

**Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) Funding Design Workgroup  
Meeting 9**

**July 23, 2025, 4:30 – 6:00 pm**

**Public attendee link:**

[https://aftonpartners.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_xIZJaUi3T7qeCc3ExdFMIw](https://aftonpartners.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_xIZJaUi3T7qeCc3ExdFMIw)

**In attendance:**

**Workgroup members: 18**

Jill Andrews (Kiddie Kollege), Anita Andrews-Hutchinson (It Takes a Village Child Care Center), Grace Araya (Concordia Place), Priscilla Bahena (Parent), Shontee Blankenship (Illinois Department of Children and Family Services), Christina De La Rosa (Erie Neighborhood House), Lee Eklund (Malone's Early Learning Center), Kesha Harris (Parent, TAC Member), April Janney (Illinois Action for Children), Tom Layman (Center for Early Learning Funding Equity), Senator Alicia Lynch-Deatherage (Illinois State Board of Education), Erika Mendez (Latino Policy Forum), Irish Parks (Parent), Delreen Schmidt-Lenz (IECMH and Early Intervention Provider), Robin Steans (Advance Illinois), Bryan Stokes III (McCormick Foundation), Edie Washington-Gurley (Illinois Department of Children and Family Services), Emma Watters Reardon (Illinois Healthcare and Family Services).

*Lori Orr (Illinois Department of Human Services) – for Lesley Schwartz*

**State Agency Members and Consultants: 14**

Ann Whalen (Early Childhood Transition Director), Maya Portillo (Project Director for Funding Design, IDEC), Gerson Ramirez (Director of Legislative Affairs, IDEC), Christi Chadwick (Project Director – Workforce and Intermediaries, IDEC)

Liz Garza (Afton Partners), Megan Bock (Afton Partners), Heather Wendell (Afton Partners), Abby McCartney (Afton Partners), Katie Reed (Afton Partners), Siri Smillie (Afton Partners), Kayla Rosen, (Afton Partners), Crystal Roman (Afton Partners), Alejandra Garcia (Afton Partners), Andrea Cammilleri (All Children Thrive)

*German Barrios – Interpreter*

**Members of the public: 19**

Angela Farwig, Bob Spatz, Bri Stormer, Brynn Seibert, Debbie Louise, Donna Emmons, Elsie Williams, Jean Davis, Jennifer Brown, Kamal Saini, Karen Berman, Kathleen Kimmey, Kelsey Bakken, Kevin Wolf, Monica Williams, Nancy Salvador, Rosario Hernandez, Rosary Horne, Rowan Atwood

**Minutes**

**1. Welcome & Introduction – Maya Portillo, IDEC (15 min)**

Maya Portillo (IDEC) started the meeting by welcoming attendees and inviting interpreter, German Barrios to provide instructions for accessing the meeting through Spanish interpretation.

Maya introduced herself and her role as Project Director for Funding Design with IDEC for any members or public participants who may have missed the last meeting. She also welcomed a new Funding Design Workgroup Member, Rachel Latham. Rachel is the Vice President of Operations for Youth Development and Nutrition Programs at the YMCA of Rock River Valley in Rockford and will step in to represent

programs serving school-age children and afterschool care following Christy Filby's role change (Christy is no longer on the workgroup). Maya invited workgroup members to introduce themselves through the chat while she shared meeting reminders and housekeeping items for the virtual meeting. Finally, Maya informed the group about a new ELC Ad hoc committee on federal resources and programs. Maya will be staffing this committee and invited workgroup members to reach out with any questions. She also shared a link to express interest in joining:

<https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=nwgia7qOPEaE9TFxIQ-QBYD-MMVxwkZKqLyFSkTs1AhUOVIXWTZHWIJHM0w4Q1dBV1ZBRFBKNjBRRi4u>

Megan Bock (Afton Partners) reviewed Funding Design goals and the timeline. She highlighted what has changed on this timeline – an emphasis on identifying any potential legislative changes for 2026 by late fall 2025, as well as the addition of a “2027-2028 (Anticipated)” column to clarify that any changes recommended to the Funding system will not be implemented until FY28 (July 2027). She also reviewed the Emerging Design Principles which draw from input provided by communities, working groups, and state leadership.

