

Topic	Discussion	Next Steps
<p>Welcome, Introductions</p> <p>Meeting was called to order at 11:00 AM</p>	<p>Working Group members: Jim Fitzpatrick, Sarah Teel, Ginny Burley, Harry Frank, Barb Russ, Karen Scott, Holly Morehouse, Brian Campion (phone), Tom Alderman, Dave Gurtman, Ann Manwaring, Katie Mobley</p> <p>Also present: Marjorie Zunder, Emanuel Betz, Amy Shollenberger, Dawn Muskowitz, Sabina Haskell, Matt Levin</p> <p>Unable to attend: Karen Heath (NOTE: Karen Heath has decided not to continue on the committee as she is not able to make the meetings.)</p>	<p><i>Handouts will all be posted online after today's meeting.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Past meeting notes approved</i></p>
<p>Meeting minutes</p>	<p>Rich with discussion – HM ran through last meeting – noted speakers. TA noted 120 hours of seat time Today – draft for the ELO recommendations need to be fairly firm today.</p>	<p><i>Motion Barb, Ginny – accepted minutes</i></p>
<p>NOTES From aligned meetings</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HM met with Stewart Comstock Gay – see NOTES provided dated September 14, 2015</li> <li>2. HM, DG – VT Children’s Trust Foundation – tasked for innovative activities falling under a broad umbrella of prevention.</li> <li>3. United Way handout of RBA results – evaluation outcomes</li> <li>4. HM and HF met with Helen Beattie – UP with Learning Idea of sequencing – development of goals and skills that create the ability for a youngster to be an independent learner. Passion vs. Curiosity Graduation</li> </ol> <p>BC – going forward there may be partnerships that we can consider – especially for high school students. Anything we can do to bring young people out of poverty is important. 60% of young people in Bennington area are living in poverty.</p>	<p><i>Notes will be posted on working group website</i></p> <p><i>Helen Beattie may be able to meet with this group in November</i></p>
<p>Systems Concern</p>	<p>AM – concerned about adding more costs to school systems. Problem solving – this is a systems change vs. a problem to be solved. Continuous Improvement – how do we grow the good things that are going on – how can this become a driver around the state?</p>	
<p>DRAFT- ELO Special Fund Report</p>	<p>The goal of this time was to review and revise the draft ELO Special Fund report. Edits were made on the working document by HM. Notes below may be duplicative.</p> <p>Page 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More clearly reference work that is being done and focused by the State in Education</li> <li>• Consider adding an intro for this to set big picture</li> </ul>	<p><i>Add more data to this where appropriate</i></p> <p><i>Add more context to the work that needs to be done.</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating opportunities for state leadership – the state DOES need to take a role at creating the importance of an issue – and public/partnerships             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State leadership – establishing standards, creating opportunities</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Page 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of purpose – perhaps add a section about how we get there. The fund is for those for students without a place to go – see definition from Act 48. Clarified definition</li> <li>• Allowable uses moved up: Allowable – encourage and expand information and to share the information between programs for program improvement, recognition.</li> <li>• Allowable uses of funds for system support: Adding PD &amp; Assessment? Were in original bill. How does this work within this Fund? Added 3% for the first; limited to \$5000/grants....annually</li> <li>• Other entities could take part in this with PD or TA in mind.</li> <li>• Independent schools – already included</li> <li>• Add business – or for profit? Could a local business take on 5 students for this? Added businesses.</li> <li>• Added high school to target populations and program types</li> <li>• Priorities - are these in order of preference? Is this a hierarchy? Priority considerations from there were switched around.</li> </ul> <p>Page 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee: confirmed that a committee should exist. As presented – too big for the role. Should these be separated? Continuation of this advocacy work, and the ELO fund.</li> <li>• Administer/fiduciary to AOE; discussed structure of Working Lands – pulls together a larger representation of organizations. The AOE has fiduciary responsibility.</li> <li>• PreK-16 Council – similar to the make-up of the Council.</li> <li>• Discussion – actual size of group, setting up the fund, keeping in the state leadership piece. Consider sub-committee. Recommend broad group for policy, vision, \$\$, and a sub-group (5-7) for actual grant decisions and work. Membership make-up discussed.</li> <li>• Community vs. legislators.... Bringing other people into this process. Discussion of purpose and how groups work toward a focus.</li> <li>• Funding goals – from draft; Match ties to the \$\$ that would go out from the Fund – Role of public and private funding. Grant review process would have to make the determination if a match is included is actually going to help the program in the way it says it would.</li> <li>• State has to put in \$ if this initiative is to go through</li> <li>• 10 million (5 million \$ and 5 million in match) = funding goal = would create full</li> </ul>	<p><i>Added placeholder for improving quality of programs and channeling information</i></p> <p><i>Add source for required program elements</i></p> <p><i>Tom will have the conversations with the Secretary of AOE due to changes in AOE structure.</i></p> <p><i>Add someone to the committee from private funders</i></p> <p><i>Brian will work with Holly to investigate larger, out-of-state funders that might be interested in making a difference</i></p> <p><b><i>Draft will be sent to you with a deadline for comments!</i></b></p>
--	--	--

	<p>afterschool and summer programs in all communities with the least 60% free or reduced proceed lunch rates at a comprehensive level of programming.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELO Fund – can set up private and public funds</li> <li>• How much money is needed? The state has to be a leader and a player in this or it won't work, private need to be invested in this or it won't work. A local match will come into this as well.</li> <li>• Role of the agency – leave the language as is, let the Secretary of Ed. react to it.</li> <li>• Discussion continued on this about where the actual funding will come from.</li> <li>• Reflect back to clear gaps in access to afterschool and summer learning.</li> <li>• Pragmatism – what is realistic vs. what would take care of the problem. Similar train of thought as what the PreK went through; argument was something similar in ASP.</li> </ul>	
DRAFT – Recommendations for PLP	Did not address during this meeting - tabled	<i>Passed out; review and take on next week</i>
DRAFT – Status Report for PreK Council Mtg	Did not address during this meeting.	<i>Comment; will be revised.  To be presented by Holly next week at PreK meeting</i>
Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full PK16 Council meeting September 21- ELO Working Group will need to do a report out at this meeting on progress to date</li> <li>• <b>October 13, 2015 in 11 – 3 pm Ethan Allen Room</b></li> </ul>	<i>Holly will send a doodle for the November meeting</i>