

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
January 28, 2008
Minutes

The meeting of the Early Childhood Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:05 p.m. on January 28, 2008, at the offices of the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Members present: Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Jessie Rasmussen. Doug Christensen, Beth Schuler and Helen Raikes were absent.

Also in attendance: From NDE: Greg Prochazka, Marcia Corr, Linda Meyers, Melody Hobson, Carol Fichter, Martha Nash and Barb Schleisser. From NCFF: Becky Veak, meeting recorder.

Due to not having a quorum present, the Board of Trustees adjourned the meeting at 1:06 p.m. A special meeting of the Board of Trustees was scheduled for February 6, 2008 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, NE in the 5th floor conference room.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees

February 6, 2008

Minutes

The meeting of the Early Childhood Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on February 6, 2008, at the offices of the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Members present: Mel Clancy, Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, Marcia Corr as designee for Doug Christianson (written advance notice received), Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes (arrived just after the minutes were approved).

Also in attendance: From NDE: Margaret Worth, Greg Prochazka, Marcia Corr, Melody Hobson, Carol Fichter, Martha Nash, and Barb Schleisser. From NCFF: Becky Veak, Jen Hernandez, meeting recorder.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy to approve the minutes from the December 17, 2007 and the January 28, 2008 meetings. Motion seconded by Beth Schuler. Roll call vote: Voting yes: Marcia Corr as designee for Doug Christensen, Mel Clancy, Beth Schuler, Chris Peterson and Jessie Rasmussen. Helen Raikes not yet present.

ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

1. The Trustees discussed the financials in the Endowment Cash Fund (handout)
 - To date, the actual balance in the cash fund is \$1,202,093.34. Greg reports that the interest on the \$40 million public investment should be reflected on the spreadsheet in February
 - An estimate of \$2,824,126.37 is projected for June 30, 2008, although a large part of the private dollars are invested in stocks so that figure could fluctuate over the next several months. The estimate includes the interest on \$40 million
2. Jessie explained LB 1125 which is a technical bill introduced by Senator Adams offering clean-up language for the Early Childhood Endowment. There are five issues in LB 1125:
 - Strike ~~all interest, earnings and proceeds~~ and insert all earnings deposited
 - Deposits into the cash fund will be annually instead of ~~quarterly~~
 - Strike ~~Educational Service Units~~ as a primary applicant
 - Up to ~~five percent~~ fifteen percent of the total amount deposited in the cash fund may be reserved for technical assistance and evaluation
 - i. Helen clarified that the Trustees would have the authority to determine how much this amount would be
 - ii. Helen indicated that between four and eleven percent can be used for quality in the Child Care Block Grant
 - iii. Jessie asked if there was an accepted amount that is generally used for evaluation of programs; Helen said there was not a set amount

- iv. Chris would like to see a ceiling on the percentage that can be used for technical assistance and evaluation, particularly as the cash fund increases
- v. There was a discussion on what would be considered appropriate percentages and/or dollar amounts
- vi. The Trustees could make a recommendation in case the issue gets into negotiation with Senator Adams
- vii. Chris asked how many Endowment grantees were expected
- viii. Jessie reminded the group that technical assistance also occurs prior to the grant awards
- ix. Group consensus was to keep the ceiling to between eleven and fifteen percent for technical assistance and evaluation and not to exceed \$500,000
- Strike the process language for the urban nomination to the Board of Trustees and make it consistent with the rural nomination process. Also adding language so that Board of Trustees' nominations can either reside or work in a county of representation
- The Board was in agreement with these technical changes
- The hearing is scheduled for Monday, February 25th at 1:30 p.m. before the Education Committee. This was not voted on but there was a consensus by the Trustees to offer an amendment to cap the amount at \$500,000 that could be used for technical assistance and evaluation, should we be asked. Possible need to vote on this at the March meeting

MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

1. Update on the Grant Process

- a. Thirty-seven Letters of Intent have been received from school districts (handout)
- b. A mandatory Bidder's Conference is scheduled for tomorrow, February 7th. (handout on video conference sites)
 - i. Chris and Helen both asked that the Bidder's Conference be recorded. Becky will make the arrangements.
- c. Community forums are scheduled in Columbus, Ogallala, Kearney and Omaha to provide more resources for possible grant application. These will be announced during the Bidder's Conference and listed on the Endowment website.
- d. Helen asked about the dissemination of the announcement for the Bidder's conference and whether potential applicants had adequate notice
 - i. Marcia reported that there was wide dissemination.
 - ii. There are five videoconference sites for the Bidder's Conference sites; each site will have someone there to monitor the audience
 - iii. Marcia Corr and Martha Nash will be responsible for answering the questions and if additional questions are asked after the conference closes, individuals will be asked to submit the in writing at each site and we will post the answers on the Endowment website

- e. The Trustees discussed whether potential applicants could identify prenatal as an at-risk population to serve - the Trustees agreed that grant applications could include prenatal if their proposal included continuing to offer services to those children once they were born
 - f. Identifying children who are most at risk was discussed. Trustees agreed that communities should define what is most at-risk for them
 - g. An update was given on the Research Conference held in Omaha on January 24, 2008. It was extremely well attended; registrations were cut off at 342.
 - h. Carol Fichter reported on evaluations of the conference. There was a good geographic mix, keynote presenters and breakouts were excellent. Several attendees commented that they wanted to have conferences like this more often. Special thanks went to Kelly Medwick from NCFF for pulling together the press conference and facilitating good media coverage
2. Transfer of Existing Birth to Three Grants to the Endowment
- a. Approximately \$450,000 (six programs) in existing grants for infants/toddlers transfers to the Board of Trustees from the current NDE Early Childhood grants for 3 & 4 year olds. Administration of the grants transfers but the funds do not. Clarification from Legal was that there is no statutory authority to have funding transfer with administration. Since the existing 0-3 programs totaling approximately \$450,000 transfers to the Trustees, discussion occurred on whether to continue the grants or to ask the programs to re-compete in the Endowment process. 79-1104.02 directs that funding priorities shall be given to continuation grants, so the Trustees discussed whether to treat the current NDE 0-3 grantees as continuation or not. Options discussed were:
 - The grants could be continued and asked to change their focus to serve 3 and 4 year olds, resulting in the programs being able to then apply for Endowment grants. It could be possible that if programs were applying for anything more than their current funding, they would need to be in full competition with other Endowment applicants. A satisfactory proposal would allow them to continue receiving their current amount
 - Helen raised the issue of making sure that the current grantees were meeting the new standards as outlined in the Endowment RFP
 - Jessie proposed that the six current programs be held harmless
 - Mel agreed that losing six programs to gain others is detrimental, and that this Board should feel obligated to continue grantees that have been meeting the required standards
 - Legal reminded the group that the statute reads continuation grants as first priority, and Trustees can interpret continuation to be either the programs currently funded or those funded by the Endowment funds
 - Do we now have a third category of Continuation Grants under the Endowment?
 - Chris raised the question of whether additional credit should be given to continuation grants in the scoring process

- Jessie proposed limiting grantees to applying for no more than two grants
- Helen proposed “grandfathering” in programs and allowing them to apply for each type of grant
- Legal suggested written clarification addressing status of continuation programs

A motion was made by Chris Peterson, with a friendly amendment by Mel Clancy, and seconded by Helen Raikes. *That the Trustees allow continuation funding to those programs currently funded by the EC grants and that they be required to meet the base standards in Column 1, Attachment A or B, as set forth in the Endowment RFP.* Jessie raised the issue of what to do with the current programs who are only receiving \$50,000 a year when the minimum for an Endowment grant is \$75,000. Chris withdrew her motion.

A motion was made by Beth Schuler and seconded by Helen Raikes. *I move to fund the existing Birth to Three grantees with Endowment funds, at a minimum level of \$75,000, with the understanding that grantees submit continuation plans that meet the enhanced quality criteria within the same timeframe as a new Endowment grantee.* This should be announced at the Bidder’s Conference tomorrow. Roll call vote: Voting yes: Marcia Corr as designee for Doug Christensen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler. Motion carried.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

- Trustees agreed to postpone the discussion of the 5% for technical assistance and evaluation until the March agenda
- Barb Jackson from the University of the Nebraska Medical Center is invited to the March meeting to facilitate a discussion on program evaluation
- Question for the March agenda: Shall there be a proportional relationship between the funding and the number of kids in school districts that are at risk?

