Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee - Minutes

Monday, January 13, 2014

12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Department of Workforce Services – 1385 South State Street, Salt Lake City

Committee Members: Karen Crompton, Bill Crim, Dr. Renee Olesen, William Duncan, Brad Drake, Joe Piccolo, Liz Zentner

Commission Members: Jon Pierpont, Martell Menlove, David Burton, Sheila Walsh-McDonald (for David Patton)

Excused: Ray Reutzel, Judge Ric Oddone, Dr. Doug Goldsmith

Staff Support: Jessica Staker, Lynette Rasmussen, Carrie Mayne

Attendees: Geoffrey Landward, Karl Wilson, Margaret Peterson, Cynthia Talbot-Holz, Mike Miller, Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson, Tricia Davis, Kristen Floyd, Anneli Segura, Ashley Babbitt, Kari Cutler, Katherine Leksander, Bobbie Ikegami, Jennifer Larson

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTION

Welcome and Introductions
 	
Review Special Committee Research Reports
	Welcome and Introductions (Bishop Burton)
	• Approval of November 18th Committee meeting minutes
	
	Review Special Committee Research Reports (Karen Crompton, Bill Duncan)
	• Agency Orientation Meetings with Special Committees – Lynette Rasmussen
	  o William Duncan presented the data found for the Parent group.
	  o Karen Crompton presented the data found for the Early Childhood group.
	  o Joe Piccolo presented the data found for the
		Brad Drake motioned to accept the minutes as written. Bill Crim seconded. Motion carried
		
		Karen Crompton will prioritize the Early Childhood group's list of data findings.
		
		William Duncan will prioritize the Parent group's list of data findings.
		
		Joe Piccolo will work to further development of the Youth Framework and will prioritize the group's list of data findings.
		
		Each Special Committee will meet before the March

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTION
	Youth group. o January 13th – Parent o January 27th – Early Childhood	Advisory Committee meeting and will be prepared to present their findings during the March Committee meeting.
2014 Legislation	2014 Legislation • Presentation – Senator Reid • DWS Budget Request for CCDF Funds – Kristen Floyd • Mechanism to Review IGP-related Bills – Jon Pierpont	Lynette Rasmussen and Jessica Staker will find another date for the next Committee meeting in March as the scheduled date is during the Legislative Session. The Special Committees will work with Lynette Rasmussen to meet with staff from the Departments represented by the Commission.
Strategic Planning Next Steps	Strategic Planning Next Steps (Mike Miller) • DWS Project Plan – Lynette Rasmussen	The Special Committees will invite Carrie Mayne to their future meetings to assist with the data needed.
Concluding Remarks	Concluding Remarks (Jon Pierpont, Bishop David Burton)	
Public Comment	Public Comment	Karen Crompton motioned to send a letter to the DWS Appropriations Committee supporting the Department's budget request of $600,000 for the CCDF funds. Liz Zentner seconded. Motion carried. Jon Pierpont will send a letter to Speaker Lockhart and President Niederhauser about the IGP Advisory Committee offering to review and provide feedback on IGP-related bills. Mike Miller requested the Committee members send an example of their favorite strategic plan. Joe Piccolo motioned to accept the proposed legislation by Senator Reid. Bill Crim seconded. Motion carried.

Parent Subcommittee Initial Report
Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee
December 16, 2013

In the chart below, we organize some of the basic information we currently have about risk factors for intergenerational poverty as they relate to the status of the parent in an IGP household. After each identified or hypothesized risk factor, we have listed (1) potential resources that might respond to each, followed by some (2) questions that might aid understanding of the factor and possible responses.

Education

Risk Factors	*Possible Resources*	*Research Holes*
No employment within last year	Nurse-Family Partnership	Link to education, skills? Specific trades?
No high school degree	Ohio's Learning, Earning, and Parenting Program[1]	Reasons?
Teen mother		Causes?
Parental support for children's education[2]	Pathways to Education (Toronto) Learnfare[3] Progresa[4]	
Parenting skills[5]	Parents as Teachers[6]	Correlation with family structure?
Limited English proficiency		Immigration status?

Home and Family

Risk Factors	*Possible Resources*	*Research Holes*
Unmarried parent[7]	Marriage Savers[8] Nurse-Family Partnership[9]	Ratio divorced, cohabiting, never married?
Changed residence within last year.		Causes?
4+ children in household	Nurse-Family Partnership	Multi-partner fertility? Marital status?
Poorer communities[10]		Causes?
Imprisonment of parent		Prevalence? Nature of offense?
Kin foster care arrangement	Grandfamilies[11]	Prevalence? Profile of household?
Social Capital[12]	Bridges Out of Poverty	
Welfare assistance – economic self-sufficiency	Nurse-Family Partnership Step 13[13]	Mechanism?

