



## Attendees

Marissa Manlove, Megan Broadas, Seth Hinshaw, Terry Green, Lora Stephens, Melissa Wall, Amanda Lopez

Guest: *Marta Fetterman*

## Key Topics Discussed

### A. ELAC Updates

- a. August ELAC public meeting has been cancelled. The next meeting is Friday, September 14<sup>th</sup>. You may attend through livestream or in person.
  - i. Will need someone to cover for Marissa to report out for Funding Streams workgroup.
- b. At the July ELAC public meeting, the Child Development and Well-Being workgroup presented a slide deck on early child brain development that will have a recorded narration. It could be shared with many audiences. The presentation was approved by the Committee. The workgroup's goal is to have it posted and available for dissemination at end of September/early October.
- c. The annual report is being worked on, and we hope to have it ready by end of October.
- d. No chair has been appointed.

### B. National News

- a. Reviewed highlights from the "Transforming the Financing of Early Care and Education" report by The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, Medicine (posted in Glip).
  - i. Are there any recommendations that Indiana are close to that we could bring up to push forward? ELAC is to work on coordination of programs and a lot of these recommendations talk to that. It's not just on funding but also data recommendations of unifying standards.
    1. Marissa: Since no one has had a chance to really read through this, it might be good to bring back on the agenda to focus in on. Amanda or Melissa pick one or two to dig deeper on.
    2. Amanda: Might be something to ask the committee if there's any one they'd like us to look into further.

### C. 2018 Workgroup Priorities

- a. Guest to talk about the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) and discuss what the program covers and preliminary results of a project focused on CACFP enrollment – *Marta Fetterman from Early Learning Indiana (ELI)*
  - i. Marta managed a program up until a year ago that worked with childcare providers on health and nutrition. She is now managing a similar program at ELI.



- ii. ELI applied for a grant with Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH) to look at how to increase participation in CACFP with a goal to get children to eat healthier. They didn't get that grant but found that Nemours was willing to pay for 5 states to look into what are the barriers to enrollment, who is eligible and why aren't they enrolling?
  1. The group did some mapping to come up with geographical areas where there was lack of participation. These places also correlated with food deserts.
  2. Next, they held a series of focus groups and learned a number of things about why people were enrolled or not enrolled. There were some real concerns and some misconceptions.
    - a. Concern with paperwork and oversight – worried it was cumbersome and not worth the money,
    - b. Misconception on how much money would be provided,
    - c. And confusion on eligibility.
      - i. A family childcare must have a sponsor when applying, and that sponsor takes a cut of the money. Centers or ministries can apply on their own but some choose to use a sponsor.
  3. Then the group came up with a series of marketing tools which were sent to the 180 providers identified in the mapping process. They will follow those providers to see if any will be enrolling. The marketing tools were also given to local CCR&Rs to see if that helps get the word out to more providers.
  4. The grant wasn't a ton of money, less than \$3,000. Small incentives were used with focus groups and a handful of key informant interviews to dig a little deeper.
  5. Marta believes the key to this project was that the contacts at ISDH and CACFP have worked together prior. There was a trust factor there, and we knew what our intent was. It is a focused project with a short time frame and few resources.
  6. Next step is to follow those providers. Open to answering any questions.
    - a. Amanda: You found about half of programs that are eligible are enrolled?
      - i. Marta: That's hard to pinpoint, but we went with a point in time and found that our state participation rates are pretty good. One thing that surprised me was the misunderstanding of who was eligible and who was not, and people thinking it was far more cumbersome and limiting than it is. Will there be changes to your program? Yes, if you're not serving as healthy food it might be a drastic change.
    - b. Terry: We're looking at CACFP. As a public school, we're trying to figure out how to not make it double work for everyone. We're currently serving 600 children ages 0-5. Did you talk to public schools in your work?





align but we'll try to have it be consistent so we're looking at the same time span. (federal fiscal year versus state fiscal year)

1. Talked before of adding footnotes to not add the numbers together because they're not an unduplicated account.
2. Perhaps at next meeting we'll want to discuss how to calculate unmet need to include. And each program is different, so we'll have to think about how to include that.
3. Marissa: Have we done that in the past?
4. Amanda: We do. It would be reaching consensus with the group and adding the appropriate notes. It sounds simple, but there are a number of nuances, so we want to make sure we're showing the data appropriately.
5. Marissa: We're trying to make this not too complicated with not tons of notes and things so our audience can get a sense. Seth, would this be helpful to legislators to understand need and unmet need?
  - a. Discussion of how to define unmet need.
  - b. Seth: Could we tier it? Last fiscal year, FSSA reported X amount of those who applied and find how many didn't get in because of lack of dollars, and if we expand it out we could serve X more families, etc. It gives legislators options rather than looking at the whole big picture. Perhaps add too, this is what it would look like if we expand to X counties.
    - i. Amanda and Marissa: I think that would be good.
    - ii. Terry: Agrees.
    - iii. Marissa: There are ways to get at that, and it essentially creates the idea of unmet need.
    - iv. Amanda: We could put it into tableau and show which options you want to prioritize.
    - v. Marissa: And then that combined with these one pagers may provide a better picture for decisions the general assembly might be considering.
    - vi. Amanda: I think ELAC is interested in baseline data to accompany recommendations, so this would provide that objective data needed.
  - c. Survey Report Out
    - i. Tabled to next meeting since the survey had not yet closed.

#### **D. Other Priorities**

- a. Final update on blending and braiding (posted in Glip)
  - i. Recommendation 1:
    1. Marissa: Seems like a good one, in line with ELAC.
    2. Amanda: Might be an easy win as there's already some action occurring, and it might help accelerate that.
  - ii. Recommendation 2:



1. Marissa: Is there a fiscal benefit to this change?
  - a. Amanda: Yes, switching the method of tracking would make the work less burdensome for state officials and state-contracted staff like CCDF intake staff as well as program staff and parents. Making the system more efficient could save the state money over time, especially if OMW is expanded to other counties.
  - b. Megan: Have these programs been long time accepters of CCDF or new to it?
    - i. Amanda: Most have been long time accepters and expanded with On My Way Pre-K (OMW Pre-K).
2. Marissa: Seems like this could be another good recommendation to offer.
- iii. Recommendation 3:
  1. Marissa: Are there fiscal implications to increasing the designation of those centers?
    - a. Lora: Doesn't envision a big fiscal impact and perhaps sees an argument against it by saying there's not enough money to allocate to those spots.
    - b. Amanda: We want families to have access, so they don't have to go across the town, etc. These programs can't diversify their funding streams because families can't pay out of pocket. So, if the state finds value in keeping these programs available in high-need, low-income areas this recommendation would assist that
    - c. Marissa: Tweak the language of the recommendation to draw out that point above more. Makes sense to consider it to bring forward to ELAC.
  2. Marissa: How are those agreement centers currently designated?
    - a. Lora: Not sure of the details. Currently required that they're Path 4.
    - b. Amanda: There was an RFP from the Office two years ago, so programs had to apply for it.
    - c. Marissa: Currently have to be Level 4 would be a factor so we're recommending including Level 3?
    - d. Lora: Also, family childcare homes are not currently eligible so that is another change we are recommending.
  3. Megan: If they're in a rural area that doesn't see a need for it, it'll be difficult to get them to become a Level 4. It's hard to get them to become a Level 1 or Level 2 at this point.
    - a. Marissa: Broadening the eligibility wouldn't hurt but Megan, do you see eligibility still being a barrier?
    - b. Megan: I see both sides of it, but I'm not sure if providers will participate. If the providers are not self-motivated to become higher quality, the reimbursements and such currently are not enough to motivate them.



- c. Amanda: It might not be for all areas.
  - iv. Recommendation 4:
    1. Marissa: Have you gotten any feedback from Adis on this one in particular?
    2. Amanda: Not outside of the workgroup meeting. She didn't mention anything at the last meeting.
  - v. Recommendation 5:
    1. Marissa: I would strongly recommend that would be a model again (blending and braiding to provide full-day preschool to children with special needs). Terry did you say that's the model you use?
    2. Terry: Yes. We promoted full inclusion in Kentucky in 1990 but also those in early childhood were trained in special education but not all teachers here have that training, so it takes a lot more support.
      - a. Marissa: So that might need to be built into the recommendation.
      - b. Terry: Yes, including financial support for teachers to get that additional training in special education.
    3. Marissa: This seems like a recommendation that a few workgroups are working on or could look into.
  - vi. Recommendation 6:
    1. Seth: Never thought about this before with the blending of the funds. So, you're saying the OMW Pre-K funding is only active during the traditional school year, but it could be that program extends through the summer, and those children receive a reduced funding during the summer?
      - a. Lora: Yes
      - b. Seth: So, they're not being removed per se, but they're receiving less funding?
      - c. Lora: In previous years, families could choose whether the program was school year or year-round, and they would have their OMW Pre-K funding through the summer if that met their needs.
    2. Seth: Not sure about the concern. I guess I don't understand the difference in the rate from school year to summer.
      - a. Amanda: Not sure why the full amount isn't being covered in the summer as it is in the school year. When that enhanced rate is dropped, the families can't always cover that in the summer and need to pull their children. This is a new change that might not have been clearly communicated with providers and families.
      - b. Megan: That amount can be pretty significant. CCDF requires that the parent pays a copay and overage. Providers can choose whether the parent pays the overage. OMW Pre-K says the parent doesn't pay the



- copy, and the provider can waive the overage. The provider is losing the difference in the reimbursement rate from CCDF and OMW Pre-K
- c. Lora: So, providers can choose to make families pay the overage during the year (OMW Pre-K)?
  - d. Megan: Yes. Most don't do it because they receive promotional materials from the state if they don't charge the overage.
  - e. Seth: Do we have data on the impact those providers that do charge that overage?
  - f. Megan: Probably not at this point due to it being recent changes in OMW Pre-K. Also, the data might not be comparable.
  - g. Amanda: I think we'd have to see what the enrollment from April to May, June, or July was to see if there was a dip. We don't know if that policy has to be in place, and if those unintended consequences are worth it or not.
  - vii. Marissa: ELAC has requested an update on this project and its findings?
  - viii. Amanda: Yes. We're presenting to ELI at the end of this month as the funder of the project. We'll get some feedback from them too. It sounds like our September meeting we might need to review this so we might not be ready to present the next day. We may need to wait until October to present.
    - 1. Marissa: So that would give us some time to finish reviewing these in September.

### Action Items

---

1. Finalize survey results.
2. Bring forward a recommendation or two from the report reviewed, to discuss further at next workgroup meeting.
3. Update funding tables with ELAC feedback and create tiered levels of unmet need.

### Next Meeting

---

Monday, September 17, 2018 | Early Learning Indiana | 10:00 am – 12:00 pm ET