



Attendees

Sarah Parks-Reese, Carla Biro, Shannon Gage, Lynn Hall, Kacey Deverell, Starr Burton, Jahanah Murphy-Sims, Olanda Lewis, Lacey Kottkamp, Mike Bachman, Amanda Lopez, Margaret Smith

Key Topics Discussed

A. Updates

1. ELAC

- a. The Early Learning Summit (indianaearlylearningsummit.org) is scheduled for October 16th.
 - i. The focus of this year's Summit is the return on investing in early childhood.
 - ii. The Summit planning team is currently accepting nominations for Community Early Learning Champion Awards.
 1. Nominations can be made for individuals or groups.
 2. Submit nominations here:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSe3zBiKICVw4tXatJgUAZ7hzhfjetHXIjhw8-LqPTRa_AHS_g/viewform

B. 2018 Workgroup Priorities

1. Coalition Toolkit Update

- a. Scheduled to be presented to ELAC on October 12th for final approval.

2. Reviewed priorities and five year goal ([ELAC website](#)).

3. Mike shared three possible options that ELAC discussed for the workgroup moving forward:

- a. Option 1: Complete a deeper dive into understanding the low participation and advancement of registered ministries in Paths to QUALITY (PTQ)
 - i. Registered ministries have a much lower participation rate (24%) than most other programs. The only program type with lower participation is school-based, which is a much newer program type.
 - ii. Of all PTQ programs, 6% are registered ministries. Of the high quality rated programs, only 7% are registered ministries.
 - iii. This low participation rate raises many questions the workgroup could explore further:
 1. Why are only 24% of ministries going through the steps to become certified and eligible for PTQ?



2. What percentage of children are being served by registered ministries and the potential impact?
 3. Has the participation rate of ministries increased over the last few years or has it remained stagnant?
 4. What are the barriers for registered ministries to not participate?
 5. What have been successful strategies to help advance registered ministries in PTQ?
- b. Option 2: Understanding the program's role with families in the CCDF and OMW enrollment processes
- i. Programs don't always understand enough about the enrollment processes to help and educate families on where to go and who to contact to access resources.
 - ii. It may be helpful for more research to be done to see how literate programs are in the CCDF/ OMW enrollment process and making recommendations to better inform and equip programs.
 - iii. This focus area will be tabled. Family Engagement is already addressing this through a current project.
- c. Option 3: Sunset the workgroup.
- i. The workgroup has completed its original goals, and the workgroup is no longer needed.
 - ii. The members of the workgroup could join other ELAC committees.
4. Workgroup Consensus on the Options
- a. There was consensus that members saw value in the workgroup and the work that still remained, so they wanted to keep meeting. Workgroup members wanted to have further discussions of what their work would consist of.
 - b. The workgroup would like to further review existing data on registered ministries and their participation in PTQ.
 - i. The workgroup wants to review/collect qualitative and quantitative data about why registered ministries aren't participating in PTQ.
 1. Trend data over the last five years
 2. Number of registered ministries in the early childhood education system
 3. Number of certified registered ministries
 4. Number of registered ministries participating in PTQ
 5. Number of registered ministries advancing through PTQ
 6. Number of children served in registered ministries
 7. Data comparing the cost for families to send children to registered ministries and other program types
 8. The amount of CCDF funding going to registered ministries



- ii. This first involves identifying who is collecting related data, what data is being collecting, and what relevant data is not being collected.
- iii. Following the data review, the workgroup will either make recommendations about policy changes moving forward or possibly make recommendations that another workgroup take the project over to recommend further action.
- iv. Data collected during this project could be included in future annual reports similar to what the Workforce workgroup did.
- c. Lacey: My recommendation would be to refine exactly what you want to do in the area of registered ministries and bring that recommendation to ELAC for approval.
- d. Who needs to be at the table for this work?

5. Workgroup Co-Chair

- a. If the workgroup is continuing on, then the workgroup will need another co-chair to support Mike.
- b. What kind of experience would be beneficial for a co-chair to have?
 - i. Program staff from registered ministries; licensing consultants; possibly a representative from United Way's registered ministries project; someone with a strong knowledge of CCDF, PTQ, OMW; director who has gone through the PTQ process as a registered ministry; religious leaders (pastor, board president of church, etc.); registered ministry teachers in addition to directors.
 - ii. Based off of this list, the workgroup may recruit an outside individual to act as a workgroup co-chair.
- c. Workgroup members can send nominations to Lacey and Amanda.

C. Next steps

- a. The workgroup will use the Stakeholder Engagement Process "wheel" moving forward.
- b. Transform Consulting Group will work with Mike to find and organize preliminary data to discuss at the next workgroup meeting.
- c. Workgroup members can send co-chair recommendations to Amanda and Lacey.

Next Meeting

To be determined. The workgroup is currently scheduled to meet on October 8th. However, many workgroup members have that day off in observance of Columbus Day. Further discussion will occur via email to determine when the work group will meet.