

**NYS Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC)
Membership Meeting
December 13, 2012**

Members:

Marsha Basloe	Doris Fromberg	Patti Lieberman	Elba Montalvo
Evelyn Blanck	Jacquelyn Jones	Dina Lieser	Patty Persell
Kate Breslin	Ira Katzenstein	Barbara-Ann Mattle	Melanie Pores
Sherry Cleary*	Kristen Kerr	Karen McGraw	Monique Rabideau
Rachel deLong	Karen Kissinger	James McGuirk	Sandy Rybaltowski
Chirs Deyss	Nancy Kolben	Mary McHugh	Mary Shaheen
Denise Dowell	Lee Kreader	Meg McNiff	Meredith Wiley
Andre Eaton	Linda Landsman	Anne Mitchell	
Robert Frawley*	James Langford	Janice Molnar	

* Co-chair

Guests:

Andrew Brodsky	David Lara	Jenn O'Connor	Sam Stephens
Beth Brumaghim	Natasha Lifton	Bob Palaich	
Charles Bruner	Kimlee Marquise	Jennifer Marino Rojas	
Talina Jones	Kim McCann	Steven Sanders	

Staff:

Phil Alotta	Barbara Hogan	Renee Nasadoski	Bridget Walsh
Liz Belsito	Maggie McGlynn	Susan Perkins	Stephanie Woodard

Welcome and Introductions

Maggie McGlynn began the meeting by having each person ask a question about an item on the agenda that they would like to learn or understand. The questions were sorted and given to the appropriate presenters for focus and attention.

Updates

-
1. Education Reform Commission report is not yet released and so this item was postponed.
 2. BUILD meeting – Marsha Basloe and Karen McGraw reported for the team that attended the fall Build meeting in Atlanta GA (October 17-19, 2012). A succinct report was prepared and included in the materials for this meeting. The importance of three overriding themes was highlighted: (1) open and continuous communication; (2) intentional work on systems building; (3) value on equity.
 3. Marsha Basloe also reported for the ad hoc group on Parent Involvement. The group met November 20th by conference call and agreed on changes to the documents that would collect names for parents to participate on the ECAC. In consultation with the Co-Chairs, the documents were further modified and e-mailed to members on December 10th. ECAC members are asked to think of parents serving in leadership roles within their organizations or agencies who might be suitable candidates for ECAC membership and to send their names and contact information to Stephanie Woodard by December 31.

Innovative Strategies: “Early Childhood Education Pay for Success Financing Strategies in NYS”

Natasha Lifton presented information to the membership on Social Impact Bonds, also known as Pay for Success Financing. She explained that Pay for Success is a broader concept and that Social Impact Bonds is a misnomer and often confused with municipal bonds. Governor Cuomo’s office prefers the use of Pay for Success financing.

Ms. Lifton also stressed that this financing strategy is one mechanism, not a panacea, and is not designed to absolve government of its responsibility. Ms. Lifton presented information on several successful examples of using this innovative financing strategy to support services and programs as background information and then presented several ideas for developing a New York State early childhood education Pay for Success effort. *(see the PowerPoint presentation prepared by Ms. Lifton)*

Cost Estimation Model

The Finance Work Group has been working with APA Consultants to develop a cost estimation model for early childhood systems in New York State. Andrew Brodsky and Robert Palaich presented an overview of the model that included a description of its purpose and operation,, the cost of quality function, and the continuing process of adding a return on investment function.

Purpose of the cost estimation model – The model is designed to answer two questions:

- 1) What does the current early childhood system in New York look like?
- 2) What does it cost to change the system?

How users operate the model – The model was set up using a comprehensive listing of early childhood programs, the current number of children served by those programs, and the unit cost per child of the services provided by each program. Every user has a unique user name and password to access the system. Once in the system, users can select any number of programs to see the current cost of the program and current number of children served by each program. Users can choose programs by domain, the age of children served, or by income eligibility guidelines. Once selected, the model shows the current number of children served and cost of serving all of the children in each program selected. The user can then adjust the enrollment numbers and the model will show how the cost of the program changes according to the change in enrollment.