## **2. Subcommittees update and discussion of emerging directions (60 min)**

### **Funding Distribution**

To begin the Subcommittee reports, Megan refreshed the group on funding design vocabulary including distinguishing between funding allocation, distribution mechanisms and funding amounts, and provided an update from the Funding Distribution Subcommittee. At their meeting in July, the Subcommittee discussed the benefits and limitations of four primary distributions strategies: competitive grants, non-competitive grants, vouchers and payee agreements. The Subcommittee's analysis of these strategies can be found in this Google doc: [tinyurl.com/ymx2r4t6](https://tinyurl.com/ymx2r4t6).

The Funding Distribution Subcommittee also discussed how different distribution tools can serve different purposes. For example, competitive grants can be “additive”, supporting new programs, expansion, while non-competitive grants can provide “base” funding and support sustainability and vouchers can help to optimize family choice and equitable access.

Delreen Schmidt-Lenz (workgroup member and Funding Distribution subcommittee member) summarized the key questions that subcommittee members have raised:

- Why is our current system set up the way it is?
- How can programs equitably access funding opportunities?
- How would distribution to primary recipients and then partner sites function?
- How are criteria set for non-competitive programs?
- Would non-competitive grants reduce administrative burden compared to competitive grants?
- How do we balance streamlining processes for programs with the needs for accountability?
- How could readiness (for interest in pursuing quality or improving facilities, for example) be assessed and awarded through non-competitive grants?
- There should be no wrong door for how children enter care. How do we get to that?
- What would be the impact on different types of providers/programs of changes to distribution methods?

The Funding Workgroup divided into four small groups to reflect on the Subcommittee's work and discuss the following prompts:

- After reviewing the different distribution methods and the subcommittee's reflections, what questions or additions would you like to raise?
- What should the subcommittee keep in mind as they are evaluating options?

Non-workgroup attendees also had the opportunity to respond to the prompts in Padlet [all Padlet comments are included in the appendix].

- English – <https://padlet.com/croman65/discussion-distribution-methods-ah3xpvwxq3nqxuvr>
- Spanish - <https://padlet.com/croman65/discusi-n-m-todos-de-distribuci-n-n395bzsd7sqibkj>

Facilitators shared the key takeaways from each of the small groups after returning to the full group:

- Group 1: The group would like to ensure that as funding is discussed, the Subcommittee keeps the idea of: “No wrong door for families” at the center of the conversation. They also recommended additional consideration for how the conversations at the two Subcommittees and the Working Group are connected.
- Group 2: The group noted that competitive grants can create instability when programs have to reapply. They also highlighted the interaction between DCFS child care licensing and funding – while some DCFS violations can easily be resolved, the status of a violation (even if resolved) can still impact grants and better communication between these systems would be helpful. They also noted that a challenge for vouchers and forward funding is anticipating attendance and uptake. From a parent perspective, vouchers should maximize choice but families need to have access to information and access to programs that meet their needs.
- Group 3: The group discussed drawbacks of competitive and non-competitive grants in light of limited resources, specifically how competitive grants might be distributed when there isn't enough funding to go around, noting that eligibility becomes very important for non-competitive grants when there isn't “enough” money to fund all programs. The group also wondered about the impact of shifts to federal funding for eligibility for non-competitive grants. Finally, they discussed whether funding could be provided in advance rather than as a reimbursement and prefer to structure most funding as up-front payment, if we can figure out the policy and structure behind it.
- Group 4: The group discussed a major drawback to competitive grants being that they are awarded to “highest performing” programs, or in some cases the programs with the strongest grant writers. They suggested considerations for supporting capacity-building and noted that quality and family choice (including that families may have different preferences or definitions of quality) should be considered as part of the distribution discussion. The group also noted that layering different distribution mechanisms may maintain the same administrative complications for providers and discussed the challenges for providers in Chicago who only have access to ECBG funds through the Chicago set-aside.

Other discussion from the chat:

- Jill Andrews (workgroup member): I think funding for children with IEP's/IFSP/Challenging Behaviors should be part of the conversation (for CBO's).

## **Funding Alignment**

After the small group reports, Abby McCartney (Afton Partners) summarized the work of the Funding Alignment Subcommittee. At the July meeting, the Subcommittee used the criteria discussed at the first meeting to evaluate programs and services and figure out which most closely align in order to make the best use of available funds and make programs feel more seamless for families and providers. The criteria the committee focused on were:

- Similar or highly connected **purpose**
- Common **recipient pool**
- Similar child/family and provider **eligibility**

Whether there is enough flexibility with federal requirements or ability to align state requirements to federal requirements is another consideration.

