



Utah School Readiness Board

Meeting Minutes

<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/sitemap/notice/868877.html>

Wednesday, November 15, 2023

1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

Location: Department of Workforce Services
720 South 200 East
SLC, UT 84111
Conference Room 100

The following link will take you to the power point which was shared throughout the meeting which may be helpful while reading through the minutes: <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1043593.pdf>

Link to the agenda:

<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1043591.pdf>

Link to the audio recording:

<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1048373.m4a>

Board Member Attendees: Jeremias Solari, Rebecca Banner, Trent Kaufman, Linda Chadburn, Seung- Hee Claire Son, Amy Terpstra, Jared Lisonbee for Jennifer Thronsden, Jamie Bitton

Excused Board Members: Annie Frazier, Marie Steffensen

Other Attendees: Ashley Trujillo, Megan Vlaming, Samantha Mafua, Lindsey Hamburger, Charlotte Tanner, Kimber Burks, Paul Mueller, Jon Collins, JoEllen Robbins, Fran Schumann, Elliot Lawrence, Katrina Herd, Cristina Barrera, SLC

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTION
Welcome	I. Jeremias Solari welcomed the group. A. <i>The following link will take you to the power point which was shared</i>	

	<p><i>throughout the meeting which may be helpful while reading through the minutes: https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1043593.pdf</i></p>	
Approval of Minutes	<p>I. Approval of 9/6/2023 drafted meeting minutes</p>	<p>Jeremias Solari called for a motion to approve the draft meeting minutes. Rebecca Banner made a motion to approve 9/6/23 meeting minutes. Linda Chadburn seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously. Minutes approved.</p>
SY 2025 Grant Application Review	<p>-Kimber Burks</p> <p>I. There have been changes since the last meeting.</p> <p>A. The RFGA for the Extended Student Access Grant has been reviewed, approved and is going out next week. It will be released with a letter of intent.</p> <p>B. The School Readiness team and Kimber are working on the RFGA documents and packet for the Becoming High Quality, which will be officially released in January.</p> <p>C. Upon receiving the letter of intent and getting a list of those who need ECERS 3 observations, the team will start completing those for those on ESA, both for returning grantees, and also any new applicants.</p> <p>D. Becoming High Quality, ESA New and ESA returning will occur at the same time this year, which is a little bit different than how it's looked in years past. We'll do all evaluations at the same time.</p> <p>II. To view the SY 2024 grant application release process and monthly application timeline please go to https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1043593.pdf</p> <p>III. The Scoring Process</p> <p>A. The new applicant total score is going to be different due to the reapplication process being different for returning grantees.</p> <p>B. The scoring threshold will still be at least 60%.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p>I. Jeremias asked if the scoring will be rounded up or down?</p> <p>A. Kimber answered it is rounded to the 10th.</p> <p>B. Megan stated it can range 0-10 and can go in .5 increments.</p> <p>II. Amy Terpstra asked what the scoring threshold is?</p> <p>A. Kimber answered that we have been using a 60% threshold and the applicants need to receive a 63% to get the right scoring. Rebecca added</p>	

	<p>they need to get 60% to be considered and does not guarantee they will be funded.</p> <p>III. Amy Terpstra asked if it was something the board made or staff? A. Rebecca Banner answered that it is something set in place for DWS grants.</p> <p>IV. Linda Chadburn asked is the overall ECERS score their average? A. Kimber answered; yes.</p> <p>V. Jamie Bitton asked if the practice ECRES scores count? A. Megan answered; no it will need to be an official observation.</p> <p>VI. Rebecca Banner made a comment that she appreciates the team for going through all the options.</p>	
USBE Annual Report and Budget Update	<p>-Jonathan Collins</p> <p>I. The first slide shows the FY23 expenditures. To view this please go to https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1043593.pdf</p> <p>II. The second slide shows the following items: A. Compares high quality, non- high quality, and the state average. B. Literacy is usually lower at this stage.</p> <p>III. Jared Lisonbee asked to take into consideration the number of the at-risk students that are included due to the higher number of at-risk students enrolled, which will affect the average.</p> <p>IV. The number of PEEP participants tested has gone up each year.</p> <p>V. KEEP entry for proficiency is staying steady.</p> <p>VI. Post pandemic participants are going down.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p>I. Jeremias asked what type of quality is included? A. Jonathan answered that they are public school programs that have not enrolled in our program.</p> <p>II. Rebecca asked if they are private providers? A. Jonathan answered they are not due to enrollment and private records are not given.</p> <p>III. Jamie Bitton asked if private providers are included? A. Jonathan they are not due to no PEEP scores collected.</p> <p>IV. Jeremias Solari asked how many students of the age for PEEP? A. Jonathan answered that public data from preschools are limited.</p> <p>V. Rebecca Banner asked if they have seen any change for the children after COVID?</p>	