The next meeting will be Friday, March 14, 2008 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200. The Trustees decided on their regular meeting schedule for 2008 to be the second Wednesday of the month from 1:00-3:00 p.m. starting with the April meeting

- March 14, 2008 (Program Evaluation)
- April 9, 2008 (Program Evaluation)
- May 14, 2008 (Selection of Grantees)
- June 11, 2008
- July 9, 2008
- August 13, 2008
- September 10, 2008
- October 8, 2008
- November 12, 2008
- December 10, 2008

The meeting adjourned at 3:33 pm.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
March 14, 2008
Minutes

The meeting of the Early Childhood Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on March 14, 2008, at the offices of the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln, NE.

Members present: Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, Doug Christensen and Helen Raikes. Mel Clancy arrived at 1:05 and Chris Peterson arrived at 1:10 p.m.

Also in attendance: Barb Jackson, Munroe Meyer (UNMC). From NDE: Greg Prochazka, Marcia Corr, Carol Fichter, Martha Nash, and Barb Schleisser. From NCFF: Becky Veak, Jen Hernandez, meeting recorder.

A motion was made by Doug Christensen to approve the minutes from the February 6, 2008 meeting. Motion seconded by Beth Schuler. Roll call vote: Doug Christensen, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler voting yes. No opposition.

ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

1. The trustees discussed the letter received from Garden County Public Schools regarding the criteria set forth in the Endowment RFP:
 - We knew that we would have limited funds for the Endowment and wanted to see the greatest impact and positive outcomes for children
 - Would the percentage of children served be a concern if there were few or no providers in a particular area or would we have a greater impact in areas like Garden County
 - Should we reconsider offering Innovation Grant funding for next year
 - Could a school offer to hire someone that met the quality standards in Column 1 to become the curriculum director, and apply for an Endowment grant to use those funds for existing staff to meet the quality standards
 - This would give schools and their partners the opportunity to tailor the grant to their community
 - The trustees agreed to make the offer of technical assistance to work with Garden County and help them think through their options to apply this grant period
 - i. Technical assistance should not only be offered to grantees but also to those wishing to apply for a grant if they need assistance
 - The trustees are comfortable with the quality standards they set for Endowment grants and agreed to send a letter to the Superintendent of Garden County Public Schools indicating that they have helped us think through the design for next year's funding and to offer technical assistance for this first funding cycle of Endowment grants

Motion by Doug Christensen, second from Mel Clancy for a letter to be sent to Garden County on behalf of the Trustees, signed by the Chair, with cc: to the Legislature's Education Committee members. Roll call vote: Doug Christensen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler voting yes. None opposed.

2. Program Evaluation – Barb Jackson; UNMC Munroe Meyer Institute

- There are various approaches the trustees could choose to evaluate the Endowment programs (comprehensive approach, broad based approach, staggered approach, targeted approach)
- Since it is anticipated there will be several different models of programs, it may be necessary to choose different approaches
- How to measure quality when using various models
 - Monitoring the fidelity of the model implementation
 - i. Consider measuring strands that run across models (example: teacher/child relationship can be measured in both center-based and home visitation models)
 - ii. Coaching is very important, particularly in home-based programs and with new teachers.
 - iii. ITERS (for use in Centers)
 - iv. Identify the key components of Home Visitation (for use in home-based, parent model programs)
- Barb suggested that the trustees need to identify and agree on the key core expectations for quality of the programs and to identify commonalities across specific models in order to develop an evaluation tool
- Barb suggested to build in a qualitative approach to guard against unintended outcomes
- Be sure to document the program characteristics like intensity of service, staff qualifications, model descriptions
- Document the child and family demographics (age of child, ethnicity, etc.)
 - Add **cumulative** risk factors (example: demographics of the communities in which they live)
 - A targeted evaluation is when a community is working with a specific risk factor. (Example: working with depressed mothers) The evaluation would need to capture this risk factor in a targeted way
- Does the program impact child outcomes
 - Results Matters Child Measures – Observational Based Measures
 - i. Design the evaluation to track the children in K-12 after they have completed the 0-3 program. The child could be flagged with “Endowment experience” and “EC Grant experience” so to allow for comparison
 - ii. Concern was raised about teacher expectations, false positives, capturing (or not) what is actually happening in terms of child development, reliability. Much of the 0-3

research does not utilize any of the three assessments used in Results Matters

- iii. A question was asked of NDE staff as to what was their level of confidence in Results Matter? Marcia reported they have high school gains data for those in the 0-3 programs
- iv. May need technical assistance around Results Matter for home visitation programs, as the Results Matter assessments are geared for child care centers
 - Further discussion to take place regarding whether there are other questions/measures related to child outcomes and if there is an interest in longitudinal impact and at what age
- Trustees asked if a small group could recommend the evaluation strategy, and the Trustees would make decisions regarding higher level issues, like policy. Quality is about process.
- Caution was raised regarding too many evaluations that have failed when focused too much on outcomes. The real outcomes that matter come much later than 0-5. We should not measure something just because we can measure it, but rather focus on predictors of success. Example: Language skills at age 3 are a great predictor of the child's ability to read.
- Look at the outcomes for the parents as well
- Possible health outcomes / indicators
 - % of children with a medical home
 - % of children who were breastfed
 - % of mothers who stopped smoking
 - % of children with current immunizations
- Program evaluation plan
 - (Process) Consultation, observation, focus groups or interviews
 - (Outcome) Observation, child assessment, parent surveys/ratings, parent-child interaction ratings/observation
- The trustees will spend some time at their next meeting discussing what questions and/or measures of child outcomes will drive the evaluation

3. Endowment Appeals Process

- The trustees discussed whether or not to have an appeals process in the event someone comes forward and wants to apply but did not attend the Bidder's Conference
- The trustees agreed to maintain the requirement that someone from the partnership participate in the bidder's conference and not to have a formal appeals process but rather an "exception"
 - Trustees want the latitude to be able to respond quickly rather than go through a formal process
 - Agreed to provide an alternative way to understand the requirements of the grant if they could not attend the Bidder's Conference (perhaps view the recorded videotape)

A motion by Mel Clancy, second by Doug Christensen to delegate authority to the Chair, Vice Chair, and one other trustee that is available to informally review an appeal and, if they recommend, provide an alternative way to understand the requirements of the grant.

Roll call vote: Doug Christensen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler voting yes. No opposition.

4. Questions from applicants

1. If some of the partners applying for an Access Expansion grant are still in the process of getting a CDA or a Bachelor's degree, can they apply for an Access Expansion grant even though they aren't at the Column #2 level of quality?

Answer: No, unless they are at Column #1 before September 1st

2. Under staff qualifications for an Assistant Teacher, can an LPN be considered an equivalent or higher to a CDA?

Answer: If the applicant does not meet the criteria specified in either Attachment A or B, they have to demonstrate that the staff qualifications meet the coursework requirements

3. Should there be a proportional relationship between the number of at-risk children in school districts and the amount of funding applicants receive?

Answer: This question does not require a decision now. Trustees will discuss this for the next round of funding.

4. Will the existing 0-3 grantees' proposals need to be reviewed by the Review Team or just automatically continued?

Answer: Yes, reviewed but not scored in competition.

5. A proposal comes in for a Family Engagement Program and one of the families' children are in a child care environment. The home visitor is working with the child care on quality issues, but if no money is exchanged, does the child care need to meet the quality indicators in Attachment A?

Answer: No.

6. If there is a minimal amount of money exchanged with the child care, to supplement subsidy funds, does the child care need to meet the quality indicators?

Answer: Yes. If funding is going to the child care provider, they must meet the standards set forth in Column #1.

7. Since these are 3-year grants, can grantees carry over funding from year to year?

Answer: Yes. Grantees must justify the carry over and the Review Team will approve. There was a discussion around not wanting to encourage carry over of dollars. The programs need to show a match each year, and carryover is handled separate from that.

8. Are there any unintended consequences of funding programs at a sub-level (example: fund one classroom instead of an entire program)?