Cost of Quality Function – The model includes information based on the current estimate of the distribution of quality provided by programs. Users will be able to determine the change in cost of a program by adjusting the level of quality of the program. Quality levels are related to the quality levels of QUALITYstarsNY.

Return on Investment Function – This function is still under development. The process to determine the return on investment is based on an extensive literature review of high quality research and therefore information is not available for all programs since research is not available for all programs. Return on investment calculations are based on future savings that result from a programs positive effect on children’s learning and development including a child’s future ability to earn increased income and reduced need for special education services.

Post-election Discussion: “The Impact of the Election on Early Childhood Programs”

David Lara, Senior Legislative Associate at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in Washington, DC presentated on the coming fiscal cliff negotiations in Washington.

Mr. Lara’s PowerPoint presentation provided charts and graphs explaining how the nation acquired the current debt load that includes tax cuts and war spending. Graphs also presented a breakdown of federal spending by category that reflected entitlement, defense and nondefense discretionary spending. Health and Social Security spending make up a large portion of the federal budget and so does defense spending. Non-defense discretionary spending includes funding for many state and local programs. That funding has reached very low levels and continues to decline. Education and early childhood programs are included in that spending category. Sequestration and the House FY 2013 budget would reduce the category by substantial amounts.

While health spending in Medicare, Medicaid and Child Health Insurance Program are significant portions of the budget, analyses have shown that they do well controlling costs compared to private health insurance. He discussed some of the cost-cutting proposals being discussed and explained why some of them are problematic because the shift costs to states and individuals. One of the unknowns in the current discussions is whether entitlement programs for low-income populations will be targeted for cuts or be exempt.

Also included in Mr. Lara's presentations were graphs that showed the impact of the Bush-era tax cuts and how they have affected the budget.

Both parties and the President agree that the debt needs to be reduced but that it should not come at the expense of those now on Social Security and Medicare. They also indicate that defense spending should not be reduced beyond what is already planned. That leaves spending which funds safety net programs for low-income households and non-defense discretionary spending. Grants to state and local governments make up nearly one-third of that spending.

In the final part of his presentation he laid out the plans put forward by both houses and the President and outlined the timeline and process for how this will unfold over the next few weeks. He wrapped up with the key decisions that will impact the poor, including Medicaid, tax credits, changes to entitlements and the need for progressive tax reform.

The second presentation was made by Steve Sanders. Mr. Sanders retired from the State Assembly in 2005 and is currently Executive Director of the Agencies for Children's Therapy Services (ACTS).

Mr. Sanders praised the ECAC and its members for their work as children's advocates. He stressed that advocates could not assume that their message would resonate with legislators and policymakers without the proper information to back up positions. In many ways, the November elections did not change the climate for early childhood programs because the budget drives so many decisions and economic conditions have not improved that much. He recognized the difficulty of making requests for additional funding in the current fiscal climate and said that neither the Governor nor other elected officials would suggest raising taxes at this point. He acknowledged the difficulty in the current politics of the New York State Senate. The leadership of that body is in flux and it will be difficult to assess how things will work out even into the coming session. He also emphasized the short term budget and revenue perspective adopted by the Legislature: one year at a time; with the caveat that unexpected events can quickly change the situation, citing the impact of dual Hurricanes last year and Super Storm Sandy this fall.

He suggested that advocates for early childhood programs document the cost-savings from these programs and use that to make the case for continued investments.

Home Visiting: Presentation by Kate Breslin, Meredith Wiley, Andrea Eaton, and Rachel DeLong

Kate Breslin provided an overview for the Home Visiting Work Group a Schuyler Center for Analysis and Advocacy (SCAA) initiative which includes state agency representation as well as Home Visiting program managers and executives. SCAA currently convenes a Home Visiting work group meeting or conference call every six to eight weeks. The meetings help plan for home visiting expansion and provide advocacy for the Home Visiting programs. The work group has completed long term and short term work. In 2007 the Home Visiting work group along with SCAA and many state agencies published a white paper <http://www.ccf.ny.gov/TempPosting/ecac.cfm>. The white paper describes a system of services that supports new families by providing three components: universal prenatal care, postpartum screening, and comprehensive home visiting. In the summer of 2012 another document entitled Home Visiting Matters <http://www.ccf.ny.gov/TempPosting/ecac.cfm> which outlines the common principals such as universal services, funding priority to needy families, and evidence based programs. Currently, the Home Visiting work group has:

- Worked with the Department of Health to include Home Visiting as part of the Medicaid Waiver;
- Amended legislation to strengthen Home Visiting programs; and
- Provided data and information to support the ECAC Early Childhood Cost Estimation Model.