	<p>A. Jonathan answered we started in 2021 so all students were impacted and we would not be able to see any difference.</p> <p>VI. Rebecca asked if there is a decrease or increase in enrollments this year than previous years in relation to KEEP?</p> <p>A. Jonathan answered it all depends on the duration of the time they are enrolled.</p>	
ECERS-3 Observation	<p>-Jared Lisonbee</p> <p>I. Each program is observed by School Readiness, OCC, USBE, so we can get a reliable view on the program.</p> <p>II. Potential and eligible students are entered in the system.</p> <p>III. Observations have started and more will be done in the first part of the new year.</p> <p>IV. To view additional information presented during this section please go to the Slide Show found at https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1043593.pdf.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p>	
Identified 2024 SR Board Meeting Dates	<p>-Megan Vlaming</p> <p>I. To view the dates please go to https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1043593.pdf.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p>I. Jared Lisonbee asked historically they have met in May, will the April 17 meeting be after scoring for grantees?</p> <p>A. Megan answered Yes.</p> <p>II. Rebecca Banner asked if the statute requires quarterly meetings?</p> <p>A. Megan answered it does not.</p>	
Grant Limits for Becoming High Quality	<p>-Megan Vlaming</p> <p>I. Asked by a member of the public to consider the topic presented for this section. To view this topic please go to page 4 of the meeting material found at https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1043593.pdf.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p>I. Jeremias asked for context.</p> <p>A. Megan Vlaming provided context that Becoming High Quality grantees are currently limited to only three years. And we see staff turnover, programmatic turnover, programmatic shift and changes to the program than was originally receiving the Becoming High Quality grant. Within that three-year time limit, it may look different today than it did</p>	<p>Megan Vlaming called for a motion for grant limits. Rebecca Banner motioned for it to be opened up for discussion. Jeremias Solari seconded. Motion passed unanimously.</p>

previously. If they were on it at the beginning of the or the inception of this program, which was in 2015 then they have expended that ability to be able to get this funding and may still want to build on that quality. The question is being asked, is it available for us to be able to change that rule? Right now there is a space in board motion that says that they're limited to three years, but the board has the ability to make that change. The biggest consensus is the understanding that these programs do look different. It doesn't matter if it's an LEA or private provider, every year looks different to these programs. Is a limit on this funding actually fair to those programs?

- II. Rebecca Banner asked if the plan was for the program to receive funding then move up to an ESA grant?
 - A. Megan answered yes, that was the goal.
- III. Jeremias Solari stated we need to consider that the program hasn't changed materially enough in the 3 years, and they're just attempting to reapply and try the same strategy as before. Therefore, that would potentially be wasteful of the funding. I think that if we do open it for people to reapply, maybe we should do some sort of limit to the number of times that so more than one time, but less than infinity.
- IV. Jared Lisonbee stated Jennifer has the same concern. Intent is to move to a different grant program. The suggestion is to evaluate on a case-by-case scenario, since there has not been increased funding. They may not have the transitional funding to help them maintain the funding.
- V. Jeremias Solari suggested there to be a cool down time frame. Who would handle case by case?
 - A. Rebecca Banner answered the case by case would need to be in the application and staff would need to know what the board would like that to be.
- VI. Jeremias Solari asked how many providers are eligible?
 - A. Megan Vlaming answered we have 454 private providers at least $\frac{1}{3}$ have been high quality before. The trend is that the amount of becoming high quality funding is going lower.
- VII. Amy Terpstra stated this is a sort of an unsavory situation, because I get where the person who suggested this is coming from. I understand and sort of accept that rationale and I carry the same concerns that many of you are voicing, that we're just simply putting more organizations, more providers into the queue, and then we can't make good on our ability to support them in their efforts. It makes me want to say no to this request and not change this. It feels disingenuous to

open the opportunity for more people, let them do all that work to apply when there's simply not enough funding to go around, even for people who meet the thresholds on the applications.