After review, there were two clear clusters of funding streams that were aligned on all three criteria: purpose, recipients, and child/family eligibility.

- Cluster 1: Child care, pre-k, and early learning and care
  - CCAP/CCDF
  - ECBG PFA/E
  - ECBG PI-Program Based
  - Smart Start Workforce Grants and Quality Supports
- Cluster 2: Home visiting/parent support
  - MIECHV
  - MCHV
  - IDHS-HV
  - ECBG PI-Home Visiting

The Subcommittee's proposal is to align these into two major funding streams, one for each purpose. This could look like merging funding streams at the state level, or if there are cases where it's not possible to totally merge or blend the funding, then the requirements, reporting, timeline, etc. can be aligned to make it feel more seamless to recipients.

EI and ECSE would continue to be funded separately, as their purpose and recipients were different enough that the subcommittee doesn't think it makes sense to blend them in with other funding.

- Bryan Stokes III (workgroup member) asked in the chat: How does alignment of program requirements / quality elements fit within this structure?

Grace Araya (workgroup member and subcommittee member) shared considerations that the Subcommittee elevated as they discussed the implications of aligning around these two funding streams. Considerations: include the impact of the current system, learning from other systems and experiences, and considerations for moving forward. There are lots of benefits to alignment of different funding sources, but Subcommittee members worry how decisions would be made about cuts if there is a decrease in funding in one stream. She also noted that discussion around quality tiers will be helpful moving forward in the discussions.

Grace then shared emerging questions from the Subcommittee discussion:

- How do we think about **prioritization** of funding, and where does the next dollar in go or who would lose funding if there is a cut?
- If there are **changes** in different sources of funding, such as federal funding, how does that impact what programs would get?
- Are there **other states** that combine CCAP and state 0-5 funds? If so, what are the lessons learned in combining funding?
- Who is the **program that could be most disrupted**, and how do we adjust for that?
- Who will be doing the work of aligning? How will **data** be collected and used effectively to improve experience?
- How are **non-state-managed resources** considered and braided in?

Other discussion:

- Jill Andrews (workgroup member) commented in the chat: Only public schools receive additional funding for students that require additional supports - not child care centers that have ISBE Prek. Nor are the CBO's ISBE prek staff eligible for TRS or state health benefits. Causes great turnover in teaching staff.

Abby previewed the next steps for the subcommittee, including discussing how to incorporate non-state-managed resources like Head Start into an alignment framework.

The Funding Workgroup divided into four small groups to reflect on the Subcommittee's work and discuss the following prompts:

- After learning about the subcommittee's discussion and direction, what questions do you have?
- What other benefits and considerations of bringing together the funding streams for child care/pre-k and home visiting would you add to the subcommittee's ideas?
- The subcommittee elevated several important questions about how alignment might happen. What else needs to be considered moving forward?

Non-workgroup attendees also had the opportunity to respond to the prompts in Padlet [all Padlet comments are included in the appendix].

- English – <https://padlet.com/croman65/discussion-alignment-piqsn4cffpkrkr9v>
- Spanish - <https://padlet.com/croman65/discusi-n-alineaci-n-rfl9cllw3wbqfj9g>

Facilitators shared the key takeaways from each of the small groups after returning to the full group:

- Group 1: The group acknowledged the challenges of including early childhood special education and early intervention but warned of potential pitfalls to maintaining siloed funding streams. They want to ensure that alignment leads to serving more children, more seamless access to services for families and/or higher quality services. They also suggested that alignment may require more funding over the long-term to ensure continuity of services, and that modeling various scenarios to demonstrate what might happen under different conditions (such as high demand or funding cuts) would be helpful. Finally, they elevated a need for clarity about the purpose of alignment, transparent decision-making for resource allocation, and clear communication for both providers and families.

