

Topic	Discussion	Next Steps
<p>Welcome, Introductions</p> <p>Meeting was called to order at 10:07</p> <p>Attendees</p>	<p>Working Group members: Ann Manwaring, Katie Mobley, Sarah Teel, Ginny Burley, Harry Frank, Barb Russ, Karen Scott, Holly Morehouse, Brian Campion, Tom Alderman</p> <p>Also present: Ethan Latour, Amy Shollenberger, Cindy Metcalf, Marjorie Zunder</p> <p>Unable to attend: Karen Heath, Jim Fitzpatrick, Lisa Ventriss (temporary designee for VT Business Roundtable)</p> <p>Working group members each introduced who they are, and gave a brief overview of their work and interest in this committee.</p> <p>Holly was unanimously voted in as chair of the working group.</p>	<p>We're expecting one new member to come on board; Lisa Ventriss is working on finding a VT Business Roundtable member to serve on the group</p> <p><i>Update (7/14): Dave Gurtman, Director at Dinse Knapp & McAndrew will be joining the Working Group</i></p>
<p>What worked well last year?</p>	<p>(roundtable discussion)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last year's report was successful and we were asked to pursue the work again this year. • Keeping grounded, developing and keeping in mind common definitions • Use of chunks of time • Outside testimony • Useable and complete notes from each session • Early drafts were presented and discussed; gave starting point for discussions so weren't always working from a blank slate • Takeaways from each meeting; planning for the next before we left. • Change: Keeping in mind that our needs may evolve • Keep in mind: How do we tie the work we do back to the people that do that work? How do we link the programs that do well in one area and reach out to others? Messaging? 	<p>NA</p>

<p>Charge 1 – Act 48 (actual bills, 48 and 391, were sent prior to meeting)</p>	<p>Discussed the process we went through last year and how that work carried over into the legislative session. Last week of the session was a major lift –House Ed committee moved the ELO language out of H. 391 into H.480 (now Act 48). The language that was pulled out is on page 6 of Act 48.</p> <p>Charge #1- This working group is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) develop recommendations for how to award funding B) develop recommendations for how to build the fund (may also solicit grants, contributions, or donations) <p>Due Date: November 15 – report by Secretary of AOE to House and Senate Ed. Committees</p> <p>Discussion and questions about this first charge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (TA) what is meant by “structured program?” – intentional, designed, leadership, serving children on a regular basis, comprehensive – serving multiple needs. Recognizing the different types of programs for different grade levels; came back at the end to understanding that there has to be some kind of program or structure in place in order to award funds (can’t be to an individual student per se) • Looked at Afterschool Alliance as a program structure model that was actually included in H.391. This model clearly outlines the key elements of a quality Expanded Learning Opportunity. That work has already been done and summarized and we can use that base. • (TA, AM, BC) State appropriation model was not approved last year; Fund can accept both public and private dollars. Has the potential to be a private public partnership – Clean Water fund, GMO fund, etc. have a such model • (BC, KM) If a private corp. gives money, what is the payback? What is the role of the administration? Is soliciting funds using state dollars a conflict? A bill has been drafted in the legislature to look at ethics of this type of situation. • (HF) Education Quality Standards; where have we been up to this point? Noted that ELO’s show up in different ways throughout the standards. Schools can be anchored in Act 77 (TA). 	<p>Nov 15 – Report by Secretary of AOE due to House and Senate Ed. Committees.</p> <p>Clarify what is meant by structured program. Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we think about the differences between elementary vs. high school structure? • Can we include internships, ways to increase employment opportunities for students? • Age range? Student-directed? • Is there an age at which students would be considered too old? <p>HM will go back to the original legislation and draft an outline for what types of programs would be eligible.</p> <p>Have someone come in from the Keurig partnership. Also someone from the administration – how did they go through the process? What can we learn from that model and others like it?</p>
---	---	--