The work conducted by this group is consistent with the current ECAC work plan which includes Home Visiting, and it has been included in the ECAC comprehensive system of services.

Meredith Wiley provided an overview of why it is necessary to have home visiting programs that support both the child and the family. Ms. Wiley explained brain development and the effects on both the physical health and adult health experience when the brain's development is impeded by things such as alcohol, nicotine, and inactivity between parent and child. Ms. Wiley explained that 25 percent of the brain development occurs at birth and 90 percent of the brain development occurs prior to two years. During this time the brain is wired for mental and physical development.

Ms. Wiley provided an overview of the Home Visiting levels (Universal, Targeted, and Intensive) as they are illustrated in the 2007 the Home Visiting white paper on page 3. Currently 20 percent to 25 percent of the Home Visiting population is currently receiving intensive Home Visiting services. This would include Nurse Family Partnership and Healthy Families New York.

Ms. Wiley outlined some of the funding information associated with Home Visiting programs which includes the federal and state funding reduction to the Healthy Families New York from approximately \$23.0 million to \$17.0 million. Although Home Visiting programs such as Nurse Family Partnership and Healthy Families New York receive state and federal funds to administer the programs, some of the Home Visiting programs receive funding from the local school districts such as The Parent-Child Home Program. Other Home Visiting programs rely on private donations and foundation grants.

Rachel de Long provided the ECAC members with an update of the Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visitation (MIECHV) funding. MIECHV is a federal funding source authorized under the Affordable Care Act (ACA). This funding stream supports evidence based programs such as Home Visiting. States are using MIECHV funding as a way to add and expand Home Visiting, explore new models and seek ways to achieve efficiencies through shared services. The MIECHV funds are not distributed to the states completely. The base funding is allocated to states based on a formula which includes the state's demographics. New York's annual allocation was been approximately \$4.1 million. New York State Department of Health has created six domains:

1. Improved maternal and newborn health;
2. Prevention of child abuse, neglect or maltreatment;
3. Improved school readiness and achievement;
4. Reduction in domestic violence;
5. Improved family economic self-sufficiency;
6. Improved coordination and referrals for needed community resources and supports.

In 2010 federal funding was available which would support a broad range of services to families. The Governor's Office assigned the Department of Health as the lead agency, in which they collaborated with the Office of Children and Families Services Healthy Family New York, SCAA and an interagency team which included the Office of Mental Health and other state agencies. Health Resources and Services Administration developed a needs assessment and the federal Administration for Children and Families requested data structured around the six domains. An index was developed and county data was used to determine need as: high, medium, and low. The Department of Health had to submit a state plan on how the money would be spent based on the needs assessment. Currently two Home Visiting Programs are supported by MIECHV funds they are:

- Healthy Families New York (HFNY) with programs in Erie and Bronx counties, and

- Nurse Family Partnership (NFP) with programs in Monroe and Bronx counties.

There was an increase of \$1.5 million which will be awarded cumulatively. A Request for Application (<http://www.health.ny.gov/funding/rfa/1207271237/index.htm>) went out October 2012 to expand NFP and HFNY programs in the hardest areas within New York State. Department of Health will develop benchmarks for the programs based on the six domains, and the programs will be measured based on service delivery and environment to ensure the program service delivery is part of the community. An evaluation will be developed to ensure policy is aligns with funding.

In conclusion to the presentation, there was a brief overview of what is happening now in the area of Home Visiting:

- Home Visiting is changing to include professionally trained people;
- Progress is being made to develop trust with the families during the visits;
- Programs are working together to allow for continuing services to both the child and the family; and
- There are more private public partnerships to include additional funds to Home Visiting Programs.