Answer: The trustees decided to move forward and allow the funding of a classroom, for example, and monitor this in coming months and years. A legal question: Is carryover of grant dollars possible?

MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

1. Review Endowment Financials – discussion postponed until April meeting
2. Grant Disbursement Process
 - The trustees discussed how much of the funds could be distributed up front in the grant period and how much needed to be reserved until progress reports are in

A motion was made by Beth Schuler, second by Mel Clancy to disburse 50% of the grant funds to programs at the start of the grant period, 40% goes out at the half-way point, and the final 10% goes out upon receipt of final reports. Roll call vote: Doug Christensen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler voting yes. No opposition.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Becky provided a brief update of the Endowment clean-up legislation, LB 1125. To date, the Education Committee has advanced the bill to General File with an amendment that would cap the dollars available for technical assistance and evaluation at 10 percent

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting will be April 9, 2008, from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200.

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 pm.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
April 9, 2008
Minutes

I. MEETING OPENING

The meeting of the Early Childhood Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:04 p.m. on April 9, 2008, at the offices of the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln, NE.

Members present: Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes. Doug Christensen was excused.

Also in attendance: From NDE: Margaret Worth, Martha Nash, Melody Hobson, and Barb Schliesser. From NCFF: Becky Veak, Jen Hernandez, meeting recorder.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy to approve the minutes from the March 14, 2008 meeting. Motion seconded by Chris Peterson. Roll call vote: Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler voting yes. No opposition.

Review of endowment financials removed from this month's agenda.

II. ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

A. Identify the Elements of Evaluation

- The trustees discussed having an independent evaluator design the evaluation / measurement tool in order to measure child and parent outcomes and to use the Results Matter and grantee progress reports to measure program outcomes
 - Think about using the same evaluation tool across programs
 - If measuring “pre” and “post” results, make sure we define “pre” and “post” time periods
 - Some concern was raised regarding the reliability of observational assessments
- Helen suggested having a standardized outcome measure around receptive language when the child turns 3 (PPDT; and an alternative measurement for non-English speaking children)
- The trustees agreed they wanted to measure child outcomes in the following areas:
 - Health outcomes consistent with Head Start Well-Child Checks
 - Current on immunizations, dental treatment, etc.
 - Making sure children are up-to-date on EPSDT
- The trustees agreed they wanted a quantitative measurement of parental engagement and parent outcomes

- Agreed that parent outcomes might be easier to measure in home-based programs than in center-based programs. Would like to measure:
 - i. If children are current on EPSDT, immunizations and health care checklist
 - ii. Attendance in the program / Do they keep appointments / Do they participate in activities, etc.
 - iii. Parent / child relationship (home visitation programs)
 - iv. Caregiver / child relationship (center-based programs)
 - v. Gather survey information from parents (Barb Schleisser will bring an example of a self-reporting type tool from NDE)
 - 1. Demographics
 - 2. How many risk factors does this child have?
 - 3. How often do you read to your child?
- Evaluation of the programs themselves will take place through Results Matter and in the progress reports that will be submitted by the Endowment grantees
 - Results Matter measures social/emotional, cognitive/language, and self-regulation
 - The definition of pre and post for Results Matter is based on the beginning of the school year and at the end of the grant period
 - There is ongoing teacher observation and assessment
 - Each school has to ensure that teachers are reliable to assess
 - Results Matter was designed to be used in a center-based program
 - Beth reported that Results Matter has been used in a home-based context but the grantees may need more support; it may also be possible to do on a school-year basis so that it would allow pre and post measurement
 - The trustees still need to discuss how to measure “adequate progress” for the program goals
 - The trustees asked the Technical Assistance team to design the grantee progress report and present it to them; make sure we can make the payment the system as 50%, 40% and 10% throughout the year
 - Example of program measurement:
 - i. Measure breastfeeding education and information provided to the families – outreach
 - A question was raised regarding how or whether to measure access expansion grants of high quality and quality enhancement grants for the same outcomes
 - Overall, the trustees agreed with a combination package that included:
 - Pre and post measurements
 - Annual evaluations
 - Standardized for receptive language measured at age 3; and

- Results Matter as a program evaluation tool
- NDE will bring their 0-3 outcomes and measures for Results Matter to the June trustee meeting when they discuss evaluation

B. Conflict of Interest for Board of Trustee members

- Margaret Worth, NDE legal counsel, reported on the definition of “conflict of interest”
- Any trustee who believes he or she might have a conflict of interest must file a Statement of Potential Conflict of Interest with the Accountability and Disclosure Commission concerning the matter

III. MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

A. Grant Review Process

- Martha Nash reported that 21 reviewers from Nebraska are secured (they have infant, toddler, and home visitation expertise) and 1 national birth to three expert will be on each review team.
- These reviews will be by conference call and conducted during the first two weeks of May
- Unsuccessful applicants will be sent reviewer comments so they know where to focus improvement
- Grant summaries will be presented at the May 14th Trustee meeting and will include:
 - Type of program, number of children served, geographic area, who partners are, budget requested
- Trustees asked the TA team to include the grant checklist on the website
- Applications due by midnight on April 15th. If an incomplete application comes in after close of business, but before midnight, on April 15th, the Endowment Provider will call applicants the morning of the 16th and ask them to submit the relevant materials by the close of business, 5:00 CST, on April 16th.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting will be May 14, 2008, from 12:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200. Lunch will be served.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
May 14, 2008
Minutes

I. MEETING OPENING

The meeting of the Early Childhood Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 12:03 p.m. on May 14, 2008, at the offices of the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln, NE.

Members present: Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, Doug Christensen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson and Helen Raikes.

Also in attendance: From NDE: Greg Prochazka, Margaret Worth, Marcia Corr, Martha Nash, Melody Hobson, Barb Schleisser, Carol Fichter. William Scheidler, Governor's Budget Office and Sandy Sostad, Legislative Fiscal Office were also present. From NCFF: Becky Veak, Jen Hernandez, meeting recorder.

Motion made by Doug Christensen to approve the minutes from the April 9, 2008 meeting. Motion seconded by Mel Clancy. Roll call vote: Doug Christensen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler voting yes.

II. ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

1. Review of Endowment Grant Summaries and Reviewer Comments

Continuation grants:

- NDE staff talked with the existing six (6) grantees about what would be required of them under the Birth-Three Endowment grants
 - i. Existing programs were guaranteed \$75,000 per classroom and asked to submit a continuation plan of how they would meet the endowment grant criteria within one year; and
 - ii. Start-up funds would not be available for continuation grants
- The trustees identified a need for technical assistance for the continuation grantees so that they meet the same standards as the other endowment grantees within one year
- ***Action item for the next meeting*** – a proposal submitted by Mel Clancy that after a thorough review of the continuation grants submitted, the trustees recommend that only \$75,000 per classroom be allowed at this time

Quality Enhancement Grants:

- A total of five (5) Quality Enhancement grant proposals were received from Elgin, Lexington, Lincoln, Papillion and Ralston.

- On a scale of 100, reviewer scores for the Quality Enhancement Grants ranged from 54.7 - 83.2. The following criteria was used to score:
 - Needs assessment and program planning (10 points)
 - Partnerships (25 points)
 - Program description (50 points)
 - Budget and funding sources (15 points)
- The trustees voiced concern with the quality of proposals under the Quality Enhancement applications. Discussion was around:
 - A possible lack of understanding of birth to three services;
 - The need for the trustees to be more clear about expectations;
 - It takes time to develop partnerships; and
 - Grant writing abilities
- The trustees discussed their options for Quality Enhancement (QE) Grants and whether to provide technical assistance and offer the possibility of funding based on contingencies, including the possibility of resubmitting applications. Also discussed was the possibility of not funding any QE Grants this cycle and to take the time this year to educate potential applicants on what the trustees are looking for under the QE Grants

Access Expansion Grants:

- A total of 13 Access Expansion grant proposals were received from Broken Bow, Chadron, Columbus, Crete, Falls City, Grand Island, Kearney, Lincoln, Loup City, Omaha, Plattsmouth, York and Wakefield
- On a scale of 100 points, the reviewer scores for Access Expansion Grants ranged from 54.3 – 95.6 and were scored according to the same criteria as listed above
- Based on reviewer's scores, the trustees decided to ask questions of the top nine (9) Access Expansion Grant applicants, with the clear understanding that asking questions does not guarantee funding
- The trustees asked NCCF staff to clarify the following questions with all the top nine applicants:
 - How many children/families are you serving now
 - How many additional children/families will you serve with Endowment funds?
 - What is the expansion of services and what will you do differently?
- In addition to the above questions, if not easily identifiable within the proposal, ask the following questions of individual applicants:
 - Crete: What curriculum are you proposing to use
 - Loup City: What is your plan for supervision of staff?
 - Plattsmouth: What is your recruitment process; how do you know you will be serving the most at risk? Are you duplicating the existing responsibility of DHHS caseworkers?
 - Columbus: Your local match is not met. What is your justification for the approach; if center-based services are documented as a need, why are you recommending home-based?