- VIII. Jeremias Solari stated we could also envision a situation where a program was potentially high quality or could be very high quality but is far from entering. By not allowing all the individuals to reapply, the pool of competition within each round is paired down every single round and it's not reinvigorated because you are not allowing people to reapply. That's also another consideration.
- IX. Amy Terpstra stated they can apply for Expanded Student Access so there is a way for them to get the funding needed and come back.
- X. Linda Chadburn agreed for the purpose of becoming high quality or is it just to get money? Is this the only avenue they only have to become high quality?
- A. Rebecca Banner answered that CCQS is available for private providers but isn't available for all groups. For example, it is not available for LEAs.
 - B. Linda Chadburn stated it comes down to getting the money to do it and it being open to a certain wait time.
- XI. Rebecca Banner stated she is open to a cool down time frame of 3 years.
- XII. Linda Chadburn stated if they meet the minimum threshold they can reapply.
- XIII. Jared Lisonbee asked just for clarification with this idea that a program after a 3 year timeframe or wait period could reapply? Would they then be eligible for another full 3 years of funding? Or are you thinking that perhaps a reduced amount? What's the thought there and they would be basically resetting the clock completely after 3 years?
- A. Megan Vlaming answered we can make the definition.
 - B. Rebecca Banner stated it can be difficult for administration to maintain but it is possible.
 - C. Jamie Bitton stated their initial one is for 3 years, the second time they apply, they can reduce it by a year. You get 2. The third time you apply, you get one year.
 - D. Jared Lisonbee added another scenario that can be considered. They have a different tax id and can reapply by different agency. Do we want to look into it?
 - E. Rebecca Banner stated it would be a licensing issue and we do not have a way of tracking that.
 - F. Megan Vlaming stated it will also be considered a new entity.
- XIV. Linda Chadburn asked why they would need BHQ if ESA is available?
- A. Megan Vlaming answered funding is not available for them so they need funding for the in between time frame.

	<p>B. Rebecca Banner stated I think there could be multiple options. Once you've gone through that grant cycle, it could be that you need more support before you can graduate to the ESA Grant. Maybe you met the eligibility but there wasn't enough funding because our ESA grant required us to prioritize any returning grantees. There's multiple options about why someone would go through and receive all 3 years of their grant and not move into an ESA or need more support.</p> <p>XV. Megan Vlaming added we can have them state explicitly how they are different than they were before and why they should be allowed to reapply. This could be put into a narrative or a letter of intent. There are ways that we can capture that prior to an application actually coming in and giving them approval to do it. Maybe there could be like a 2 or 3 person committee from the Board that makes that decision. We can say hey these are the guidelines, they have to turn in their appeal by this date, and then we send it to that committee and say you guys review this and let us know if they can submit.</p> <p>XVI. Details of prioritization will be worked out at a prior date.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p>I. Paul Mueller asked if it is an additional 2 times after receiving the grant?</p> <p>A. Rebecca Banner answered they can only get the grant for a total of 6 years or for 2 times.</p>	<p>Jeremias called for a motion. Rebecca Banner motioned for allowing grantees that have received becoming high quality to reapply after waiting a 3 year period and they can receive the grant no more than 2 times. Applications where an applicant has never received becoming high quality will be prioritized over grantees or applicants who have received this grant before. Jeremias Solari seconded. Motion passed 5-3. Motion accepted.</p>
Other Business and Public Comment	<p>-Rebecca Banner</p> <p>I. Announced Charlotte Tanner as the newest member of the School Readiness Team.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p>I. No public comment</p>	
Adjournment	<p>Next Meeting: April 17, 2024 1:00pm – 3:00pm</p>	<p>Jeremias Solari motioned to adjourn. motioned. Jamie Bitton seconded. Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned.</p>