	Strengthening Families Protective Framework	

Health

Risk Factors	*Possible Resources*	*Research Holes*
Unresolved childhood trauma[14]	Child First (home visiting)	

[1] Robert G. Wood, et al., "Encouraging School Enrollment and Attendance Among Teenage Parents on Welafre: Early Impacts of Ohio's LEAP Program" Children & Youth Services Review 17(1/2):277-307 (1995).
[2] Philip Oreopoulos & Robert S. Brown (unpublished manuscript)
[3] Thomas S. Dee, "Conditional Cash Penalties in Education: Evidence from the Learnfare Experiment" Economics of Education Review 30:924-937 (2011).
[4] T. Paul Schultz, "School Subsidies for the Poor: Evaluating the Mexican Progresa Poverty Program" Journal of Developmental Economics 74:199-250 (2004).
[5] Richard V. Reeves & Kimberly Howard, "The Parenting Gap" Center Children & Families at Brookings, September 8, 2013 at http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/09/09-parenting-gap-social-mobility-wellbeing-reeves; Kay Hymowitz, "Universal Pro-K Won't Solve Vocabulary Gap (or Inequality): Results Show Just How Hard it is for the Government to Compensate for Poor Learning Environments at Home" Time, October 25, 2013 at http://ideas.time.com/2013/10/25/universal-pre-k-wont-solve-vocabulary-gap-or-inequality/; Jim Dryden, "Nurturing May Protect Kids from Brain Changes Linked to Poverty" Washington University in St. Louis, October 28, 2013 at http://news.wustl.edu/news/Pages/26052.aspx
[6] http://www.parentsasteachers.org/
[7] Raj Chetty, et al., "Equality of Opportunity Project" at http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/; W. Bradford Wilcox, "Marriage Makes Our Children Richer—Here's Why" The Atlantic, October 2013 at http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/10/marriage-makes-our-children-richer-heres-why/280930/; W. Bradford Wilcox, "John Rawls and Salt Lake City: Perfect Together" Family Studies, October 16, 2013 at http://family-studies.org/john-rawls-and-salt-lake-city-perfect-together/; Kate Antonovics & Robert Town, "Are All the Good Men Married? Uncovering the Source of the Marital Wage Premium" The American Economic Review 94(3):317-321 (2004); Michael DeGroote, "Moving Up: How Marriage and Education Affect the Face of Economic Mobility" Deseret News, September 18, 2013 at http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865586674/Moving-up-How-marriage-and-education-affect-the-face-of-economic-mobility.html?pg=all; Christine Kim, "Marriage Combats Child Poverty" Heritage Foundation, December 6, 2013 at http://www.spotlightonpoverty.org/ExclusiveCommentary.aspx?id=93e821a0-46b1-4562-b499-e8646300e8bf; Kay Hymowitz, "No Place Like Home" Family Studies, October 17, 2013 at http://family-studies.org/neighborhood-race-family-economic-mobility/
[8] "Kentucky Profiting from Divorce-Proofing Marriages" CBN News, December 12 2013 at http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/us/2013/December/Saving-Communities-Kentucky-Tackles-Divorce-Head-On/.
[9] http://www.nursefamilypartnership.org/proven-results/Evidence-of-Effectiveness
[10] Raj Chetty, et al., "Equality of Opportunity Project" at http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/; Philip Oreopoulos, "The Long-Run Consequences of Living in a Poor Neighborhood" The Quarterly Journal of Economics. 118(4):1533-1575 (2003).
[11] http://www.cssutah.org/grandfamilies-main-page
[12] Raj Chetty, et al., "Equality of Opportunity Project" at http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/
[13] Scott Walter, "Enemy of the Welfare State" Philanthropy Daily, October 14, 2013 at http://www.philanthropydaily.com/enemy-of-the-welfare-state/
[14] Vinent J. Felitti & Robert F. Anda, "The Relationship of Adverse Childhood Experiences to Adult Medical Disease, Psychiatric Disorders and Sexual Behavior: Implications for Healthcare" in The Impact of Early Life Trauma on Health and Disease (Ruth A. Lanius, et al., editors 2010); David Boorstein, "Protecting Children from Toxic Stress" New York Times, October 30, 2013 at http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/10/30/protecting-children-from-toxic-stress/

EARLY CHILDHOOD FRAMEWORK

- There is an evidence base for policy areas and policy foundations
- The years starting at birth and continuing through age 8 are a critical time for achieving positive health, learning, and economic outcomes later in life
- The supports and experiences that children receive have a cumulative effect – each experience influences the next and sustains the grow and sustains the growth and development that comes before

