

Early Learning Advisory Committee (ELAC)

Meeting Minutes

January 17, 2014

Present: Kevin Bain, Tammy Veselsky, Connie Sherman, Charlie Geier, John Burnett, Beckie Minglin, Melanie Brizzi

Absent: Alonzo Weems

Guest presenters: N/A

Next meeting: The meeting scheduled for February 19, 2014 was rescheduled for **March 7, 2014**, from 1 to 3 p.m. in the Indiana Government Center South Conference Center

1. Announcements

N/A

2. Discussion

a. Review of Minutes from last meeting, held December 4, 2013:

The minutes were approved.

b. Early Education Matching Grant RFF Update and Timetable—Melanie Brizzi

Melanie updated the committee on the EEMG RFF (<http://www.in.gov/fssa/carefinder/4845.htm>).

The first of four webinars was held today to inform providers of the EEMG opportunity and requirements. A special teleconference will be held for licensed child care home providers. An in-person session will be held on January 22 at IGCS. An FAQ will be posted on the website (above) after the sessions are over. Charlie Geier noted that he received positive feedback from people who attended the first webinar.

FSSA issued a press release Wednesday with a statement from the governor.

The Bureau of Child Care is looking for a diverse pool of grant reviewers that extends beyond research and higher education professionals.

BCC has received numerous inquiries from programs not currently enrolled in Paths to QUALITY™ and is hoping that the EEMG will encourage participation.

So far the letters of intent to apply have indicated a combination of part-time and full-time proposals. A question was raised about how PT/FT and the corresponding dollar amounts were determined. The EEMG workgroup made the PT/FT determination at the ELAC's request. The dollar amounts were based on guidance from the ELAC; the State Spending Comparison Chart; CHOICE scholarship amount; and what it costs to provide the care. The language in the RFF says that a program can apply for "up to" the PT or FT amount. The one-to-one match is still required.

c. Discussion of Work Plan Strategic Framework and Workgroups—Kevin Bain

Kevin presented the committee with his proposed work plan and strategic framework for working toward the ELAC's statutory requirements.

The proposed strategic work plan framework was developed using Indiana's recent Race to the Top grant proposal; Kevin's prior knowledge of child care and early education; and the statutory requirements for the ELAC. The committee discussed House Bill 1004 and the new proposed responsibilities but it was noted that the bill is still in draft form and the ELAC's primary focus should be on current statute.

Within the proposed work plan, each of the statutory requirements would have a dedicated workgroup, and each workgroup would work under a common focus/task framework to maximize efficiency; facilitate understanding of responsibility; and guide workgroup updates on progress. The proposed workgroups proposed initially included: Family Enrollment and Engagement; Provider Participation and Increased Quality; Funding Streams and Efficiencies; Professional Credentials and Development; and Data Coordination, Needs Assessment, and Evaluation of Impact. The common focus areas proposed were:

- a. *Objective*. Each group should continually assess and refine objectives;
- b. *Primary Targets*. The target audience(s) must be defined.
- c. *Baseline*. Much of the initial work of each workgroup is likely to involve an assessment of the current landscape.
- d. *Best-Practice Based Strategies*. These would be the workgroup's recommendation for how to tackle the issues.
- e. *Quick Wins*. These are tangible measures of progress in the short term.
- f. *5-year Outcomes*, or measures of significant progress.

Kevin engaged the committee in a discussion of the proposed structure. Noteworthy points of discussion included:

- g. A workgroup structure would bring informed people together to have the necessary discussions and bring recommendations to the ELAC.
- h. A key place to obtain baseline data is the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Kids Count Data Center.
- i. John Burnett shared information on a process approach—"How Coalitions Work"—that the workgroups might be able to utilize. The committee looked at the diagrams associated with this approach and discussed feasibility. Concerns and points made included:
 - i. There will be a lot of attempts at hard work within the workgroups, but without an established and consistent process, there might not be enough to show for it.
 - ii. One concern is the length of time it would take for the workgroups to understand and effectively implement the process.
 - iii. Under this process, 4 key roles are needed: Facilitated Leadership; Content Experts; Broader Stakeholders; and Process Facilitator.
 - iv. John volunteered his existing group to offer a kick-off workshop on the "How Coalitions Work" process approach and to offer ongoing assistance to ELAC workgroups (e.g. via email).
- j. The committee discussed the proposed workgroups and focus areas. The following comments and agreements were made:
 - i. Quick closure is needed on what the workgroups are; the ELAC needs to identify who should be in each group; many key players won't change even if the scope of a workgroup changes.

- ii. It would be ideal to have ELAC representation on each committee, at least one on each group to serve as the chair or co-chair.
- iii. The committee discussed that “Funding Streams and Efficiencies” is proposed as a workgroup but might function better as a common focus of each workgroup instead. The Funding Streams workgroup might work better if it was related to Governance and Collaboration as opposed to funding, because time would be better spent focusing on quality of infrastructure. Such a workgroup could identify opportunities for collaboration and increasing efficiency.
 1. The committee discussed that a focus would be needed on resource flows and alignment.
 2. The committee discussed the need for funding to be a common focus area of each workgroup.
- iv. The committee discussed the need to include a focus on Child Outcomes in the “Data Coordination, Needs Assessment, and Evaluation of Impact” workgroup.
- v. The committee discussed the need for the “Provider Participation and Increased Quality” workgroup to focus on program accountability and quality improvement.
- vi. The committee’s discussion will be taken as input, as well as their suggestions for workgroup scope, membership, et cetera and a revised work plan will be presented at the next meeting.
 - 1.

d. Lessons Learned – Race to the Top and IDOE Survey

Race to the Top was incorporated into the discussion of the above agenda items. IDOE survey was not discussed.

e. Other Business

N/A