Present:
Erin Kissling
Lacey Kottkamp
Nicole Norvell
Connie Sherman

I.   Call to Order

1. Lacey Kottkamp, Interim Chairwoman, called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm.

II.   Approve April Meeting Minutes

1. Motion to approve: Erin
2. Seconded: Nicole

III.   Updates from the Chair and/or Appointed Members

1.   None

IV.   Workgroup Report Outs for 2018 Priorities

1. Child Development and Well-Being: Co-chair Carrie Bale

    a. Improving the early identification of developmental delays

        i.   The workgroup is currently serving as the leadership team for Help Me Grow (HMG) Indiana

        ii. As the leadership team, they have recently completed and reviewed HMG Readiness Assessments

        iii. The workgroup will be helping to create a HMG strategic plan and prepare for implementation this fall

    b. Suspension/Expulsion Policy

        i.   Assisted the Office of Early Childhood and Out of School Learning (OECOSL) in developing this state policy and creating resources to support providers in the implementation of this policy

Question from Lacey: I'm curious to hear more about the peer learning opportunity members of your group had relating to state suspension and expulsion policies.

Answer from Beth Barrett, workgroup member: We were able to learn from other states about their suspension and expulsion policies. We had monthly webinars that included information on implementation and technology support.

    c. The above mentioned priorities align with item two within the ELAC Statute

    d. Early Brain Development- Presentation Recommendation

       i. This recommendation was shared by workgroup members Drs. Katie Swec and Nancy Michael

      ii. The first Early Learning Summit in 2016 included a call to action for the education of the greater community in the area of early brain development

     iii. The previous ELAC Chair, Kevin Bain, asked the Child Development and Well-Being workgroup to package information on early brain development in a manner that could be shared with various communities

     iv. The workgroup and Early Brain Development subcommittee have created the following documents over the last several months:

        1. Slide deck presentation, which has been piloted and reviewed by experts

        2. User Guide

        3. Communications Plan

        4. Supplemental handouts

      v. This presentation is to be used to share knowledge about early brain development and to prepare communities to invest in early brain development

     vi. This presentation is scripted and will be recorded, in order to ensure script fidelity

    vii. Question and answer sessions can be facilitated and targeted to specific audiences

   viii. The presentation contains three key messages:

        1. The brain grows rapidly in the first five years

        2. Early experiences can change brain development

        3. What we can do to promote healthy brain development in our children

     ix. The workgroup recommends that ELAC adopt the Early Brain Development presentation and its corresponding documents

    x. This recommendation is in alignment with item four of the ELAC Statute

Question from Nicole: If I'm a legislator and this is my first exposure to this information, I may leave the presentation asking, "What should I do now?". Will this be addressed in the discussion portion? Will we give information to them on how to use this knowledge to inform policy?

Answer from Dr. Swec: The call to action in the presentation was meant to be broad as this will be used with diverse audiences. The discussion will be tailored to each audience and additional resources could be created for legislators and other groups.

Answer from John Peirce, workgroup member: The User Guide provides example discussion questions for legislators. The presentation is meant to be concise and 20 minutes in duration. Further discussion can be expanded. We have experts listed on the User Guide who can be contacted to answer any questions.

Question from Erin: Wil the presentation and related documents be housed on the ELAC website? How will it be disseminated?

Answer from Carrie: We didn't want to delve too far into the technology component until we had ELAC approval. Yes, it will be housed on the ELAC website. We will be able to monitor who is downloading the presentation, and we will send a follow-up survey to get feedback and frequently asked questions.

Question from Nicole: Since this will be available for anyone to use, do you have any worries about consistent messaging? We know the recorded components will remain consistent, but did you have a conversation about consistency in the discussion period?

Answer from Carrie: No, we mainly focused on why this information was important to share. The User Guide provides example discussion questions.

Question from Erin: What is your hope for teachers who use this resource?

Answer from Carrie: We want them to have access to the information and to have a resource they can use within their program for professional development and to inform their day to day work. This will also help them explain why they do certain things. ELAC is well positioned for providers to look to for best practices.

Question from Nicole: I don't have questions about the content, but I have some questions about costs associated with this recommendation that didn't seem to be explained in the documents we received.

Answer from Carrie: We did not want to look at costs too deeply until we received ELAC's approval. Many of the partners we have talked to about recording and disseminating will provide those services in-kind. We will obtain approval from ELAC for any funding needs that arise.

         xi. ELAC vote on this recommendation: All in favor, none opposed

2. Data Coordination and System Integration: Co-chair Charlie Geier

    a. The workgroup has been focused on the annual report, which aligns with items one, two and four of the ELAC Statute

        i. At the last workgroup meeting, they reviewed ELAC's feedback on the annual report outline

        ii. They are looking at existing scorecards that could be adopted and used to look at system building

    b. Collaboration and coordination between entities in terms of data, aligning with item 2 of the ELAC Statute

        i. Carol Rogers attended June's workgroup meeting to discuss the Early Learning Indiana (ELI) Data Center

            1. The workgroup discussed future collaboration with the Center and provided feedback

        ii. The workgroup has recently been discussing how to maximize possible collaboration with the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and their work with the M.A. Rooney Foundation to launch the Ed-Fi database.

Question from Lacey: What is Ed-Fi?

Answer from Erin: It is a data standardization system. It includes a set of rules about how we collect data. Schools will now have guidelines to unify the way student data is collected. In the long term, schools and the IDOE will be able to share data back and forth consistently. It will help schools transfer information to other schools. These guidelines give the systems the ability to talk to each other. At an exploratory level, we are also discussing how some of these guidelines can be applied in the early learning space.

        iii. The workgroup is serving as the Data Workgroup for HMG

3. Evaluation of Child and Family Outcomes: Co-chair Megan Purcell

    a. The workgroup has been working to develop a base of information about Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)

        i. They anticipate finalizing an introductory one-page document at their meeting this month

        ii. A communications plan will be developed

        iii. The group is interested in developing additional documents about ACEs that target specific groups (i.e. teachers, policy makers)

Question from Nicole: Who is the target audience for the introductory one-page document on ACEs?

Answer from Megan: We are keeping it general. This first document is meant for everybody. It is then our goal to create subsequent papers for specific groups and audiences. ELAC and lobbying organizations are the first audiences.

Response from Nicole: My encouragement is to think about narrowing your target audience. It will be hard to roll out a communications plan if you don't know the target audience. From a policy perspective, it's important for policy makers to understand ACEs, and they then need to know what to do with that information. A broad document will be difficult to share.

Response from Megan: We will discuss who the target audience might be at our meeting Friday and then make some decisions.

Response from Nicole: I also suggest going back to the ELAC Statute to figure out how you frame this ACEs conversation as aligning to the statute.

    b. The workgroup has also been hoping to produce resources that dispel the myth about "fade out"

        i. They are still working on resources

    c. At their May meeting, the group discussed future work around program evaluation (referring specifically to Continuous Quality Improvement)

Question from Erin: What level of program evaluation were you discussing?

Answer from Megan: Early learning. We have reached out to early learning programs to hear about how they evaluate programs. We are trying to identify good examples to lift up for other programs.

    4. Family Engagement: Co-chair John Peirce

a. The workgroup's priorities and current activities relate to item 2 in the ELAC Statute; There is also specific language in the statute about parent and family engagement

b. The workgroup is waiting to find a website to host five family-facing blogs

    i. ELI and OECOSL are discussing if it would be possible to post them on the Brighter Futures website

c. Family Engagement Toolkit: The workgroup is interested in promoting and expanding its use by creating a one page promotional piece and a user guide

    i. There is a great deal of content in the toolkit, which can be off putting to users

    ii. The promotional piece can get users interested in the toolkit and the user guide will give tips based on the feedback of past users

    iii. The workgroup has identified the key components to include in these documents and are ready to draft the documents if asked to by ELAC

    iv. The workgroup also identified that there may be a need for additional training and coaching for the toolkit

        1. They are working with state partners and agencies to see if this type of training is taking place or if it is something the workgroup can assist with

Question from Nicole: How did you identify the need for additional training? How did you collect feedback?

Answer from John: Our other co-chair, Katie Herron, is more involved in that process. She is working with many programs and received feedback from ELI on the toolkit.

Question from Nicole: Was feedback solicited from programs or from coaches?

Answer from Amanda Lopez: Survey data was collected from some coaches.

Suggestion from Nicole: Can we find out the response rate from coaches? We want to be sure we are getting solid information from coaches to make sure we know what they need.

Question from Nicole: Has the group had any access to the data about how the toolkit is being used? It would be helpful to understand what data the group has looked at before we decide on next steps.