POLICY AREAS

Health Policy Choices

- Timely and ongoing prenatal, pediatric, and oral health care
- Access to affordable health insurance for children and families
- Screening, assessment and appropriate follow-up for developmental delays or disabilities
- Partnerships to coordinate the identification and delivery of health care services with early learning programs.
- Community-based programs targeting sources of toxic stress such as violence, crime, substance abuse and mental illness, combined with support for parents and caregivers who need them
- Simplify access, expand outreach, materials, training, and data use that will maximize participation of families, providers, schools and communities in the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children Program (WIC), the Child, the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast programs

Family Support Policy Choices

- Voluntary, evidence-based, home visiting programs for new and expectant families at risk for poor child outcomes
- Parent education and parent-child interaction programs that support development and nurturing of infants and toddlers
- Access to child care assistance for eligible families with provisions for quality and continuity of care
- Effective outreach and enrollment in programs that promote family economic stability and parent participation in higher education
- Prevention programs and services for children at risk of abuse and neglect and their families
- Family engagement policies starting with defining family engagement, establishing benchmarks of success for targeted populations, and monitoring progress
- Access to health care and education programs for children cared for by grandparents and other relative caregivers

Education Policy Choices

- Access to high-quality care and learning through high quality standards based programs for infants and toddlers with educational, health and development components; high-quality child care, voluntary preschool for low-income 3- and 4- olds; and full day kindergarten

- Partnerships between community and school-based early learning programs and services Opportunities for learning outside of the school day, including summer
- Transition planning from early care, to preschool, to K-12 learning environments Coordinated professional development, coaching and training that improves practice and provides effective learning opportunities for children

POLICY FOUNDATIONS – Standards, Screening and Assessment, Accountability Systems

Standards Policy Choices

- Developmentally appropriate early learning standards that reflect the major domains of development (social-emotional, physical, cognitive, and language) and foundational skill areas (literacy, math, sciences social studies and the arts)
- Alignment of early learning standards and K-12 standards across the major domains of development and foundational skill areas
- Implementation of standards through teacher training, curricula and assessment, with review of results for vulnerable children
- Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) that are financed to advance programs to higher quality ratings and improved child outcomes
- Development and use of program quality and practice standards for family support providers

Screening and Assessment Policy Choices

- Screenings for hearing, vision, metabolic disorders, and developmental delays with appropriate follow up
- Timely, appropriate behavioral and mental health identification and intervention including the needs of children who come to the attention of the child welfare system
- Timely and appropriate assessment, referral, and enrollment in early childhood development and prevention programs
- Child assessment tools that are formative, as well as developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate
- Assessment of the quality of learning environments, educator/child interaction, and teaching strategies
- Statewide Kindergarten entry assessment to assess readiness and inform initial instruction
- Aligned early learning, Kindergarten entry, and K-3 assessments

Accountability Systems Policy Choices

- Clear benchmarks of outcomes for children, families, and program effectiveness from health, family support, and learning objectives
- Longitudinal, linked data systems between programs and state agencies that can be disaggregated by risk factors to inform strategies for improving program quality and child outcomes

- Early warning systems to identify problems such as chronic absence and allow for timely intervention
- Early childhood education program data collected and analyzed by children, programs, and the workforce
- Professional development for data users (teachers, administrators) to support the correct interpretation and use of data

IGP Youth Framework

Our coordinated approach ensures youth are relevant in Utah's advancing economy by guaranteeing success as they pursue and achieve academic and career goals and as they develop healthy interpersonal relationships.

Our Goals

1. Academic success.
    a. Increase the % of youth performing at grade level according to end of year tests
    b. Increase average composite ACT scores
    c. % of youth with high school diploma or GED
    d. % of youth that are re-engaged in academic achievement
    e. Increase the number of high school graduates

2. Career Skills.
    a. % of youth pursuing post-secondary or trade education or military training/service
    b. % of youth participating in career counseling, assessment on Utah Futures
    c. % of youth engaged in appropriate employment

3. Interpersonal Relationships.
    a. % of youth that complete a relationship education class/workshop
    b. Increase parental involvement, mentoring and leadership opportunities.
    c. Increase collaboration efforts with community partners

1 **EXTENDED EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS**
2 2014 GENERAL SESSION
3 STATE OF UTAH
4