- Lincoln: Clarify the targeted population to be served under this proposal. Will this be linked to their student parent program? What is the timeline for training and professional development? How does this proposal meet the qualifications in Column #2?
- Omaha: Clarify what OPS is contributing to the partnership? In terms of both home visiting and Early Head Start, how does this proposal expand services so as not to duplicate or supplant funds?
- Broken Bow: How do you plan to do self-evaluation?
- York: Their proposed curriculum seems more appropriate for center-based services rather than home visitation.
- Grand Island: Curriculum?
- The trustees discussed the importance of balancing the scores while addressing the need to distribute the grants as geographically as possible
- The trustees asked staff to ask reviewers and the applicants for their comments on the process and what would make it better for the next round of funding

III. MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

- In deciding how many grants to fund, the trustees discussed the availability of dollars currently in the Endowment Cash Fund
- Greg Prochazka, NDE, reported on the Endowment financials
- Some concern was raised regarding the private investment due to the recent low performance of stocks in the marketplace, but confidence was expressed regarding the decision and need for long-term investment strategies
- The financials indicate no deposit had been made from the public sector since September 2007
 - The trustees raised concerns about losing interest during that timeframe and of the overall delay in timely deposits
- The trustees asked NCFF staff to meet with the State Investment Council to inquire as to the delay and report back at the next meeting
- The trustees discussed how much of the Endowment Cash Fund to set aside for technical assistance and evaluation. They have the authority to set aside up to five percent (5%) which would be approximately \$75,000 – ***Action item for the next meeting***

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting will be Wednesday, June 11, 2008, from 12:00-3:00 p.m. with two video conference sites scheduled as an option for participation. The two sites are: 1) Nebraska Department of Education Computer Lab, 301 Centennial Mall South, 6th Floor, Lincoln, NE; and 2) Hastings Child and Family Head Start Center, 123 Marian Road in Hastings, NE.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
June 11, 2008
Minutes

I. MEETING OPENING

The meeting of the Early Childhood Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 12:07 p.m. on June 11, 2008, via two video conference sites, at the Nebraska Department of Education in Lincoln and the Head Start Child and Family Development Center in Hastings.

Members present: Jessie Rasmussen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, and Helen Raikes at the Lincoln video conference site at the Nebraska Department of Education computer lab; Beth Schuler by video conference site at the Child and Family Head Start Center in Hastings. Doug Christensen sent designee, Marcia Corr, to represent him at the Lincoln site.

Also in attendance: From NDE: Greg Prochazka, Martha Nash, Carol Fichter and Margaret Worth. William Scheideler from the Governor's Budget Office and Sandy Sostad from the Legislative Fiscal Office. NCFE staff Becky Veak and Jen Hernandez, meeting recorder.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy to approve the minutes from the May 14, 2008 meeting. Motion seconded by Beth Schuler. Roll call vote: Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, and Marcia Corr voting yes. No opposition.

II. MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

I. Endowment Cash Fund Financials

- Greg Prochazka reported \$2.2 million as the current amount available for possible distribution this fiscal year beginning July 1, 2008
- Based on a 4.5% return, Greg projects \$2.2 million for next year, however, the Investment Council is predicting a 3.5% rate of return; in that case, the projection would likely be \$1.5 to \$1.75 million
- Jessie reported that no distribution in July would come from private investment
- The trustees discussed what dollar amount should be distributed this year for grants, keeping in mind the need to have enough funds next year to continue grants
- The trustees discussed "spending authority" and the need to ensure they secure enough "authority" to spend the money. In the event

the private market rebounds, the trustees may need to request a higher spending authority

A motion was made by Mel Clancy and seconded by Marcia Corr to increase the spending authority to \$3.1 million. Roll call vote: Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, and Marcia Corr voting yes. No opposition.

III. ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

Continuation grants

A motion was made by Mel Clancy that existing grants transferred from NDE to the Endowment will receive continuation funding as long as they meet the Endowment requirements within three years. Motion seconded by Marcia Corr.

A motion was made by Beth Schuler to amend Mel's motion so that existing grantees would need to meet the Endowment quality criteria within one year. Mel Clancy seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson and Marcia Corr voting yes.

The trustees agreed to fund the continuation grantees at \$75,000 per classroom with no start-up funding. The total for continuation grants is \$675,000. Continuation grantees are Alliance, Lincoln, Omaha, Santee, Omaha Nation and Walthill.

Selection of Endowment Grantees

- Crete application. The reviewer's score for Crete was 95.6 out of 100 points. The trustees thought that Crete's choice of curriculum models were research-based and reliable. Creative Curriculum will tie nicely to the children transitioning into 3-4 year old grants. Their Home visitation programs are year round.
- Loup City application. The reviewer's score for Loup City was 93.1 out of 100 points. The partnership between Central Nebraska Community Services and the school is strong and the intensity and duration they are proposing are indicators of quality.
- Plattsmouth application. The reviewer's score for Plattsmouth was 90.8 out of 100 points. The trustees liked the school's partnership with an existing private child care provider.
- Lincoln application. The reviewer's score for Lincoln was 90 out of 100 points. The program appears to be during the school year only. The trustees' only concern was Lincoln's ability to hire home visitors with the appropriate educational requirements given the salaries they proposed in their application.
- Omaha application. The reviewer's score for Omaha was 90 out of 100 points. This proposal was well-coordinated, year-round care. No concerns.

- Broken Bow application. The reviewer's score for Broken Bow was 87.6 out of 100 points. The trustees liked the year round services. There were no concerns voiced.
- York application. The reviewer's score for York was 87.5 out of 100 points. One concern noted was that the application says they will provide "contact" through home visitation three times per month but only two of those contacts are personal contacts. They liked the connection with the correctional facility and offering parenting programs to that population. No other concerns noted.

The next two applicants were Columbus at 86.6 and Grand Island at 86.2.

- The trustees discussed the top nine grant applications and made the decision, because of funding availability, to fund the top seven
 - Crete \$150,000 (not including start-up funds)
 - Loup City \$75,000
 - Plattsmouth \$78,475
 - Lincoln \$150,000
 - Omaha \$150,000
 - Broken Bow \$147,249
 - York \$150,000
 - Columbus \$150,000
 - Grand Island \$148,678

Total for the top nine applications: \$1,874,402

Total start-up funds for the top nine: \$ 203,984

Total funding for top seven applicants: \$1,575,724

Total start-up funds for the top seven: \$ 153,984

A motion was made by Mel Clancy and seconded by Helen Raikes to award Endowment funding to the following applicants: Crete, Loup City, Plattsmouth, Lincoln, Broken Bow and York. No further discussion. Roll call vote: Voting yes: Jessie Rasmussen, Chris Peterson, Mel Clancy, Beth Schuler, Helen Raikes and Marcia Corr.