Answer from John: We have a spreadsheet with related information that can be reviewed.

d. The workgroup discussed the possibility of creating a flow-chart and recommendations for when and how to engage family voices in early childhood system-building throughout the state based on research, best practices and input from families and organizations that serve them

Comment from Nicole: OECOSL is undertaking a process of looking at how family-friendly our current policies are. This may be a good opportunity for the Family Engagement workgroup to act as an external reviewer for the office. The group can review the policies and provide recommendations and identify barriers for the office.

Response from John: The workgroup would be willing to take this on.

e. The workgroup is interested in exploring ways to promote collaborative, family-friendly best practices for transitions from home visiting to early childhood education (ECE) and ECE to kindergarten beyond what IDOE and Head Start are doing.

Update from Erin: IDOE is working to identify overarching competencies that can apply to any transition. This should be done before Spring 2019.

Question from John: So, we should wait until then and let that inform our work?

Answer from Erin: Yes, IDOE's target audiences are likely different than ELAC's target audiences. Community coalitions are not are target audience, but another group like ELAC may be able to share this information with coalitions.

f. The workgroup is willing to recommend, at the appropriate time, improvements to the content of the Family Engagement Toolkit based on new research and feedback from providers and coaches

Request from John: We are seeking guidance on our next steps and what work with should proceed with.

Next steps, suggested by the committee: Nicole will attend the next workgroup meeting to discuss the possibility of the group acting as an external reviewer of state policies.

5. Funding Streams: Workgroup member Mandy Zimmerman

   a. The workgroup has been developing one page documents about key pre-K funding sources

      i. Existing resources have been reviewed and initial drafts have been developed

         1. Drafts should be finalized before their August meeting

Question from Nicole: Within each funding stream, states and local communities have decisions about how they use the funding. It's a complex topic to discuss. What's the message you plan to articulate?

Answer from Mandy and Amanda: We want to first identify baseline data about funding and see if there are needs for more funding or different use of funding. We want to package this information in a useful way to help people who don't deal with funding every day.

Question from Nicole: Have you created a communications plan? Who is the intended audience?

Answer from Mandy: We do not have a communications plan yet. The audience is anyone who needs to quickly understand what options are available for public funding of pre-K.

Suggestion from Nicole: The workgroup may need to think more narrowly about who your audience is (i.e. providers, policy makers).

Question from Lacey: Why did you focus on public funding for pre-K instead of looking at ages 0-3?

Answer from Mandy: Narrowing it to pre-K seemed more manageable and pre-K has been the focus of recent annual reports.

Suggestion from Lacey: We are working to be more holistic this year. It would be interesting to see identified the unmet need for ages 0-3 as well. This may involve looking at publicly funded seats for that age group.

    b. The workgroup plans to identify promising practices of employer supported ECE this fall

    c. The workgroup hopes to lift up success stories of local communities and providers who have been successful in blending and braiding funding

      i. They have held panel discussions with foundation representatives and philanthropic funders to get information about what they are funding

      ii. They hope to share their findings in a summary report or as part of the annual report

    d. They are serving as an advisor to ELI in relation to their blending and braiding process

Question from Erin: What is the timeline for the blending and braiding project to be completed?

Answer from Amanda: August

Question from Nicole: How do you see the workgroup's priorities informing the annual report?

Answer from Mandy and Amanda: In looking at existing funding sources, we plan to identify how much funding is being allocated and how many children are being served. Looking at the availability of subsidized options relates to the annual report sections concerning accessibility and affordability.

Suggestion from Nicole: The workgroup has done a lot of work around publicly funded pre-K. We suggest you refocus some of your work on infant and toddler care, as care for that age group can be harder to access than public pre-K.

6. Workforce and Professional Development: Co-chairs Dianna Wallace and Mike Tinsley

    a. In alignment to item one of the ELAC Statute, the workgroup has assisted in preparing for this year's annual report and its focus on the early childhood workforce

        i. They have reviewed related national reports as well as data from the higher education commission

        ii. Erin Kissling recently presented Career and Technical Education data to the workgroup

        iii. The workgroup is currently waiting to receive quantitative data from the Management Performance Hub (MPH)

    b. The workgroup has also focused on retention, recruitment and recognition

        i. About a year ago, they discussed a qualitative process called "Voice of the consumer"

        ii. Based on this model, they developed a set of interview questions for early childhood directors and teachers with the goal of identifying:

            1. Why they entered the profession;

            2. Why they stay;

            3. And what are the reasons that may make them leave.

      iii. Workgroup member Dr. Hanan Osmon conducted these interviews, with the help of staff members from the Indiana Association for the Education of Young Children

          1. Interview responses have been thematically analyzed and will be discussed at the workgroup's August meeting

      iv. The workgroup is hoping this data will be useful in driving workforce initiatives and future work

Suggestion from Erin: Make sure that this information is shared with the right people in order to inform future work. This may be something to discuss with the workgroup. How will this information be used and disseminated to inform practices?

    7. Provider Participation and Advancement: Chair Michael Bachman

      a. The workgroup successfully transitioned the coalition building toolkit to a state partner this spring.

      b. The workgroup has not met this summer and is awaiting further direction from ELAC

Comment from Lacey: I wonder if this is an opportunity to discuss if the Provider Participation and Advancement workgroup has fulfilled its work and if we should move it to an ad hoc group.

Question from Nicole: Do you feel like the group has wrapped up their work?

Answer from Michael: Yes, but I know a theme that reappeared consistently was how to best engage registered ministries. They continue to have low participation in Paths to Quality.

Response from Nicole: If there is not current work the group is committed to, maybe members can join other workgroups. A provider lens would be helpful in the other groups.

Response from Michael: I think that would be welcomed. This group could be a strong advisory group as certain pieces move forward. There was an interest at one time about advising on verbiage of how information is presented to providers. We could fill this advisory role as an ad hoc workgroup.

Response from Nicole: Let's see if the group has crossover with impact project workgroups or other ELAC workgroups. That will help us see if their expertise is plugged in elsewhere. We can look at ad hoc groups and which members have time to commit to certain projects. The request to join ad hoc workgroups could be asked via email.

      c. ELAC will send Michael an email about ad hoc projects for members to commit to.

V. Public Comment

Comment from Dr. Nancy Michael: ACEs and data transfer relate to the healthcare field as well. If demographics and outcomes are key pieces of information, how do we track ACEs and early brain development? We need to make sure this information does not get lost.

Question from John Peirce: I've heard references to federal grants that groups are applying for. Is it possible for this information to be reported out?

Answer from Nicole: There is a Preschool Development Grant. A group has convened (which includes ELAC representatives) to discuss the possibility of Indiana applying for this funding. It should be noted that the focus of this funding is on the coordination of system building rather than starting new programs or funding direct service.

Related question from Carrie Bale: Is it ELAC's role to recommend that the state apply for this type of funding?

Answer from Nicole: ELAC can, but the decision will be made by the governor. Because the focus is a bit different and more on system building, a lot of providers and government employees are involved.

Response from Carrie: We see our role in ELAC as a lot of system building. I see ELAC as a good entity to pull that up.

Response from Nicole: The governor makes the decision and will designate an agency to lead that effort and application. ELAC is not an agency so it would not be directly involved in that application. ELAC could make recommendations on what is included in the application, but could not write the application.

Related answer from Nicole: There was increased appropriation for the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

VI. Plan for 2019 ELAC Annual Report and Need Assessment

1. Data update and timeline: Charlie Geier, Co-chair of the Data Coordination and Systems Integration Workgroup

   a. The goal is to finish the report by October. The Data workgroup is currently working with state partners to gather data requests. Many of these requests are only partially completed.

      i. The workgroup requested that ELAC state partners encourage their employers to push these requests along.

  b. Current outline was shared and presented

Question from Erin: We had a good conversation last month about the kindergarten readiness piece. Has your group had a chance to process that at all?

Answer from Charlie: We discussed it and think it makes sense for an ad hoc group to compose that piece. We suggest that the ad hoc group come from the DOE and other workgroups that have more expertise in this area. We need help identifying the right people

  2. Ad hoc Kindergarten Readiness Workgroup

    a. Erin volunteered to chair this ad hoc group.

    b. Charlie volunteered to be a member of this group.

Question from Erin: Is the goal for this workgroup to have something for this year's report?

Answer from Charlie: Yes ideally, but we could also make a recommendation that a measurable definition be established. We may also need to make recommendations about how data is collected related to a future measurable definition.

VII.   **On My Way Pre-K Program Updates**

  1. None

VIII.   **Federal and State Legislative Updates**

  1. DOE will participate in the conversation around the Preschool Development Grant

  2. Head Start Report is completed and a communications plan will be created to disseminate the report.

IX.   Lacey motioned to adjourn at 2:59 pm; Erin seconded.

X.   **Next Meeting**: August 10, 2018 1:00-3:00 pm I Indiana Government Center South