5 **LONG TITLE**
6 **General Description:**
7 This bill creates the Extended Education Opportunities Grant Program.
8 **Highlighted Provisions:**
9 This bill:
10 ▸ defines terms;
11 ▸ creates the Extended Education Opportunities Grant Program to fund additional
12 educational opportunities for students affected by intergenerational poverty, outside
13 of the regular school day offerings;
14 ▸ requires the State Board of Education to:
15 • solicit proposals from school districts and charter schools to receive money
16 under the program; and
17 • award grants to school districts and charter schools based on certain criteria;
18 ▸ establishes criteria for the State Board of Education to consider when awarding
19 grants to school districts and charter schools; and
20 ▸ requires the State Board of Education to annually report to the Education Interim
21 Committee and the Utah Intergenerational Welfare Reform Commission.
22 **Money Appropriated in this Bill:**
23 This bill appropriates:
24 ▸ to the State Board of Education - Utah State Office of Education - Initiative
25 Programs, as an ongoing appropriation:
26 • from the Education Fund, $5,000,000.
27 **Other Special Clauses:**
28 This bill provides an effective date.
29 **Utah Code Sections Affected:**
30 ENACTS:
31 **53A-17a-171**, Utah Code Annotated 1953
32

33 *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the state of Utah:*

34 Section 1. Section **53A-17a-171** is enacted to read:

35 **53A-17a-171. Extended Education Opportunities Grant Program -- Definitions --**
36 **Grant requirements -- Reporting requirements.**

37 (1) As used in this section:

38 (a) "Board" means the State Board of Education.

39 (b) "Eligible student" means a student who is classified as a child affected by
40 intergenerational poverty.

41 (c) "Intergenerational poverty" has the same meaning as in Section 35A-9-102.

42 (d) "Local Education Agency" or "LEA" means a school district or charter school.

43 (e) "Program" means the Extended Education Opportunities Program created in
44 Subsection (2).

45 (2) The Extended Education Opportunities Grant Program is created to provide grants
46 to eligible LEAs to fund additional educational opportunities for eligible students, outside of
47 the regular school day offerings.

48 (3) Subject to future budget constraints, the board shall distribute money appropriated
49 for the program to LEAs in accordance with this section.

50 (4) The board shall:

51 (a) solicit proposals from LEAs to receive money under the program; and

52 (b) award grants to LEAs based on criteria described in Subsection (5).

53 (5) In awarding a grant under Subsection (4), the board shall consider:

54 (a) the percentage of an LEA's students that are classified as children affected by
55 intergenerational poverty;

56 (b) the level of administrative support and leadership at an eligible LEA to effectively
57 implement, monitor, and evaluate the program; and

58 (c) an LEA's commitment and ability to work with the Department of Workforce
59 Services, the Department of Health, the Department of Human Services, and the juvenile courts
60 to provide services to the LEA's eligible students.

61 (6) To receive a grant under the program, an LEA shall submit a proposal to the board
62 detailing:

63 (a) the LEA's strategy to implement the program, including the LEA's strategy to

64 improve the academic achievement of children affected by intergenerational poverty;
65 (b) the LEA's strategy for coordinating with and engaging the Department of
66 Workforce Services to provide services for the LEA's eligible students;
67 (c) the number of students the LEA plans to serve, categorized by age,
68 intergenerational poverty status, free or reduced price school lunch status, and English
69 language learner status;
70 (d) the number of students, eligible students, and schools the LEA plans to fund with
71 the grant money; and
72 (e) the estimated cost per student.
73 (7) (a) The board shall annually report to the Legislature's Education Interim
74 Committee and the Utah Intergenerational Welfare Reform Commission created in Section
75 35A-9-301, by November 31 each year:
76 (i) the progress of LEA programs using grant money;
77 (ii) the progress of LEA programs in improving the academic achievement of children
78 affected by intergenerational poverty; and
79 (iii) the LEAs coordination efforts with the Department of Workforce Services, the
80 Department of Health, the Department of Human Services, and the juvenile courts.
81 (b) LEAs that receive grant money pursuant to this section shall provide to the board
82 information that is necessary for the board's report to the Legislature's Education Interim
83 Committee and the Utah Intergenerational Welfare Reform Commission as required in
84 Subsection (7)(a).
85 Section 2. **Appropriation.**
86 Under the terms and conditions of Title 63J, Chapter 1, Budgetary Procedures Act, for
87 the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014, and ending June 30, 2015, the following sums of money
88 are appropriated from resources not otherwise appropriated, or reduced from amounts
89 previously appropriated, out of the funds or accounts indicated. These sums of money are in
90 addition to any amounts previously appropriated for fiscal year 2015.
91 From Education Fund $5,000,000
92 Schedule of Programs:
93 Contracts and Grants $5,000,000
94 The Legislature intends that the appropriation under this section is:

95 (1) ongoing, subject to availability of funds;

96 (2) to be used to carry out the requirements of Section 53A-17a-171; and

97 (3) nonlapsing.

98 Section 3. **Effective date.**

99 (1) Except as provided in Subsection (2), this bill takes effect on May 13, 2014.

100 (2) Uncodified Section 2, Appropriation, takes effect on July 1, 2014.

Legislative Review Note
as of 12-10-13 4:16 PM

Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel