

**Early Learning Advisory Committee**  
Minutes  
December 12, 2014

Call to Order 1:05 pm

**Present:**

Kevin Bain  
Charlie Geier  
Beckie Minglin  
Connie Sherman  
Tammy Veselsky  
Alonzo Weems  
Guests:  
Beth Barrett  
Megan Purcell

**Absent:**

John Burnett  
Melanie Brizzi

Kevin called the meeting to order and thanked Melanie for stepping in last month and chairing meeting in his absence.

**I. Review of Minutes**

Charlie motioned to approve. Beckie second. Minutes were approved.

**II. Workgroup Updates:**

*Evaluation of Child Outcomes* –Workgroup has recommendation to present today to ELAC. Megan Purcell – co-chair presented to group. Group has been working on KRA (Kindergarten Readiness Assessment) processes. Again the group looked at what other states are doing. CEELo provided what other states are currently using – narrowed to 7 states and took those 7 to 3 for a deeper look – Washington, Florida and Ohio. Washington has a unique approach and they are using Teaching Strategies Gold. Florida is using one they formatted and finally Ohio and their work with Enhanced Advancement Grant Consortium. Indiana has been participating as an advisory state in the EAG Consortium in their assessment processes.

The workgroup proposes:

Based on the information collected during the research and review process, the workgroup recommends moving from an Advisory State to a Charter State with the EAG Consortium for the utilization of their multi-domain assessment process. Becoming a Charter State will allow Indiana more participatory rights and assessment process development and be part of the implementation process for that.

Rationale discussed (see attached recommendation)

Other discussion:

Arts are being used and each state can individualize and align with our early learning state standards. We could maintain our own with rights and responsibilities. Certain components must be maintained for reliability and validity.

Crosswalk developed with Ohio with Head Start performance standards? Asked if aligned but not about specific crosswalk – there is an alignment with HS outcomes.

Clarification that this would be kindergarten entry – early learning assessment would still be completed in the preschool years with head start.

Question was asked about who this is for? Consideration for On My Way Pre-K and will be looked at for evaluator for longitudinal study – would go to DOE for approval in January. Will also be discussed with FSSA for On My Way Pre-K and longitudinal study.

Also will need to consider in 2017 make decision continue or change direction. Correct # students to determine if valuable – charter status could be for any Indiana child to get enough children.

What are requirements as a charter state? As advisory we gave foundations for alignment and we can give opinions in discussion and participate. Charter would allow us to implement decisions made by consortium. Charter allows us to offer our opinions to be included and not just heard.

West-Ed & John Hopkins University are partners in consortium. West Ed is a comprehensive center and services many states. They are a think tank.

EAG is a federal grant. Maryland is the fiscal agent.

Question asked if this would substitute for ISTAR-KR? That is still to be determined – ISTAR is part of the longitudinal study - how does this co-exists?? All part of discussion – a lot to learn about this and want to understand potential overlap with ISTAR. Opportunity to further research for options for Indiana and see what works best. Multiple options with groups to see what best options are – ISTAR is being used and lots of data we don't want to lose. Need multiple years – let's do this the right way and take our time.

What was response of workgroup this week? Group was very supportive – practitioners comments. Very supportive and excited to see where it goes. No apprehension.

What is process to become a charter? Piece of paper to sign. Superintendent of Public Instruction Glenda Ritz signed to become an advisory state – assume she would be the one to sign again.

Announcement that Purdue University has been selected as for longitudinal study – this is all interconnected. Feel there is a need for discussion with Purdue as finalize design to use with On My Way and KRA currently being used and what will Purdue be doing. We also need to review what it takes to be a charter state and how that fits with OMW.

Charter state requirements - participate in development of KEA as state we can customize with EAG – two systems running at same time. Funding is provided as a charter and we can pilot the tool – cannot pilot as an advisory state. Cannot customize as an advisory state.

Next step would be to form a team from DOE, FSSA and subgroup of workgroup to work on what we would need to become a charter state. Not off the shelf - we are developing for the future.

As advisory are we committing the state to something we need to follow through on – do we understand commitment to be a charter – what will Indiana be required to do and scope of what Indiana would be required to do? How many other charter states – 7 states participating – 4 are charter – 3 are advisory. End goal is development of usable assessment process for both preschool and kindergarten entry. Who owns it? Maryland is fiscal agent but consortium would own.

Assessment tools currently utilized by the EAG consortium would be tools of choice for consideration for Indiana – recommendation from workgroup. Now, we would Proceed to explore the requirements involved with becoming a consortium charter state and fully understand and sign off on along with an understanding of how all this fits with the scope of use with Purdue University and the On My Way Longitudinal Study.