A second motion was made by Mel Clancy and seconded by Helen Raikes to award Endowment funding to Omaha Public Schools. Roll call vote: Voting yes: Chris Peterson, Mel Clancy, Beth Schuler, Helen Raikes and Marcia Corr. Jessie Rasmussen abstained.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy and seconded by Helen Raikes to reserve \$100,000 in the Endowment Cash Fund to go toward technical assistance (\$75,000) for the grantees and to design the formal evaluation (\$25,000). Roll call vote: Voting yes: Jessie Rasmussen, Chris Peterson, Mel Clancy, Beth Schuler, Helen Raikes and Marcia Corr.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Discussion of the distribution of dollars from the State Investment Council into the Endowment Cash Fund
 - a. At the end of the quarter, the Investment Council sends a letter to State Street directing them on how to distribute the funding into the various Funds
 - b. State Street transfers the funds into the Nebraska State Treasurer's account at Wells Fargo
 - c. Nebraska State Treasurer's Office is then responsible to transfer the earnings into the Endowment Cash Fund
- B. The trustees have questions regarding the lag time of funds moving from the Wells Fargo account into the Endowment Cash Fund, and they direct staff to invite representatives of the State Investment Council and the State Treasurer's Office to attend the next Endowment Board of Trustee meeting on July 16, 2008
- C. Future meeting agendas
 - a. The next meeting will be held Wednesday, July 16, 2008 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation Conference Room, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200
 - b. Barb Jackson from the University of Nebraska Medical Center will make a proposal to the trustees on the Endowment evaluation design
- D. The seven Endowment grantees who were selected today and the six continuation grantees will receive telephone calls within the next two days and a Letter of Agreement within the next ten days
- E. A press release will be distributed on Monday, June 16, 2008 announcing the seven new grantees and six continuation grantees

V. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
July 16, 2008
Minutes

I. MEETING OPENING

The meeting of the Early Childhood Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on July 16, 2008, at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, in Lincoln.

Members present: Jessie Rasmussen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, and Marcia Corr.

Also in attendance: Greg Prochazka, Martha Nash, Carol Fichter and Margaret Worth from NDE; Sandy Sostad from the Legislative Fiscal Office; and Barb Jackson, Munroe Meyers Institute, University of Nebraska Medical Center. NCFE staff present was Mary Colacurci, Becky Veak and Jen Hernandez, meeting recorder. Others present were Dave Bomberger and Joe Jurich from the State Investment Council and Jason Hayes and Heidi Wallace from the State Treasurer's Office.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy to approve the minutes from the June 11, 2008 meeting. Motion seconded by Helen Raikes. Roll call vote: Voting yes, Marcia Corr, Mel Clancy, Helen Raikes and Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

II. MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

Financial Distributions (Public Funds) to the Endowment Cash Fund

- The trustees received a presentation from the State Investment Council and the State Treasurer's Office on the distribution of the \$40 million public funds into the Endowment Cash Fund
- Dave Bomberger, State Investment Officer, and Joe Jurich, Investment Analyst distributed three handouts
 - The Investment Council oversees more than 30 investments, including over \$1 billion in state endowment funds, of which the Early Childhood Endowment is one
 - Rather than liquidating assets and reinvesting for the Early Childhood Endowment, \$40 million was carved out of the Permanent School Fund. Their investment strategy for endowments is approximately 50% in U.S. equities and 50% in fixed income
- The trend on returns for the Permanent School Fund is 3-4 percent
- Their target date for distribution of earnings is the end of the following quarter (ie: the first quarter distribution would be in June)
- Process of the distribution and the transfer of funds to the Cash Fund:

- Letter from the State Investment Council to State Street outlines and directs the distribution of funds to the various accounts
- State Street transfers the funds to the State Treasurer's account at Wells Fargo Bank and copies the State Treasurer's Office
- When the Treasurer's office receives the letter, they transfer funds into the Endowment Cash Funds.
- The Department of Administrative Services keeps monthly entries of the amount of interest accrued
- The trustees raised questions regarding why the delay is so long by the time the Cash Funds show up in the Cash Fund account
- The State Investment Council said "it's all about your spot in the queue". They believe that the process will speed up now that the Endowment is not so new
- It usually takes approximately three months for the money to be distributed and show up on the ledger – the auditing process takes about three months
- The dollars remain invested for that three months and either grow or shrink according to the market's performance
- The trustees are thinking about next year's grants and asked why there was a six month delay in distributions of public dollars into the Cash Fund
- History suggests about a 3-3.5% of fund balance is reasonable to expect
- Greg Prochazka has not been receiving the information regarding the growth in the \$40 million principal, and he will request to receive that information regularly

III. ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

Evaluation Design

- Barb Jackson from Munroe-Meyers presented a draft evaluation proposal
- The structure for collecting data will have three layers of support: a State Team led by Barb Jackson; regional evaluation data collectors that will complete the quality ratings, provide feedback and complete child assessments; and local evaluators to help monitor the data collection process
- Barb suggests four evaluation questions:
 1. Are the programs being implemented as intended?
 2. Are the Endowment projects improving developmental outcomes of infants and toddlers in Nebraska?
 3. Are children/parents meeting the set health indicators?
 4. What impact does the program have on parent's warmth and responsiveness to their child and their ability to support their child's language and literacy?
- Becky and Martha indicated they have developed a 6 month and a 12 month progress report that will ask for progress on the quality indicators

- The question was raised on how it can be determined if a grantee is implementing a particular model correctly – further discussion is required on this
- Barb suggested to think about evaluation components that cross models
- Helen suggested another question be included on the evaluation:
 - What is the total cost of service per child (based on grant dollars and matching funds)
- The areas that will be evaluated are: child outcomes, family outcomes, health outcomes, program outcomes – information will be gathered including program characteristics and demographic information
 - Grantees will enter data into Results Matter database
 - For center-based programs – enter data in the fall and spring. Barb will check into entry, as well.
 - For home-based programs – McArthur or REEL assessments are being suggested at entry and at various ages, rather than at particular times of the year (6 mos, 12 mos, 18 mos, and 24 mos)
 - The length of McArthur is a concern
- The trustees agreed to take advantage of Helen Raikes expertise in evaluation and allow her and Barb to decide on the assessment tools. Melody Hobson or Linda Meyers from NDE will provide their expertise regarding the interface with Results Matter

A motion was made by Helen Raikes and seconded by Mel Clancy to approve and contract with Barb Jackson to proceed in developing the evaluation tool. A friendly amendment by Chris Peterson was offered to cap the contract at \$25,000. Barb Jackson will attend the August meeting of the trustees and submit a final evaluation budget based on the tools selected. Roll call vote: Voting yes, Marcia Corr, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes and Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

- The trustees asked Barb to bring a proposal of what it would cost for evaluation if they used the highest standards for evaluation and a proposal of what they have decided to evaluate for this first funding cycle

Endowment Branding

- Kelley Peterson from NCFE talked about branding the Endowment for fundraising
- She unveiled the “Sixpence” brand to the Trustees
 - Positive feedback was provided by the trustees

Press conference schedule

- Local press conferences will be held for each grantee. A “Sixpence” seal will be presented to the grantees at that time

Confirmed press conference dates

- July 29 (9 a.m.) – Crete

- July 30 (9 a.m.) – York
- Aug 5 (10 a.m.) – Loup City
- Aug 6 (9 a.m.) - Alliance
- Aug 7 (9 a.m.) – Broken Bow
- Aug 12 (9 a.m.) – Lincoln
- Aug 14 (9 a.m.) – Plattsmouth
- Aug 19 (10 a.m.) – Walthill
- Aug 19 (1 p.m.) – UMON HON Nation; Macy
- Aug 20 (10 a.m.) - Santee
- Aug 26 (10 a.m.) – Omaha

Proposal for Technical Assistance

- Staff from NDE and NCFF presented a joint proposal on how to carry out technical assistance for the Endowment grantees
- The proposal includes:
 - The Early Childhood Training Center (ECTC) of the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) offers to commit up to .50 of Martha Nash's current time to dedicate toward technical assistance for the Endowment
 - NCFF proposes to hire an early childhood specialist that will be dedicated toward technical assistance for the current Endowment grantees and potential Endowment applicants. This position will be housed at NCFF and funded by the following:
 - Fifty percent (50%) or approximately \$35,000 annually from the Buffett Early Childhood Fund grant with NCFF
 - Fifty percent (50%) or approximately \$35,000 annually from the Endowment Cash Fund Technical Assistance dollars
- The trustees want the person hired for technical assistance to have a solid background in early childhood education
- A question was raised regarding how additional costs for mileage and office space for this person will be covered
- This person would not have to meet the state personnel, union and/or classification requirements by the state

A motion was made by Chris Peterson and seconded by Mel Clancy to authorize Jessie Rasmussen, as Chair of the Board of Trustees, to enter into an agreement with NCFF for technical assistance up to \$35,000 (from the Endowment Cash Fund). Roll call vote: Voting yes, Marcia Corr, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes and Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

- Becky will bring a job description and a full proposal of additional expenses to the next meeting

Election of Officers

A motion was made by Chris Peterson and second by Mel Clancy that Jessie Rasmussen, Chair, and Helen Raikes, Vice Chair, of the Board of Trustees

remain the same for another year. Roll call vote: Voting yes, Marcia Corr, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes and Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

- Conference calls are scheduled with the Endowment grantees for July 28th and August 8th – an Orientation is scheduled for September 26th in Kearney
 - Staff will be sure to connect with Barb Jackson to ensure that grantees are gathering the correct information on children and families upon intake
- Future meeting agendas:
 - The next meeting will be held August 13, 2008 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation Conference Room, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200

V. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
August 13, 2008
Minutes

I. MEETING OPENING

The meeting of the Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on August 13, 2008, at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation (NCFF), 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln.

Members present: Jessie Rasmussen, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Beth Schuler and Marcia Corr (representing the Commissioner of Education).

Also in attendance: Greg Prochazka, Martha Nash, Carol Fichter, Melody Hobson, and Barb Schleisser from NDE; and Barb Jackson, Munroe-Meyers Institute, University of Nebraska Medical Center. NCFF staff present was Mary Colacurci, Kelley Peterson, Becky Veak and Jen Hernandez, meeting recorder.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy to approve the minutes from the July 16, 2008 meeting. Motion seconded by Chris Peterson. Roll call vote: Voting yes, Marcia Corr, Chris Peterson, Mel Clancy, Helen Raikes, Beth Schuler and Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

II. MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

Technical Assistance Proposal and Budget

At their July meeting, the Board of Trustees authorized \$75,000 from the Cash Fund to be used to provide technical assistance to the Endowment grantees. In addition, the Board authorized up to \$35,000 of the \$75,000 to pay for .50 of a full time staff person and NCFF would pay \$35,000 for the remaining half. Becky shared an estimated budget of expenses required to hire a full-time person for technical assistance, and it reflected a cost of \$83,940 for this position - \$13,940 over what was authorized.

Motion by Mel Clancy, second by Helen Raikes: *To add an additional \$14,000 to the already-authorized \$35,000 to cover the overage as presented – a total of \$49,000 from the Cash Fund.* Roll call vote: Marcia Corr, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler. No opposition.

The trustees discussed an offer from the Director of the Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC) grant to distribute \$50,000 into the Endowment Cash Fund to be used for technical assistance to the Endowment grantees. The trustees need to discuss how the Cash Fund can receive donations. Further discussion needs to occur on the spending authority in the event the Board needs additional funds for technical assistance.

Status of Cash Fund after Grant Disbursements

Greg Prochazka reported on the status of the Cash Fund after grant disbursements. The total of the 2008 grant awards was \$1,729,708. Out of that amount, \$941,846 has currently been distributed (50% of grants plus start-up costs). At six months, on December 31st, \$630,290 (40% of grant) will be distributed and the last 10% of the grants, \$157,572, will be distributed no later than August 15, 2009.

South Sioux City Grant Application

NCFF received an email from South Sioux City Public Schools on July 30, 2008, inquiring about the status of their grant application. South Sioux City had documentation they had submitted their application on April 15, 2008 but NCFF's records show no indication of having received the application. Questions from the Board of Trustees' legal counsel were:

1. Had the Board kept copies of correspondence with applicants, confirming receipt of their applications; and
2. Did the Board widely post the timeline announcing application due dates, award notification, etc.

Becky summarized South Sioux City's grant application for the Board, in which two separate discussions occurred: 1) whether to fund the South Sioux City grant; and 2) releasing the RFP for the second round of grants, and should it be limited to those who applied during the first round and scored high but were not able to be funded or to open it up to full competition.

Motion by Chris Peterson, seconded by Helen Raikes: *To not fund the South Sioux City grant application since it was not received in a timely way to be scored competitively against the other grants.* Roll call vote: Marcia Corr, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler. No opposition.

III. ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

Adoption of the Sixpence Logo

The board reiterated their support of the Sixpence brand that was originally developed by NCFF staff as an Endowment fundraising tool. The Board also confirmed that the Endowment has several elements to it (i.e., the Board of Trustees, private fundraising, cash fund, etc.) and that Sixpence could become the way to represent the collective picture. Examples:

- The Board of Trustees *governs* the Sixpence fund
- The grantees are *funded* by Sixpence funds
- Donors *contribute* to the Sixpence fund

It was decided that no action was needed, but the Board requested to see and approve various items that carry the Sixpence brand such as trustee letterhead, seals, and the Sixpence website.

The Board then discussed the origins of Sixpence and nursery rhymes in general and whether they should be concerned that some may equate Sixpence with pirate origins that date back to the 1400's. Sixpence language will be crafted so that it refers to rhymes, children responding to cadence, literacy-building and the caring interactions that reading provides to parent and child.

Final Evaluation Design & Budget Proposal

Barb Jackson from Munroe-Meyers reported on the final design to be used to evaluate child, family, health, and program outcomes with the Endowment grantees. The current cost to the Board for evaluation is \$25,000. For the purposes of the Board estimating evaluation costs for next year, it will likely be in the \$40,000 range due to additional numbers of children/families and programs to evaluate.

The evaluation includes the cost of three Endowment programs who provide home visiting services to volunteer to pilot some video taping interactions between: 1) parent/family and child; and 2) parent/family member and home visitor. Some of the tools for assessment include the ability to be provided via other languages. For those that do not; discussion occurred regarding an option for translation.

The trustees want to have further discussion about the total number of children and/or families that are impacted by Endowment programs. They also want to have further discussion about serving children until they are eligible to be served under another program.

Motion by Mel Clancy, second by Beth Schuler: *To accept the evaluation proposal as presented by Barb Jackson and the commensurate funding request of \$25,000.* Roll call vote: Marcia Corr, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler. No opposition.

Revisions to the 2009 Endowment RFP

Becky provided a list of questions to the trustees that included both content and process changes. Discussion will occur at the September meeting.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

- An Endowment grantee orientation will be held on September 26, 2008
- Helen suggested having one grantee join each Board of Trustee meeting, even by phone, and possibly sending photos of their program

V. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held September 10, 2008 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation Conference Room, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
September 10, 2008
Minutes

I. MEETING OPENING

The meeting of the Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on September 10, 2008, at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation (NCFF), 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln.

Members present: Jessie Rasmussen, Mel Clancy, Beth Schuler and Melody Hobson (representing the Commissioner of Education). Chris Peterson and Helen Raikes were absent.

Also in attendance: Greg Prochazka, Martha Nash, and Barb Schleisser from NDE. NCFF staff present was Becky Veak and Jen Hernandez, meeting recorder.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy and seconded by Beth Schuler to approve the minutes from the August 13, 2008 meeting with the following correction: *To not consider funding the South Sioux City grant application since it was not received in a timely way to be scored competitively against the other grants.* (The underline reflects added text). Roll call vote: Voting yes: Mel Clancy, Melody Hobson, Beth Schuler and Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

II. MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

Update on Endowment Financials

Greg Prochazka reported from NDE. After initial distributions to the grantees, \$1.878,157.28 million remains in the Cash Fund on June 30, 2008.

Letter of Agreement with Parent Information Resource Centers (PIRC)

The PIRC grant wants to transfer \$50,000 to the Endowment Cash Fund to be used for technical assistance. PIRC is in the second year of a five year grant and would need to report expenditures by October 1, 2008. They are asking the Trustees to provide documentation for the use of those funds for the months of July 1, 2008 to September 30, 2008.

Various ways for providing the documentation were discussed. There was a suggestion to talk with Omaha and Lincoln grantees (as opposed to all grantees) and talk about the personnel and fringe expenses they have expended during that three month period to be considered as technical assistance and, therefore, documented as such. Personnel and fringe counts as technical assistance (not to grantee, but to families) because any direct service to parents would qualify.

Several budget and accounting questions were raised.

