



Attendees

Sandy Kaufman, Kofi Darku, Deb Hughes, Kathryn Raasch, Lacey Kottkamp, Kathy Oren; *On phone:* Randy Garratt, Andrea Zimmerman, Maggie Synder, Amanda Lopez, Kyle Wehmann

Key Topics Discussed

ELAC Updates

- A. The Committee is working towards releasing the next Annual Report the first of November. Workgroups are invited to suggest recommendations by September or October at the latest. Look at past annual reports for inspiration. Annual Report Recommendations typically help establish baselines and understand the current state, or suggest best practices for the future.
 - Kofi offered to take the lead on drafting some potential recommendations for this workgroup.
- B. Kathryn asked about ESSA and what ELAC has been doing to support it? ESSA has been a standing agenda item for committee meetings. Nathan Williamson is the contact. There hasn't been much news yet because the rules are still being promulgated.

Indiana Early Learning Coalitions List and Map

- A. Workgroup reviewed the list of coalitions in the map shared at the Summit. The workgroup discussed adding the point of contact information to the map. We will reach out to the identified coalitions to gather that information and some other key items, such as their focus areas and support needed
- B. How do we promote the Coalition List and Map for public consumption? The key will be having contact information publicized, including social media links.
- C. Sandy suggested linking up with the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (IAPSS), who are currently working to advocate and promote pre-k! How can we align our work with theirs?
- D. Kofi shared that he already has meetings scheduled with superintendents in some regions across IN to become informed of what they are doing. Sandy agreed to put Kofi in contact with more.
- E. Lacey added that Wells County School Systems also wants to get involved and she will share those contacts with Kofi.

Coalition Building Toolkit Update

- A. Workgroup reviewed the toolkit "Overview" slide deck that Amanda provided.
- B. Discussed how the toolkit could be formatted and shared with test coalitions for feedback.



- C. Which coalitions should be asked to pilot the toolkit? Big Goal Collaborative (one of the 11 counties, not whole region), Grant County, Bartholomew County, and Geminus were suggested. Selecting 6-10 coalitions was recommended.
- D. Discussed creating a messaging document (to be include in the toolkit) on how to involve key stakeholders and get them around the table. Basically, this document will equip coalitions with the “how to” on making this happen.
 - Amanda suggested using some of the slides from the Summit workshop that discussed different types of messaging for different sectors as a resource.
 - Deb agreed to draft some talking points with more compelling language to get the faith based community around the table. Ruth and Andrea could also draft talking points for their stakeholders.
- E. Lacey suggested discussing dissemination of the toolkit ASAP to make sure coalitions are aware that the toolkit exists. The Commission for Higher Education (CHE) College Success Communities tool was mentioned as an example for what they did to spread the word.

High Quality Provider Data

- A. Workgroup transitioned to review and discuss provider capacity data.
- B. Discussed family, friend, and neighbor care and how to get those types of providers to become regulated? What positive messaging would encourage them to apply for CCDF at the very least?
- C. Discussed using “carrots” for providers like advertising the higher rates of reimbursement for CCDF programs, or promoting successful strategies that have worked in other communities (such as getting homes or faith-based providers to participate in PTQ).
 - How could we work through local coalitions to get this started? Is this something the workgroup wants to take on?
- D. This workgroup could summarize best practices to equip coalitions to learn from each other and not re-invent the wheel.
- E. Sandy asked about kindergarten retention data. Who is collecting it and can it be filtered by students in high-quality programs? Not currently. This would involve having STN numbers for tracking or a statewide readiness assessment.
- F. Workgroup is still wrestling with their key focus. Is it to get more providers to participate in PTQ, to advance in PTQ or a combination of both? Workgroup also discussed the map in the ELAC Annual Report that shows that 8 counties currently do not have any high quality programs. The workgroup discussed this being a focus area that could align with the coalition work.

Other Items

- A. OECOSL is going to release an RFP to work with the Office to develop a pathway for school-age programs to participate in Paths to QUALITY that honors their work. Right now, PTQ is



more designed for programs that serve young children (under 6 years old) and not as relevant for school-age programs.

Action Items

1. Kofi offered to take the lead on drafting some potential recommendations for this workgroup to present to ELAC in September/October for the 2017 Annual Report.
2. ELAC Project Support Team will follow-up with the coalitions in the map to gather their point of contact information and identify their key issues and/or support needed.
3. Project Support Team will format the Coalition Self-Assessment Tool to share with the identified "pilot" coalitions.
4. Lacey will share her contacts at the Wells County School System with Kofi.
5. Lacey, Kofi and Deb will work on drafting a talking points / messaging resource for the toolkit.

Next Meeting

Monday, September 12, 2016, 1:00 - 3:00pm