Recommendation currently to move to a charter state status – Maybe recommendation should be that workgroup recommends we use the EAG consortium assessments and explore more what it means to become a charter state and how it fits with On My Way Pre-K before signing on the dotted line. Cannot use tools without being a charter but need to explore fully what charter state status means.

Suggested a conversation with consortium – need to have final conversations with FSSA, Purdue and others who have questions for consortium – now that we know who needs to have these conversations.

Recommendation doesn't change – ELAC needs these questions answered. Want to use the tool but need to understand better what charter status means to allow us to use the tool. Ultimate authority needs to make the determination of charter status – ELAC could endorse and then decision made.

How do you change status?

Submit in writing why want to change status.

Request submitted Executive committee with same signature

Executive committee will act upon request within 2 weeks and submit for approval

Once a charter state, state would receive seat on executive committee.

5 points:

1. Commit to consortium and met qualifications
2. Member of only one consortium
3. Active role in policy and decision making
4. Provide a representative to the executive committee
5. Participate in final decision making

ELAC Committee decision – multiple issues raised:

Endorse the narrowing work done to identify a path forward by workgroup but direct workgroup to better understand scope of work of tools through conversations with Purdue and investigate charter state status and find what is needed for Indiana to become charter state – and come back with recommendations.

Now it's about process.

Workgroup showed advantages of this tool are it would become valid and reliable, free, user friendly, specific to Indiana and aligned to our Early Learning Guidelines.

Recommendation: In order to provide a valid and reliable tool aligned with the Indiana Early Learning Guidelines, that is voluntary, free, user friendly tool for evaluating the effectiveness of On My Way Pre-K and other Early Learning programs, we further pursue, by an executive team, further review the details of what it means to be a charter state.

Cautious with cost piece- only free to Dec. 2017 - developmental costs covered  
Concern raised cost to administer for programs??

Fully appreciate the work of the workgroup and we want Indiana's assessment to have all the qualities/recommendations mentioned in the rationale – here is a way to get there. As ELAC final recommendation would be to pursue this as an option to get to these qualities/recommendations.

Recommendation not about EAG – more global stance for what the accountability system for Early Learning and about an appropriate assessment for children entering kindergarten– the workgroup did that work. Committing to participating in a group and fully imbed what commitment means.

ELAC further explore the option recommended by workgroup and all related implementations before moving to charter state. Don't want to return to looking at all the tools – just look at implications of moving forward.

Fundamentally why this approach was chosen – more well rounded – on demand/observational – covers more of what group was looking for – multi-domain. Measures aligned with PS/K – long term adding IT. Covers children with developmental delays/ disabilities and are incorporated and number of experts in development process. Tailored to state – we have more say for alignment with our standards and we can develop.

Was ISTAR included in conversation?? Yes

At the end do we own? – EAG would own – we would own as part of consortium. You have say of development and where it goes. Not at mercy of vendor.

**ELAC decision – not changing workgroup's recommendation  
Next step is for ELAC to further explore the option recommended by evaluation work group in order to fully understand the scope of use, the implications and all commitments required before consideration given to move IN to charter state status with the EAG Consortium.**

Megan commented this was comfortable for her as co-chair of work group and she understands the need to look at legal implications.

Next phase – stakeholders will not know or understand work group process – long form explanation with edits from guiding team to give rationale.

Charlie motioned to approve - Alonzo seconded – members all approved.

Great work by all – great conversation and clarity – opened another realm we were not aware of – huge implications.

*Child Development and Well Being* – Connie – This workgroup has spent time looking at format of new guidelines/foundations and tasked with recommendation of Higher Ed and experts for further review. Group is also prioritizing work for next year.

*Family Engagement* –Keith – renamed customer satisfaction work group – same update as last month – more detailed definitions of framework and working on tool kit to improve family engagement by providers in 5 county pilot – Now that we have agreements for providers and families - looking for suggestions/recommendations and what it will look like. This will be a living document and hopefully flexible. Appreciate wide variety of options. Data back to work group of what is working from OMW and EEMG. ELAC is Birth-3 and look at activity for K-3 for transition and great next step and provide alignment with Early Learning. Representative from DOE has been added to the work group and he is currently working on Family Engagement for K-12. Timeframe was discussed when tools might be ready – working on definitions this month and hope to get a good start – tools posted to wiggio and need to organize. January should have beginnings. Training and tech assistance can be offered from work group members.

