



Attendees

Ann PH, Matt Hetzel, Jeff Hudnall, Charlie Geier, Kyle Wehmann; *On phone*: John Peirce, Cheryl Miller, Chuck Hert, Cathy Gray, Amy Hutcheson, Michael Conn-Powers, Jenna Wachtmann, Amanda Lopez

Key Topics Discussed

A. Additional Agenda Item

- Charlie proposes that this workgroup identify 3-5 infrastructure-related recommendations to go in front of ELAC in the upcoming months.
- Amanda suggested asking what research questions we want to answer first:
 1. *How many seats are available and how many need seats?*
 2. *What is the quality of those seats?*
- The workgroup discussed potential recommendations and supporting points and agreed upon the following (with some additional wordsmithing):
 1. Any child enrolled in any type of pre-k that is state, local or federally funded should be reported with a mandated unique identifier, and/or at a minimum, in a consistent manner.
 - IDOE should require school districts to report all the enrollment data for pre-K, not just Title 1 and SPED.
 - The unique identifier could be issued at birth under the guise of “preventing fraud”. (This could be a supporting point if we get kickback from this recommendation.)
 2. School districts should collect pre-k information on Kindergarten entrance of every child.
 - Then we could match which licensed pre-k program that kid came from.
 - Cathy can write up what was done in Evansville as an example, and this group can weigh in.
 3. ELAC data requests to state agencies need to include a county indicator and an indicator of where a child attended pre-k, plus all other data necessary to meet state required reporting.
 - Include the funding report data request as well to prevent duplication.



4. Review Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) reporting requirements and think about what will be required in K-12. Then align what will be needed from pre-K.
5. IDOE and FSSA provide the most accurate and timely data to INK for the annual reporting needs of ELAC.

B. 2017 ELAC Annual Report

- ELAC Annual Report will be published at the beginning of November.
- The Family Engagement workgroup is creating family engagement indicators for the Report's dashboard.
- It has also been suggested to have more dashboard indicators geared toward infant/toddlers.
- IACCRR data center only includes FSSA data, not IDOE data. This is a big disconnect for creating county-level profiles as well as issues of duplicate counts of children in general.
- The main challenge is to know how many seats TOTAL are available in the state!
 - Head Start, Title 1, Pre-K Pilots, IDOE (public school preschools), Licensed and non-licensed programs... What is the total number of ALL available pre-K seats within all of these programs across the state?
 - Cathy explained that provider capacity can sometimes depend on resources using an example of voucher-holding families choosing programs: If a program is chosen, the voucher "increases" the resources an organization has to serve more children. This adds another layer to uncovering true capacity.
- Charlie suggested showcasing the outcome data for year one EEMG/OMY children in the 2017 Annual Report, even if just at that aggregate level.
- Discussed the need to determine an official "data pull" date going forward for all agencies so we are comparing apples to apples. This will be discussed at the July 13th meeting of agency data managers to review the data that ELAC needs for the 2017 Annual Report.
- Discussed that currently, INK will not receive 2015-16 IDOE data until November of 2016, which is quite late for. INK or ELAC (or both) could make a recommendation to get this data earlier (backed by the support of agency representatives to "prioritize" the request), citing the need to have the most accurate, up-to-date data possible to inform policy.
- All new data requests have to go through the IDOE Data Committee and is a lengthy, 1 to 3-month process.
- What local data can and cannot be collected will be determined at the July 13th meeting of data managers.



Action Items

1. Members are asked to re-review the 2016 Annual ELAC Report and think about what other information could be included to make the 2017 iteration even better.
2. At the next data workgroup meeting, we will discuss the July 13th meeting of agency data managers, including any issues raised or new data requests. The workgroup will also discuss the process and timeline for getting the county-level data profiles underway.

Next Meeting

Thursday, July 28th | 1:00 – 3:00 pm | Ice Miller Offices