# Feedback from Working Group Members:

# Management and Oversight Topics

We compiled and consolidated all feedback received into a single document for the working group discussion. The content is organized by topic and whether the feedback might impact the actual recommendation, context around the recommendation, or implementation considerations. We will use this as a starting point for the conversation.

| ***Topic*** | ***Change to Recommendation*** | ***Context*** | ***Implementation*** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Management and Oversight Topics** | | | | |
| New State Agency | Actual recommendation language is a bit ambiguous about NEW state agency vs just centralize as the actual final recommendation; language needs to be stronger that a New State Agency is the recommendation, but more work needs to be done. | New Agency: More information and discussion needed for ***why*** a New State agency was determined by Commissioners to be the best option. | |  |
| State Accountability and Equity |  | For equity and accountability, include language re:  The New state agency is expected to engage most underserved children and families in partnership.  The accountability office at the new state agency and the performance scorecard is to hold the STATE accountable, not just communities. | |  |
| Data /Systems | Data and information should be used to evaluate the implementation and impact of recommendations, including equitable access to high-quality services. | Any data should be disaggregated by race, age, ELs, and special needs. | |  |
| English Learners | Revise the Commission’s guiding principles to explicitly highlight English Learner needs as a fundamental component to reimagining a viable and quality early childhood system.  Report should address recommendations around protections and supports for English Learners and whether centralizing into one state agency or new agency will have a positive, neutral, or negative impact.  Develop a section in the final report that explicitly outlines the Commission’s recommendations on how to best meet the needs of English Learners.  This section should include a section on how English Learners best fare under the governance and funding mechanism's recommendations. |  | | Ensure any new agency and infrastructure is designed to support needs of English Learners.  Report must address a plan to determine how services for English Learners will be delivered in the future.  Form a subcommittee with practitioners and specialists in early childhood English Learners to evaluate the commission’s recommendations and answer the implementation questions posted in external feedback.  ExceleRate Illinois must include culturally and linguistically responsive practices. |
| Advisory Bodies |  |  | | Future advisory bodies must include diverse stakeholders, including representation by race, English Learners, and children w/disabilities.  Parent/community voices should be compensated for their participation in advisories. |
| Community Systems Development, Regional, and Local Infrastructure |  | Report must include more language about community level infrastructure and collaborations as critical piece of the system. There is scant attention paid to community collaborations in the outline.  Include the framework for local collaboration that was submitted that includes critical functions for community collaborations. | |  |
| Intermediaries | Include explicit references to roles intermediaries play currently and should in the future. |  | |  |
| Implementation Planning |  |  | | Needs to be a next step strategy that includes an implementation team, plan, and designated leader and person accountable.  Implementation should be informed by public/private tables, particularly parents, families, and providers.  Report should reference the Early Learning Council specifically and address the role it will play in implementation.  Caution against another taskforce to oversee transition and creation of a New State Agency. Current state agencies should be given time/space/resources to develop a blue print and next steps, with definite attention to accountability mechanisms and forums.  Potentially include language around some of implementation questions that need to be answered, such as:   * Teacher Licensure * Standards alignment * K Transitions |
| Home Visiting Department @ State Agency | State should establish a “lead” home visiting division in centralized structure w/the authority to make decisions regarding home visiting throughout the system. |  | |  |
| Family Child Care and FFN Care |  |  | | Little mention of FCC & networks’ unique role in the outline. Need deeper engagement during implementation.  Much more attention needs to be focused on how to support FFN to enable flexibility in scheduling and address equity access issues. |