 1 -

Child care centers, local ECAC, and schools – resource and referral

Who does RFP? Accountability and modeling.

Per child funding needs to increase – LEA and family sliding scale

### Option 2 –

Up/increase flat funding by child- look at cost.

State → public school district (PreK department - early childhood person) and private community programs receive grants from MSDE (continue the model we currently have). The RFP process will ensure that the strongest applicants are serving the PreK students.

Set a cost per child.

If local ECAC was functioning, they could be the local collaborative.

MSDE could accept plans sent in with the district plans and then get approval.

Would vouchers for students be considered?

### Option 3 –

Children with IEP need to be counted in with FARMS count.

Federal, state, local, family sliding scale to pay for PreK.

Should flow to LEA and then to PreK.

Funding mechanism: funding from MSDE – then to LEA – then to PreK programs.

Would there be a sliding family scale?

Early Intervention- can be paid for by up to 20% by state funds – currently state is funding less about 13% - need more money for early intervention.

Children with IEP are required by IDEA to be given free public school in least restrictive environment. Maryland is not in compliance.

Public PreK at 185% may be at risk young children with IEP are at risk.

Funds follow child into inclusive setting. Important – funding comes from special ed to LEA with automatic federal funding.

How many 4 year olds got services publicly and how many kindergartners got no services before Kindergarten?

The 2014 Act – a child with special needs will be eligible regardless of income and must be included in the count because they must get a free and appropriate public education in least restrictive environment with their peers.

Increase flat funding.

RFPs use ECACs to distribute funds or R and Rs or LEAs.

MOUs could be monitorable.

Important to have accountability of funding.

#### **Option 4 –**

Funding – from State to each county or LEA or Board of representatives

OR

From State to regional office to counties to public and private PreK programs.

Reporting documents for accountability – paid county positions that answer to MSDE (newly created office).

#### **Option 5 –**

School system as keeper of funds and distributor with clear direction.

County government doesn't have established relationship with MSDE.

### Topic 3: Capacity Building – Professional Development, Program Quality

#### **Option 1 –**

Working with child care providers.

PreK programming PD could be done at county and invite private and vice versa.

ECAC organizes PD with community and public schools.

All inclusive PD invite, and anyone can join (both private and public providers)

System standards (accreditation) – state wide.

#### **Option 2 –**

Family child care should be included – there are over 6,000 family providers with over 50,000 children. The state should monitor, then LEAs should do the leg work and be motivated to reach out to centers and family providers to help create capacity. LEA must be convinced to do this.

Moving forward in future all settings must be at EXCELS 5. If we keep EXCELS level 5 as required how do we get more than 10% which is where we are now?

If LEA provides a certified teacher that can teach at child care in centers/family child care – fastest way to get the program to level 5. One certified teacher could oversee more than one classroom or family child care. Public LEA pays for the teacher so they get compensation and benefits. Credentialing/professional development fund helps pay for PD. LEAs should invite all child care to in-service training.

#### **Option 3 –**

Consistent high standards are across board.

Streamline a structure to consolidate/crosswalk across various accreditations.

Put a certified public school in every center – would give equal compensation.

Shared PD.

#### **Option 4 –**

ECAC as valuable knowledge resource.

Be mindful of how many entities are monitoring – how many visits, how many sets of standards to meet and possible conflicts/implications.

June 8, 2017

Require a minimum percentage of community based organizations involved in PreK delivery.

Consider the ramifications for after school or wrap around care for additional PreK children, also transportation.

Consideration to build workforce.

Cultural considerations.

### **Option 5 –**

High standards must be consistent across the board for all programs.

Anyone that gets funding should meet the same high quality standards to prepare children and give same readiness skills. Can programs submit application for funding? Provided based on qualifications of program? Different amount to programs?

Can we start phasing in with a half day program? or

Are we phasing in experience for every child? or

Increasing experience for low income? Or

Hybrid?

FARMS – full day? Other children – half day?

How can we hold a public school teacher floating accountable?

Professional development needs to utilize mentorship, observing, reflection