- Group 2: The group raised questions about whether and how requirements for the various programs would be aligned along with the funding. They noted that while similar in purpose, the programs in each bucket have different delivery expectations and serve specific populations and wondered if that would continue to be true – which impacts the administrative burden cost allocation and reporting for providers.
- Group 3: The group appreciated aligning funding streams based on purpose and agreed that much of the proposal made sense. They were also interested in modeling a variety of scenarios to understand what might happen related to federal funding or other changes. They wondered how challenging it might be for a family or provider to access different funding arrangements and if we can anticipate potential pain points.
- Group 4: The group noted that having one stream of funding could have an unintended consequence of causing greater instability if one program violation or change of eligibility impacted more than one stream of funding. They also talked about an ideal scenario where the most resources/funding is targeted to the families in greatest need and that for providers, securing funding should be both simpler and less competitive.

### **3. Discussion: Family portraits (10 min)**

Andrea Cammilleri (All Children Thrive) shared a concept of “Family Portraits” emerging from the Family Service Workgroups to provide realistic representation of the diversity of families across Illinois and portray the intersectionality of experiences and identities of families with young children. The purpose of this tool is to intentionally and continuously center families who have historically been marginalized or underrepresented and to address concerns raised regarding operationalizing equity in decision-making, using a single tool or resource to make decisions and understanding the complexity and intersectionality within families and communities.

Family portraits are being developed using extensive data already collected, additional interviews and community conversations to create more holistic portraits and identify gaps and soliciting feedback from the Transition Advisory Council (TAC) and other transition workgroups.

The family portraits will serve as one of several tools to evaluate the strength of ideas and proposals raised in the strategic planning process. Their intent is to keep the real stories and lived experiences of Illinois families at the center of this process, and at the front of the mind of TAC and workgroup members. One potential use for family portraits would be to review proposed strategies or solutions through the lens of the family’s experience. Guiding questions might include:

- What would be the impact of this proposed change on this family?
- Would this family benefit from the change? If so, how?
- What might prevent this family from benefitting from this change?
- Would this solution be easy for this family to access? Why or why not?
- Is this solution a high priority for this family?
- What other solutions might have a greater impact on this child/family?
- How does this funding solution impact providers?

Andrea invited the workgroup members to provide feedback on this concept through the chat and the post-meeting survey.

Chat comments:

- Bryan Stokes III: It seems that a majority of the potential impact of recommendations from this committee will be experienced by providers, rather than families directly. Will we also have a set of provider portraits?
  - Maya: Hi Bryan - thanks for the question. Yes, we will be conducting an extensive amount of outreach with providers. We will present more on our intended outreach efforts next meeting
- Grace Araya: I think provider portraits is a great idea.
- Anita: 👍 Provider portraits too

#### **4. Public comment, next steps & adjourn – Megan Bock, Afton Partners (5 min)**

Megan opened up the floor for public comment.

- Brynn Seibert, Director of Childcare and early Learning Division of SEIU,
  - SEIU represents child care providers in home-based settings and ECE workers at community-based centers.
  - The work of this group is critical and exciting.
  - Two things to lift up – centering the unique needs of home-based child care – both licensed child care providers (operating in a system not designed for them and don't always have access to supports and funding that could benefit them) and Family Friend and Neighbor (FFN) Care, which makes up a huge part of our system.
  - We want to ensure that these providers and the families who use them do not experience any unintended consequences.
  - Blended funding is important, but we need to acknowledge that these funding streams were intended to serve different purposes – for example, CCAP is to support families pursuing work and education while Pre-K designed to support school readiness.

Megan thanked the Workgroup and public attendees, shared details for the next meeting, the meeting survey link, and closed the meeting.

## Appendix

### Padlet comments – Funding Distribution Subcommittee Summary Discussion

After reviewing the different distribution methods and the reflections, what questions or additions would you like to raise?