- Is it allowable to accept federal money into the Cash Fund?
- Could NDE accept the money and track it as a federal program but use it for technical assistance for the Endowment grants?
- It was determined that NCFF could not receive the dollars because NCFF is not providing the direct technical assistance to families, but rather to the programs

Legal counsel advised that the trustees should obtain written authorization from the federal program officer overseeing the PIRC grant to make sure that sub-granting is allowable. Until then, it may be possible to have PIRC contract directly with the Omaha and Lincoln programs to receive PIRC dollars and then the Endowment would adjust their next grant distribution accordingly to reflect the dollars they already received from the PIRC grant.

A motion by Mel Clancy and seconded by Beth Schuler: *To have further discussion with PIRC regarding two possible options for utilizing the \$50,000 from PIRC for technical assistance. 1) Ask PIRC if they can contract directly with the Omaha and Lincoln programs to receive monies from PIRC with the agreement that we will adjust their payment from the Endowment to equal the amount they received in PIRC dollars; 2) Follow up with the PIRC program officer for authorization to proceed in this manner, and to ensure potential future transactions proceed under a normal procedure of receiving money and documenting its use.* The trustees were in agreement that if PIRC could not directly contract with Lincoln and Omaha, the possibility existed they were forfeiting the \$50,000.

The trustees had further conversation regarding direct contributions into the Cash Fund and what would be allowable and non-allowable to accept. Legal Counsel suggested the trustees may need to seek statutory authority in some cases. Legal Counsel will research the issue of direct contributions and bring a recommendation to the next meeting. Issues discussed:

- Direct contributions from private donors
- Gifts, bequests
- Spending authority
 - Every budget bill contains a clause that indicates accepting gifts over \$10,000 must be approved by the Governor; if the Governor approves the gift, it comes with automatic spending authority

The issue of sustainability of funds was discussed in the event that contributions were made directly to the Cash Fund; it would be a one-time contribution and therefore not subject to investment or reinvestment under the Endowment.

Status Update on Contracts for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

- A Letter of Agreement is being drafted between NDE (on behalf of the Board of Trustees) and Munroe-Meyer Institute for \$25,000 for evaluation

- A Letter of Agreement is being drafted between NDE (on behalf of the Board of Trustees and NCFF for \$49,000 for partial payment of a staff position to provide technical assistance

Status Update on Technical Assistance Staff Position

- Eleven applications have been received
- An interview team has been organized with representation from the Trustees, NDE and DHHS
- Interviews are scheduled for September 30 and October 8, 2008

III. ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

Approve Sixpence Materials

Trustee letterhead with the Sixpence brand on it was distributed and discussed. There is still some confusion over the relationship between the trustees and Sixpence. Further work will be done.

Questions for the 2009 Endowment RFP

Several questions were posed to the trustees regarding issues discussed this past year and whether to consider integrating them into the next round of Endowment funding.

1. Should grant funds that are awarded be proportional to the school district's at-risk population?

The trustees discussed how to build into the grant the identification of children who are most at risk. Two issues rose to the surface: 1) do multiple risk factors require a higher level of investment; and 2) do larger school district populations warrant larger grant amounts?

The trustees discussed allowing the option to apply for more than the current ceiling of \$150,000 if applicants were able to document the additional cost of serving children with multiple risk factors. It may be possible if applicants could document the additional cost of services to address multiple risk factors, they could serve fewer children.

If the trustees choose this option, the technical assistance provided to applicants would need to focus on how to identify community needs and the most at risk populations. Standards would need to be clear: 1) for serving the most at risk; 2) offer flexibility in funding to adequately fund programs that address populations with multiple risk factors; and 3) build in accountability for results.

The trustees discussed allowing a larger grant ceiling (currently \$150,000) for communities with larger populations of children who are at risk or to maintain the ceiling at \$150,000 but allow the possibility of applicants writing an additional application for any amount over \$150,000. In ranking the grants, consideration

would need to still be given to a distribution across the state and for counties in particular need. The trustees agreed to stay within the current range of grant awards of \$75,000 - \$150,000 while considering options for allowing applications that exceed \$150,000 based on documented need.

2. Will the 2009 grant process be a fully competitive process?

Trustees had discussed the possibility of taking the applications from last year that received a high score but there wasn't enough funding available to fund them in the first year. The trustees agreed that it should be a fully competitive process and that applicants who submitted a grant last year would need to submit again.

3. If a teacher is sick or has to be out for training, etc., do the substitute(s) teacher(s) have to have an early childhood endorsement?

This question has been raised by current grantees that primarily live in rural areas. They have indicated it is difficult for them to find substitute teachers who have an early childhood endorsement. The trustees agreed that programs could use substitutes who do not have an early childhood endorsement but that it needs to be made clear this is not a permanent situation. They also discussed whether the substitute should be a certified teacher. The trustees agreed:

- The substitute should have at least the minimum qualifications stipulated in the grant for the paraprofessional or assistant teacher;
- The staff ratios need to be maintained as set forth in the grant; and
- The substitute should meet the schools procedure for background checks.

The substitute issue only pertains to classrooms and not to home visitation situations.

4. Do you want to have an exception process in place?

The trustees agreed "no exceptions".

5. This year Continuation Grants will be added. Last year you discussed: 1) start-up grants to get to Column #1; 2) innovation grants; and 3) Centers of Excellence.

For the current grantees, their year-end progress documentation will serve as their continuation proposal. The trustees agreed that the Endowment is still too new to offer the opportunity to apply for start-up grants, innovation grants or Centers of Excellence.

6. Would you like to encourage programs to offer full-day (7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.) year round care?

The trustees agreed to build a requirement into the RFP that home visitation programs need to be year round. They also agreed that center-based programs will receive extra points in the scoring if they offer full-day year-round care or demonstrate they are moving to that model.

A motion by Mel Clancy and seconded by Beth Schuler to build the above answers to the questions (#2 - #6) into this year's RFP. Roll call vote. Voting yes: Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, Mel Clancy and Melody Hobson. No opposition.

The trustees want to revisit the discussion under Question #1 regarding grant funds being proportional to a school district's at-risk population. The trustees asked staff to bring to the next meeting an answer to the following question:

- How many children in each school district meet the definition of at or below poverty?
- What percentages of children who are at risk are in each school district?

A motion by Mel Clancy, seconded by Melody Hobson to accept the following process changes in relation to the RFP release:

- Release date in December instead of January
- Require an abstract (executive summary) from the applicant outlining their proposal (include number of children served and approach taken)
- Limit the number of pages
- Have all pages be the same orientation
- Include a start-up plan
- Require numbered pages and the applicant's name on each page
- No formal Bidder's Conference; hold TA workshops instead (post questions and answers on the website for consistent message)
- Require facilities to be handicap accessible for parents and children
- Submit application electronically and follow-up with a hard copy
- Ask applicants to follow up and ask for a confirmation of receipt after submitting their application

Roll call vote. Voting yes: Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler, Mel Clancy and Melody Hobson. No opposition.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

- Endowment Press Conference articles were shared with the trustees
- Jessie Rasmussen attended the last State Board of Education meeting and presented progress on the Endowment

V. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m. The next meeting will be held October 8, 2008 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation Conference Room, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
October 8, 2008
Minutes

I. MEETING OPENING

The meeting of the Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on October 8, 2008, at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation (NCFF), 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln.

Members present: Mel Clancy, Melody Hobson (representing the Commissioner of Education), Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen, and Beth Schuler.

Also in attendance: Greg Prochazka, Carol Fichter, Martha Nash, and Barb Schleisser from NDE. Representing NCFF were Becky Veak and Jen Hernandez (meeting recorder).

A motion was made by Mel Clancy and seconded by Chris Peterson to approve the minutes from the September 10, 2008 meeting. Roll call vote: Voting yes: Mel Clancy, Melody Hobson, Chris Peterson, Beth Schuler and Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

II. MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

Update on Endowment Financials

Report from Greg Prochazka. Based on a three percent (3%) return on investment, projections are that on June 30, 2009 there will be an available balance of \$1,875,060.27. In order to sustain the current grants, the trustees need to plan for distributing \$1,575,000 of the \$1,875,060.27. Leaving \$457,632 for distribution in 2009.

Based on this information, the trustees discussed the possibility of not releasing an RFP in 2009. All agreed it was important to award grants in 2009 even if it is one or two additional grant awards. Mel Clancy made a suggestion that the website indicate that trustees plan to sustain existing grants and new grants will be more limited and dependent on availability of funds. Jessie Rasmussen, Chair of the Trustees, will send a letter indicating the same to the current grantees and reassuring them of the Board's commitment to sustaining the programs currently funded. An action item to vote on proceeding with the RFP will be on the November meeting agenda.

Authority to Accept Dollars into the Cash Fund

Margaret Worth, Legal Counsel to the Board of Trustees, reported on accepting dollars into the Endowment Cash Fund. Margaret reported that all indications are that private donors can contribute directly to the Cash Fund. Once it is in the

Cash Fund, money, as directed by the Board, can only be used for the grant program according to statute. Any bequest dollars or private/public family foundation monies can go directly to the Cash Fund.

Margaret's legal opinion is the Board of Trustees does not have the authority to accept or reject gifts to the Cash Fund. Further, the Board of Trustees cannot carry out conditions tied to any gift to the Cash Fund. Cash Fund contributions can be private, but public (taxpayer dollar) funds are still in question. Federal public dollars could, however, be given to NDE.

Update on PIRC funds

It was reported that due to time constraints, the Endowment Cash Fund was not able to receive the \$50,000 from PIRC federal dollars.

III. ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

Grant Funds Proportional to School District's At Risk Population

Mel Clancy asked the Board of Trustees to delay this issue for one year due to limited dollars in the Cash Fund. There was continued recognition that current grant amounts are not proportional to the differences in the need across school districts. The base amount for grant awards will stay at \$75,000, but the Trustees will continue to discuss what the ceiling should be, and if that ceiling should vary based on raw numbers of the at risk population.

Confirm 2009 RFP Adjustments

- The RFP will be released on December 12, 2008
- The language will reflect *most* at risk
- Continue the documentation for the partnership agreements and the Early Childhood Advisory Committee
- Agreed that continuation grants were a new grant category
- Agreed to continue having a mandatory bidder's conference allowing at least one member of the partnership to satisfy the mandatory attendance
- Agreed to technical assistance workshops
- Agreed to add a new category for scoring which included how communities would determine the most at risk in their areas

A motion made by Helen Raikes and seconded by Mel Clancy *to approve the 2009 RFP adjustments*. Roll call vote: Melody Hobson, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen, Beth Schuler. No opposition.

The trustees then had further discussion about making year-round services a priority for awarding grants. The trustees agreed it is important to have applicants demonstrate how they are meeting the greatest needs of the families they serve and were wondering whether limited hours and days of programs excluded the most at risk population. The trustees then had further discussion

regarding all-day, year-round services. Most agreed it was harmful to have infants and toddlers in multiple settings with too many transitions.

A motion made by Beth Schuler and seconded by Helen Raikes *to require year-round services, and that center based programs that do not provide full-day services need to justify in their application why their model is meeting the needs of their community. Further, if services change over the summer, applicants will provide justification for the change.* Roll call vote: Melody Hobson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen and Beth Schuler voting yes; Mel Clancy and Chris Peterson voting no. Motion carries.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Martha Nash reported on the technical assistance to Walthill and Macy, and the Grantee Orientation.

Carol Fichter thanked Jessie Rasmussen for presenting to the Nebraska State Board of Education regarding the Endowment Program.

V. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m. The next meeting will be held November 12, 2008 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation Conference Room, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200, Lincoln, NE.

Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees
November 12, 2008
Minutes

I. MEETING OPENING

The meeting of the Early Childhood Education Endowment Board of Trustees was called to order at 1:10 p.m. on November 12, 2008, at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation (NCFF), 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 200, Lincoln.

Members present: Mel Clancy, Melody Hobson (representing the Commissioner of Education), Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, and Jessie Rasmussen.

Also in attendance: Greg Prochazka, Carol Fichter, and Barb Schleisser from NDE. Representing NCFF were Becky Veak and Jen Hernandez (meeting recorder).

A conference call with the Crete program was added to the agenda for 2:30 p.m. to hear a report on the status of their grant program.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy and seconded by Chris Peterson to approve the minutes from the October 8, 2008 meeting. Roll call vote. Voting yes: Mel Clancy, Melody Hobson, Chris Peterson, and Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

II. MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

Public disclosure

A \$49,000 contract between the Endowment Board of Trustees and the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation was disclosed as part of the Board of Trustees agenda, and also appeared on the State Board of Education's agenda at their last meeting.

Update on Endowment Financials

Proceeds from the second quarter of the calendar year (April-June) were deposited in October in the amount of \$455,016.56. Three percent (3%) is still the current estimate for earnings.

There was discussion of whether the \$40 million principal ever declines due to market fluctuations or if it stays constant and the money generated is what fluctuates, based on market conditions. Since deposits into the cash fund are generally two quarters behind, the Trustees noted the downturn in the economy will not be revealed in their financial documents in real time. They discussed the need for a more current way to reconcile balances and requested staff to invite officials from the State Investment Council to come to their next meeting in January.

In order to prepare for the next funding cycle, the projected amount that will be available in the cash fund for distribution on June 30, 2009 is \$2,045,267.41. After sustaining the current grants at \$1,729,709 and providing \$49,000 for technical assistance and \$25,000 for evaluation, a balance would remain of \$241,558.

Based on projections and the downturn not yet appearing in the financial documents, the trustees discussed whether to release the RFP in December 2008 or to delay release for one year. They also discussed the possibility of funding a few small planning grants or to go back to applications that were submitted in April 2008 and fund the next one or two in line. The trustees asked staff to check with legal counsel to determine the legality of returning to applications that have already been submitted during the last stage.

A motion was made by Mel Clancy to *delay the RFP indefinitely*. An amendment was suggested by Melody Hobson to *delay the RFP release for the 2009-2010 grant cycle*. Seconded by Helen Raikes. Roll call vote. Voting yes: Melody Hobson, Mel Clancy, Chris Peterson, Helen Raikes, Jessie Rasmussen. No opposition.

III. ENDOWMENT ADMINISTRATION

Requirement of full day, year-round care

Since the RFP will not be released this grant cycle, this discussion was held.

Approve 2009 RFP for release on December 12, 2008

This action item did not take place due to the decision of the trustees to delay the release of the RFP.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Update on technical assistance position

It was announced that Kathleen Feller was hired by the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation as the Associate Vice President of Early Childhood Programs. Kathleen will be working with the Board of Trustees and providing technical assistance to the grantees.

Update from Crete program

Connie Lentell called in to report on progress of the Crete program.

Crete's program started 13 years ago under Even Start funding. A couple of years ago, they noticed that high school girls were becoming mothers earlier and earlier. They started providing home visiting, but the caseloads were increasing rapidly. When the endowment funding became available, Crete decided to expand their program to serve pregnant teens in addition to parenting teens.

The program asks the teens to stay in school; there is after-school tutoring for the young women in addition to home visits. They currently serve 24 teen mothers; two of them are in college. Most of the young women are Medicaid eligible, though some of the girls are on their parent's insurance. Most are Hispanic but they can speak English, with the exception of the two newest clients who need translators.

They have had some challenges in hiring staff. Their home visitor has a bachelor's degree in family science and is getting a second degree in elementary and preschool education. In addition to the home visitors, they work in partnership with a Registered Nurse who goes along on home visits, does prenatal visits and speaks with the doctor if there are concerns in the home.

During the summer of 2009, Blue River will hire a new infant teacher, and the Crete program will buy slots for the children of the teen parents they are currently serving. Currently, some of the children of the teen parents being served are in the Blue River center while their mothers are in school.

The Crete program is very two generation focused. They get excited about:

- babies born full term and healthy size;
- seeing parenting gains;
- grades and school attendance; and
- home visits on time.

Connie reported the only issue is trying to juggle child care with only one infant room. They currently need more space than is available.

Next meetings

The trustees decided not to hold a December meeting, and to continue meeting the second Wednesday of every month through 2009.

V. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next meeting will be held January 14, 2009 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. at the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation Conference Room, 215 Centennial Mall South, Suite #200, Lincoln, NE.