<p>Charge 2 - PK-16 Council</p>	<p>Charge #2- Personalized Learning Plans and Proficiency-Based Graduation Requirements and how that relates to out-of-school time activities</p> <p>Schools have a lot to deal with – PreK, ELT, EQR – what are the connections to out-of-school activities?</p> <p>Recommendations – we should focus on what can happen in the short run? (AM) this will smooth out over time and get up to speed.</p>	<p>Potential Testimony: Amy Fowler – developing EQR Team; Donna W – Nellie Mae Funding; K. Kesson – PLP development around the state.</p>
<p>Design Elements of the ELO Special Fund</p>	<p>ELO Special Fund- Discussion of structure and potential issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (AM) more bang for the buck; bringing more low income kids into the programs. Need to be clear with the mission statement. • (BR) can be an equity issue – those who do not have access due to working poor. • (ST) Who can we bring in who isn't able to access quality programs – those with no programs, those in areas who have programs that they can't afford. Where are students dropping off due to funding issues? Vermont Afterschool has maps on access and quality. • (HM) families needed to pay for 15 hours of ASP/Summer for students who want it. \$311 spent per week by families on ASP/Summer. • (AM) have a philosophical, broad goal that increasing access to high quality programs; capacity. STARS, sustainability, develop models that can be shared • (BR) Improve program quality; this is not a priority for everyone on committee but all agreed that it played an important role. Increasing access may be the priority but we need to make sure that we are increasing access to quality programs, not just any programs. • (HF) what defines the outcome? • (HM) what if we have no programs in a community? Start-ups should be OK • (KM) leveraging funds to increase sustainability • (BC) where do we get funds from? • (BC) A 501 c 3 may be offer more access to tax deductions for funders. This committee has a wider perspective which is good. • (HM) is it only schools? How do we structure it if we allow entities other than schools to apply? • Creating a clear message that will solicit strong applicants. Focus on specific outcomes (HF) • Transportation – supporting students? Budget relief? Needs to be worked out in criteria • Gaps – within funding of programs, areas not qualified for programs, areas without capacity. • Quality improvements • Sustain an existing program • Tiered model for funding that reflects range of priorities 	<p>Craft a well-defined message about what the fund is meant to do. Most of this can be pulled from the work from last year.</p> <p>Point to models of best practice; make sure we are funding quality programs; Vermont Afterschool has done a lot of work in this area</p> <p>Idea to bring in reps from Foundations and/or business for a roundtable discussion with us about what the program would need to look like in order to attract private supporters.</p> <p>How do we organize ourselves to be effective in raising and managing funds?</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the discussion about low income on target as a priority? What is the impact of focusing on low-income students? There exists an inequity of access that we want to address but we may not want to create programs that serve only low-income students. • In the context of quality – what does diversity mean and how does it fit in there? Don't want to set up something that creates inequity. • What are the targets for the program? Student participation and outcomes. Measure social and emotional development, not only academic outcomes. • Keep this committee focused on people that are involved in the work. <p>General agreement in the group that the Fund should be used for any of the following, recognizing that limited funds will force a prioritization among these potential uses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Increasing participation in an existing program (especially for students who qualify for free or reduced price lunch) 2) Starting a new ELO program 3) Making quality improvements to an existing program 4) Providing transportation for students to a program when the program is located offsite from the school 5) Sustaining an existing program, such as one receiving 21st CCLC funding 	
<p>Program Administration of the ELO Special Fund</p>	<p>Committee – role, membership, oversee the fund. Original H. 391 laid out membership – pg. 3 of H. 391 bill. This working group is now charged with making the recommendation on membership and structure.</p> <p>Purposely set up to be able to include different voices. That diversity of viewpoints and voices is very important. Other potential members to consider if this becomes a permanent committee to oversee the ELO Fund:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member from appropriations • Parent voice • Student voice • Needs to include expertise of fundraising on the committee • Community foundation, philanthropist, business, workforce investment board • Could VCF be involved somehow <p>Going back to the responsibility of this group: What do we need to do this first year to get things started? Think about a one-year framework; what area the tasks that need to be accomplished?</p>	<p>HM will create a draft document to outline the group's first cut at recommendations for both program design and administration.</p> <p>Finalize the task list and develop a plan for tackling each item in the time given between now and October/November.</p>

	<p>Tasks in Year One – potential framework:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Create pithy message from last year’s work 2) Clarify what is meant by structured programs 3) Identify target populations/program types if there are any (e.g., low income) 4) Define expected outcomes for those receiving funds 5) Define quality; refer to Afterschool Alliance’s eight areas 6) Decide where committee lives; what is the relationship between the committee and the AOE? 7) Outline the basics of what it looks like going forward into the future with a mix of public-private support 8) Solicit seed money to get the fund started 9) Define how much needs to be raised to meet yearly targets for granting. 10) Create a report for AOE Secretary (with sufficient time for her review/discussion before the November 15th deadline) 	
<p>Brainstorm for next meeting</p>	<p>At next meeting; who should be hear from? Could be 1-1 conversations? Roundtable Discussion Group (prep before) potential members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stewart/VCF and/or other private foundations/ philanthropists • Keurig and/or Governor’s office • Businesses not from Chittenden County (BC and AM will send ideas) • Mark Avery? – board member, Lake Morey owner 	<p>HM will contact the Governor’s chief of staff to discuss the Keurig set-up</p> <p>If others want to have those conversations, please coordinate with HM</p>
<p>Outside ELO Providers</p>	<p>Tom gave an overview of the work with ELO Providers work. Would like to see us define the fund in a way that keeps the flexibility for high-school programs and Flexible Pathways connections.</p>	<p>Define what this will look like at the high school level.</p> <p>Consider standards for high quality programs.</p>
<p>Outcomes for the ELO Special Fund</p>	<p>Discussion about expected outcomes for recipients and other related funding questions that arose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the outcomes and how are we (and any grantees) going to get there? • How do we foster real ownership of outcomes? • How would you pick the 10 out of 50 awardees? Let people sell their programs. How can we shake things up? • What won’t we fund? Need to be very clear. Need to get as specific as possible. • Keeping ideas for grants broad in order to encourage innovative programs while also supporting efforts to meet the greatest need (i.e., access to quality programs afterschool and over the summer) • Fiduciary requirement will be needed. 	<p>NA</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to refer back to the original legislation to clarify our charge and the original intention for the ELO Fund. • Discussion of dosage, who can be funded, interpretation about children and youth, must happen outside the school day, • Intentional learning that happens externally – having that link back and be recognized as useful learning in an academic environment. • Can we fund services in addition to what schools can provide? Or are we offering something not already available? Is it both? Agreement that can be both but that it has to be outside the regular school day (i.e., afterschool, weekend, summer, etc.). It is not meant to fund things that a school is already expected to be doing for all students during the course of a regular school day or year. • Reminder that where children and youth fall behind is with the opportunity gap that occurs outside of school. That’s what this fund was set up to address. 	
Next Meeting	July 30 – continue discussion on the fund; review the draft documents generated from this meeting; may start to bring in discussion of PLP depending on time and availability of witnesses/guests	