- One of my first thoughts was how will a mixed delivery system work with a new funding distribution system? What might be unintended consequences of a new system? Will there be harm to other providers as there has been with the Smart Start non-competitive grants?
- What category would K-12 funding fit into?: Would EBF funding be considered non-competitive? What about Categoricals and Transportation funding? Also note that the EBF is NOT calculated as a per child distribution.
- How long can we anticipate Smart Start to last: As you can imagin[e], everyone is trying to plan for the future and increased wages is not sustainable without increased income. The state is raising subsidy payment rates, but families not on subsidy can not manage the incredible increases that the grant has provided to centers for wage-increases. How can we be 'in the loop' on the life cycle of the Smart Start Grants?
- New System of Funding Mechanisms: It could also be helpful to consider distributing funds according to streamlined uses/buckets (education & care, home visiting, incubation & start-up, etc.) and analyze the appropriate funding mechanisms for each bucket.
- You might consider what distribution mechanisms different providers are used to accessing, using funding data. For example, license-exempt providers only use CCAP vouchers. FCCs are accessing non-competitive grants and vouchers, but are not accessing much competitive funding. When we make changes, we have to think about how to broadly communicate and support the change management.
- Distribution interaction with Alignment: If funding streams are recommended to be aligned, then:
  - 1) Must the aligned programs have the same distribution methods.
  - 2) If not, what combinations of distribution methods can be supported/allowed (and which combinations would be logistically/politically/financial should be prohibited.
- Grouping of programs: Think the grouping of HV all together is great. For the other program lines under early learning, how we will define an infant-toddler program and determine the funding needed for that program to meet the program requirements? Will there be multiple program models?
- Capacity to apply for infant toddler funding has been challenging for programs outside of Chicago where we don't have a ramp-up period built in to the quality requirements. How will we ensure that funding can be distributed where it is needed?

What should the subcommittee keep in mind as they are evaluating options?

- Diversity of Input: You seem to be very focused on obtaining input from diverse sources which is excellent. I would encourage you to ensure that regionally diverse program managers and caregivers are represented in equal numbers, even if it requires more direct invitation or incentives, due to the often excessive workload placed on these interested parties, often resulting in low response to public invitation and the appearance of disinterest.
- (Significant) Underfunding: One problem with non-competitive grants is one of three approaches:



- 1) First in First out and the money can run out. --- most organized (and therefore usually the best resourced) recipients get their applications in first and get money while others (new programs and under resourced programs) are left out.
- 2) All in and Prorated amount out -- sometimes recipients receive far less than expected and opt not to offer the service because they can't take the risk.
- 3) Statute commits to fully fund program even if the total of grants exceeds expected/budgeted amount.
- I can't believe that the state legislature would approve #3 for any major EC program, and #1 and #2 both result in different types of inequities."
- I would encourage you to involve Head Start and Early Head Start programs in these discussions as most access state funding also. You seem to hesitate to do that since Head Start funding is federal to local. However, Head Start is a big part of the Illinois EC landscape and it would be the equitable thing to do.
- Consider how funding mechanisms can be used to help IL better align practices with CCDF rules around paying for enrollment vs attendance and to pay providers before services are provided, not in arrears. These are common practices in private pay, and are important to keep in mind when centering equity for providers and for families.

Non-competitive grants, like Smart Start, still have significant admin burden for providers in application and reporting. It's encouraging to see this reflected in the form of multi-year grants with less frequent reviews and simpler processes.

Ensure that unintended consequences are considered when making shifts-- for example, families with children in multiple settings, Family Friend and Neighbor providers (who are not eligible for non-competitive grants-- if there's a shift away from vouchers as primary payment method for CCAP, how will FFN providers and families utilizing FFN care be impacted?)

- +1 to these points!
- Avoiding Cliffs and U-shaped Access: Try to have more (mathematically) continuous calculations of funding and/or have more steps so that cliffs aren't created where below X you get "lots of funding" and X + \$1 you get nothing (or a lot less). This also often results in U-Shaped access -- lowest income has access and highest income have access, but those in the lower, middle, and higher, end up with inequitable access.
- while ECSE direct services will flow through LEAs, the early childhood program models and funding levels need to reflect what a program needs to enroll and support children with disabilities and delays throughout their day, and for staff to team with both EI and ECSE providers.

### **Padlet comments – Funding Distribution Subcommittee Summary Discussion**

After learning about the subcommittee's discussion and direction, what questions do you have?

- Are there any HS/EHS providers at the table on any of the Funding committees? If not, why not? Never too late to add someone.
- I appreciate that the committee is exploring separate funding streams for child care/pre-k and for home visiting, and I do agree that is the right move. However, I am wondering how the child care/pre-k side of things will handle the needs of children 0-3. In the ECBG as it currently stands, 25% goes to 0-3 and the majority of that is for HV. So if we take HV out of the equation, we will

need to be careful to ensure that infants and toddlers still receive an equitable portion of the funding. How will 0-3 be prioritized in this model?

