



Attendees

Conference Call: Andy Goebel, Ted Maple, Kent Mitchell, Mandy Zimmerman, Russel Menyhart, Christina Hage, Meghan Smith, Terry Green, Rhonda Clark, Kyle Wehmann, Amanda Lopez

Key Topics Discussed

A. ELAC and Other Updates

- Welcomed new member, Russell Menyhart, partner at Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP.
- June's (tomorrow) ELAC meeting had been cancelled.
- An online communication tool to replace Wiggio is currently being piloted.
- Additional 15 counties added to OMW Pre-K Pilot Program were publically announced yesterday! Rhonda discussed plans for "onboarding" those counties and some details of the new legislation.
 - The Office aims to start a small cohort in January 2018, the rest will start in the fall.
 - Capacity building funds have been built-in to get the new providers up to speed.
 - EEMG counties have been rolled into the new legislation.
- Terry asked if the requirement of a service need would impact potential enrollment numbers since the 15 new counties did not know about the service need when they applied to be part of the pilot.
- Amanda suggested this workgroup take on the development of a white paper or toolkit for layering (all types) of funding sources.

B. Update on Funding Data Available by County to Include in ELAC Annual Report

- What funding data should be included in the county profiles and why? How does cost of care differ by county? We want to understand the entire "pie" of early education funding.
- Mandy Zimmerman reported that ELI does not track how many kids with each program provider are under which funding stream. ELI should be able to report cost of care *averages* by county, but there may be issues with protecting confidentiality for individual providers in counties with a small number of programs.
- Ted recommended the ELAC project support team provide a list of funding data available by county for members to review *prior to* workgroup meetings for a deeper discussion of what data should be included in the Annual Report and county. (Will also note any nuances with the data.)

C. Overview of ELI Project on Layering of Funds

- Kent provided some background and context for this project. The main goal is to provide training and technical assistance on blending and braiding funds to 10-20 high-functioning



“ready” programs to help them understand the options for layering funding and maximize their ability to serve children. Programs will be asked to identify the financial goal(s) they want to accomplish at the beginning of the project, then work to layer funding (all types, public and private) to help reach those real goals. Tools, frameworks, and trainings will be developed to benefit all early childhood programs in the future.

- The project will be organized in 3 phases: **Phase 1** will happen this summer which includes gathering relevant research on best practices, determining the selection criteria for participating providers, and making those selections. **Phase 2** will begin in September with one-on-one engagement in the form of onsite training, coaching, and technical assistance for participating programs over one year. **Phase 3** will be to reflect on lessons learned and best practices to share across the state and eventually integrate into provider coaching and training. Policy implications could include recommending changes to current regulations that may inhibit layering of funding.
- ELAC’s Project Management Team, Transform Consulting Group, has been hired to lead the work. The Funding Streams workgroup has agreed to act as an advisory group to guide this work, starting with determining selection criteria for programs and gathering related research.

D. Program Selection Criteria Discussion

- Amanda shared some potential criteria and examples:
 - High-quality programs (in current OMW Pre-K counties);
 - Diverse program setting types (1-2 of each, minus family child care homes);
 - Program currently using more than 1 funding source (i.e. CCDF, Head Start, OMW Pre-K);
 - Geographic proximity of programs would lend to efficient use of project staff time (not too far to travel each month).
- Workgroup discussed the following options regarding program criteria:
 - Amanda gave some rationale for *potentially* not including family child care homes:
 1. Small capacity to serve kids;
 2. Usually do not have a business model;
 3. Limited funding is available to for-profit entities.
 - Terry and Ted said family child care homes can also layer funding and should not be left out. Ted also said that a large swath of providers would be left out if we exclude for-profits.
 - Should both full- and part-day programs be eligible? Ted thinks part-day programs would be less likely to layer funding.



- Mandy recommended pulling provider data based on a few of the criteria the workgroup is fairly sure about to see what we are working with and go from there. Then, more criteria can be set if necessary. All agreed!
- Andy suggested private and religious schools be eligible to participate.
- Members liked the idea of keeping the age group criteria “broad” to include infants and toddlers, not just focus on preschool-aged children.
- Should program size be part of the criteria? Programs serving a certain number of children, or that have a certain number of classrooms? Terry sees value in including a wide variety of program sizes because their business models are so different.
- Mandy suggested program capacity (at capacity vs. not) as a potential criteria measure.

E. Research on alternative funding strategies

- A subgroup was formed to lead this work and outline the goals that includes Kent, Russel, Andy, and Kristina.
 - Kent has already collected a lot of research and agreed to share with subgroup. Andy suggested utilizing resources from Tempe, AZ.

Action Items

1. Project management team will provide the list of funding data available by county to workgroup members in advance of meetings where feedback is requested.
2. Project management team will provide questions about layering of funding project in advance of meetings where feedback / advice is requested. Kyle will make the layering of funding project a standing agenda item.
3. Kyle will share the list of program selection criteria with Mandy to pull provider data.
4. Project management team will connect subgroup members and plan/facilitate meetings to discuss research on alternative funding strategies.
5. If anyone finds resources related to layering funding or other alternative ECE funding strategies, please upload to Wiggio (a subfolder will be created) or send to Amanda/Kyle via email to share.

Next Meeting

Thursday, July 13th from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm at Early Learning Indiana