*Funding Streams* –Amanda commented for group. Met yesterday – working on comprehensive summary of Early Learning funding in Indiana – will be presenting to ELAC – public funding and now including philanthropy and private (parents) . Currently the group is reaching out to state agencies to get documentation to finalize. Focus on accessibility, affordable and high quality. Next priority area: looking for efficiency and opportunities for collaborations. How are high quality programs using their funding? Key metrics efficiency and effectiveness – better results if spend more? Thanks for work on glossary – talk of glossary of funding? Funding glossary will be included in report with history and flexibility of how to use funds. Really trying to make it user friendly. Those are the questions coming from the field – need to provide clarity. Blending /braiding/layering what does it all mean? More complex each day – Marion Co. new funding and each county is different. Where is ELAC on pay for success? Work group is exploring and researching – on the radar. Timeframe – report should be ready early in 2015 –

*Workforce Update* – Amanda reported the group is working on 2 data sets – current data set and 2020 data – for supply and demand. The group is looking at data back in January to complete current picture of workforce. Workforce study currently underway /HE inventory due in June. Next step – what does the future state look like.

*Provider Participation and Advancement* – Melanie reported the last several meetings the group has worked its way through each provider type pathway to participate in On My Way Pre-K. Last week 4 schools joined PTQ using express pathway and this helped build capacity in a pilot county. Several more schools are interested for a fall start. DOE is getting lots of phone calls. This group is looking at gaps of participation and will begin working on that.

*Data Coordination and System Integration* Charlie reported this workgroup is preparing a research brief and recommendations of where to go from here. Currently in the revision and clean up of this document and focus will be on completing the document in early 2015. Next piece is sub-questions to answer and what data is needed to answer those questions. Some unique to Indiana and many members of the work group are contributing to this. INK is helping with that along with IYI and both are taking the lead. Group will revise the white paper and write a MOU to accomplish what is needed.

### **III. Early Education Matching Grant**

Melanie provided an update on the status. In November the 2015-16 RFF was released – app available on website – simplified version. Logic model removed. There are some differences from last year’s application – pilot county providers not eligible to continue or apply for new grant. Current EEMG providers do not need to complete full RFF – shorter application will go out in January. The OECOSL has received numerous Intent to Apply letters and will be looking at available funding. Applications are due Jan. 16<sup>th</sup> and still time to apply – intent not mandatory. Current grantees are completing their year and assessment. Many plan to continue for a second year.

EEMG – current counties request larger amount? Yes providing one-one cash match is attained.

### **V. On My Way Pre-K Pilot**



300 parent lottery applications were received today – 750 applications total to date. Vanderburgh County has 2 family events tomorrow. Providers have enrolled and programs will begin by Jan. 18<sup>th</sup>. There have been some lessons learned. The age requirements were very confusing for families and any child eligible, we will hold on to those applications for fall. As mentioned before, Purdue has been awarded the evaluation grant and the OECOSL is working to finalize the methodology and write their contract. Discussion is continuing on how to best assess the first cohort.

Gov. Pence has announced he will seek a budget change request to annually extend funding for 2 more years when the legislature returns to session.

### **VII. Other Business**

Charlie commented work on the Indiana Foundations is underway to align with the new K-12 standards. 2012 foundations aligned to common core standards. Since last legislative session voted new academic standards and now the foundations need to be re-aligned. Multiple groups of stakeholders have given input into new alignment and Child Development and Wellbeing work group has had input. DOE is now ready for phase 2 – looking for a panel of experts to assess. Now the foundations cover a spectrum from birth to K – although the content is basically the same with some new information. Now experts need to take what the field is saying and it now needs to be formatted to see the progression of skills. Lots of work to do – but we don’t want to hurry. Not talking about curriculum. Decision on assessment is tied to this as alignment will need to be to that also.

So far just collecting data – important as it feeds into all the other work. Don't want to rush - want to get right.

Next meeting date – No ELAC meeting in January 2015. Next meeting Feb. 13, 2015 from 1-3pm. In January, all work groups will meet collectively to work together and discuss progress to date and set goals for 2015. All members of ELAC are invited on Jan 23, 2015 – place to be determined. Watch your email for an invitation.

Appreciation to ELAC members for this year of service – blessing to group and state. Merry Christmas and happy holidays! Thanks to Kevin for his leadership! Great work and very satisfying !

**Closing:**

Charlie motioned to end the meeting. Melanie second. All approved. Meeting adjourned at 2:48 pm.