- As far as separating the funding for EC and HV, I would recommend leaving it combined and let the programs divide the funding as their community requires. Many, many programs do both center and HV.
- Non-Traditional-Hours: Non-traditional-hour care (12-hour shifts, overnight, weekends, etc.) have very different needs than traditional-hour care and options. For instance, school districts have very little infrastructure or capacity to handle non-traditional-hours), and "universal" PK often assume/expect heavy school district involvement.
- Good comments from SEIU representative about the original purposes of each funding stream. That should definitely be taken into account.

What additional benefits or considerations would you add to combining funding for child care/pre-K and home visiting?

- I liked the idea of aligning to Federal Requirements for EC since they are the most stringent and represent higher quality in many cases. MIECHV already has done this for DHS HV.
- The current staff qualifications for child care and PreK are quite different, which results in different pay rates for staff and differing operating costs. Would this be a consideration in a funding equation?
- Before we decide to move forward with combining these streams, I think we should consider the benefits of each stream as it currently. With CCAP, for example, we have the ability to adjust payments based on provider type and children served, and because it follows the family, providers are always being paid for the children they currently serve. Workforce grants allow us specifically to support compensation. ECBG allows for rigorous program standards. What do we lose when we combine streams, and will that make the lives of providers and families easier?
- While child care and pre-k ostensibly align on the three selected criteria, it feels like there is a lot more to understand about the current system and thinking through impacts on families and providers. Some examples include: (1) what hours of care do families need and how will funding account for that? (2) how to equitably account for the different settings that children receive pre-k and care in so that all families can access the education and care they choose in their own community and all? (3) how will varying program standards and eligibility requirements be accounted for in combined funding?
- Combining would allow it to be easier to set priority based on need. The current model pushes a lot of the responsibility for determining the priority (and dollars) for different funding streams to the state legislature (and the advocates and lobbyist). How can legislators still have the input they want (need) while providing priorities be set at a more appropriate level.
- It's critical to consider both the benefits and the unintended consequences of combining funding streams. Will it help providers who previously haven't been able to access more stable sources of funding (ex, family child care provider participation in pre-k is minimal-- and instead rely on CCAP funding which is less stable and predictable)? Pre-k funding also comes with higher credentialing requirements-- does combining them risk pushing experienced providers who lack credentials out of the field and destabilizing the field? It's critical to be thoughtful about these benefits and consequences on the front end.
- It's also important to keep in mind that while there may be significant overlap in providers and families-- child care and pre-k programs were intended to serve different needs and have different requirements for participation for families and providers.

What other considerations are important for moving alignment forward?

- So far the program most hurt by funding decisions has been Head Start/Early Head Start. How can we stop that from happening in the future?
- Currently half day and full day PreK are two different competitive (ECBG) grants. Is there an opportunity to combine those into one funding stream for PreK, allowing entities flexibility to apply an appropriate portion of the funds to each format as needed by current families in their care and the flexibility to adapt as needs change?
- Understanding (Administrative and Funding) Impact on Different types of Provider Organizations: There is such diversity of Provider organizations from FFN and home childcare providers caring for a very small number of (usually homogeneous) children to the multi-state/multi-center for profit childcare companies to the very large holistic community organizations that provide services across the spectrum to organizations providing push-in or pull-out services for those with special needs to school districts with hundreds of students to those with tens of thousands.

An "alignment" that benefits one type of provider organization might (inadvertently) adversely impact another. Especially if the goal is to reduce complexity and administrative overhead for providers and families the state may have to accept some of that complexity.

- Blending and Braiding -- Where and Who: Alignment seems a lot about trying to do blending and braiding further upstream to keep the complexity away from the (particularly small) providers. However, where and who (state, regional, collaboratives, local jurisdictions, providers, and/or families) should have responsibility for the
- Frequency of Distribution: I know you mentioned there could be multiple checks that go out, but I do want to flag frequency of distribution as a consideration. CCAP payments come in monthly (and CCAC is talking about potential bi-monthly distribution to support prospective payment). Most other funds are distributed quarterly or in a lump sum. If the number and characteristics of children served is part of the calculation in an aligned funding stream, more frequent distribution is likely required.
- Infant/Toddler vs 3-5 Staffing Levels impact on Alignment: While childcare could be aligned across ages, the very different staffing levels for Infant/Toddler care vs 3-5 care make the finances very different. Many centers use a business model to "subsidize" the very expensive 0-3 care with their larger less (but still) expensive 3-5 care.
- Program Portraits too!: Maybe the committee should create program portraits (like the family portraits) to apply the potential recommendations to.