



## Attendees

---

Marissa Manlove, Andy Goebbel, Adis Coulibaly, Amanda Lopez, Melissa Wall  
Guests: Amber Kocher, Sue McKinney, Natalie Brake

## Key Topics Discussed

---

### A. ELAC Updates

- a. The ELAC public meeting is tomorrow (10/12). Marissa will not be in attendance. There will be a discussion about the future of ELAC. Not sure if it will be recorded, but it will be livestreamed. Marissa will be offering up her input after the meeting.
- b. The annual report is in the final stages of being written. A final draft will be presented to the ELAC at the November meeting. County profiles will not be included this year however Early Learning Indiana (ELI) will be debuting its online data center soon, and it will have a similar set of data for counties.
- c. The Indiana Early Learning Summit is next Tuesday (10/16). ELI will be presenting the findings of a new study they've completed in partnership with IU's Public Policy Institute. New this year are the awards for early learning champions.
- d. Earlier this week Noble had a legislative forum specific to issues around developmental disabilities, and Brian Bosma attended. Marissa brought up looking at special education funding and braiding funding. Bosma was very interested in learning more and following up – Kim Dodson at Arc of Indiana was also interested in learning more.

### B. National News

- a. No news.

### C. 2018 Workgroup Priorities

- a. Blending and Braiding
  - i. Policy Updates:
    1. Reviewed updates from the last meeting. An updated document has been posted in Glip.
    2. Update PPI to IU PPI (not IUPUI PPI).
    3. "Shared services" bullet not changed in recommendation 10.
  - ii. Next step: An overview of the project would be presented and then the Funding Streams workgroup would present the recommendations to the ELAC.
    1. Marissa: Should we pull out only those with financial implications?
    2. Amanda: That is certainly one way to frame it. Concerned that there are still ten recommendations.
    3. Natalie: Not sure if there's any that have no financial implications, but there may be different levels of change (administrative within an agency versus



- legislative). Some are recommending studying impact and those could be separated out as a place to start.
4. Marissa: Is there a ranking in terms of priority, or are there some that are shorter term versus longer term? How would we answer those kinds of questions?
    - a. Amanda: I think we could come ready for those questions.
    - b. Marissa: I think that would be important.
  5. Amanda: Some of these are positive funding differences. Money saved by blending and braiding funding in developmental and general preschool.
    - a. Adis: Definitely need improvement with communications around Title funding.
  6. Andy – Looking at recommendation 3 and thinking of Vanderburgh County, we received 52% less funding this year than last. This leads to a question about blending CCDF and OMW funding. We're serving fewer kids but not that many fewer.
- iii. Next steps (continued):
1. The workgroup has approved the recommendations.
  2. Next step is to create slide deck.
  3. It's been a few months since we've reviewed the other parts of the project. We provided tools as well. ELI has been working with those and testing them.
- iv. Discussion of tools
1. Looked at in two groups – financial and business management
    - a. We reviewed them to see if anything could be changed to make it easier for the user, and if there were any recommendations on what background education will be needed (supports needed, such as help with Excel).
    - b. Amber: Takeaways and suggestions on financial tools.
      - i. Good tools, they seemed accurate and the formulas worked. I think you will need Excel training or YouTube videos to explain some of the more advanced tools.
      - ii. Add a front page with more basic questions, and perhaps the first tab could populate other tabs. The first tab could be written in language for the provider that would populate the relevant blanks on the financial tabs.
      - iii. Some tools could have additional formulas added to lower the number of entries/calculations the providers need to do on their own (such as number of Fridays in a month/year).
      - iv. Capacity enrollment tracking tool – color coding that would color the goal/calculation to show if they're doing well, needs improvement, etc.



- (could add Excel formatting to do that) would add a helpful visual dimension.
- v. Natalie: Need to make sure the formulas are locked so people can't mess up the sheet.
  - vi. Amber: Need to change or explain how to change to normal view to input figures into Excel file.
  - vii. It would be helpful to know how long these sheets should take.
    - 1. Amanda: Also adding what things they should have readily available before starting would be helpful.
    - 2. We might not have the information to estimate the time the tools take.
2. Follow up with Amber for any additional/more specific comments on the 3-4 tools she reviewed.
  3. Natalie and team are still reviewing some of the other tools. Funding cheat sheet and fund development toolkit are good. Looking to review the employer-sponsored toolkit because it could be pushed out next year through the coalitions.
    - a. Andy: Seems like the timing couldn't be any better with the need to attract and retain talent.
    - b. Natalie wants a clear pathway to usage for all of the tools before putting them out there and sees a pathway already for the employer-sponsored toolkit.
  - v. Next steps: Timing of presentation – separate recommendations and tools or wait to have them together?
    1. This was started last year, and we have yet to give a broad presentation on how this is going/went.
    2. Seems like it might be better to wait until the tools are ready to go along with the policy recommendations. Do a combined presentation that goes over everything broadly for the ELAC public meeting – so other workgroups can learn about it too.
    3. Focus on tools that could/should be scaled out and can be supported in use now and mention the others as valuable but not scaled out yet.
    4. Aim to present at December ELAC meeting (12/14).
    5. Next meeting work on a draft of the presentation and how we want to frame the message.
      - a. Biggest takeaway was that all of the programs were high-quality but various gaps in business management knowledge including fundamentals.
- b. Funding Tables



- i. Break out by programs with income thresholds and breakout into ages (infant toddler versus preschool) – CCDF, OMW, EHS/HS
    1. If you're targeting these populations, here's the unmet need.
  - ii. Need to add SFY or FFY.
  - iii. Add asterisk to OMW that more has since been appropriated, and how funding has changed with the addition of blending/braiding.
  - iv. Add mention of where the data came from on front page (ELAC 2017 report with dates for data).
  - v. Double check statute for OMW language (probably need to add "qualified") of those who applied.
  - vi. Add pie charts to funding and by age group (infant/toddler and preschool).
  - vii. Update numbers with this year's report for a version 2 (keeping current 2017 version as version 1) – aim to have something to present for November's ELAC meeting.
  - viii. Add comment to recommendations of "additional funding would help to reduce unmet need".
  - ix. Do we show OMW breakout/breakdown somewhere (else)? Confirm funding breakouts with data workgroup.
- c. Survey document – Plan to share with IPA members. There would be no recommendations, but it would discuss what is happening across the state (because each community is different).
- i. Work with Marissa and Maureen on final version – maybe add IPA's logo and IAUWs?
  - ii. Talk with Marissa and Maureen on what do they want to do with this now and how to share it.

### Action Items

---

1. Follow up with Marissa about survey document.
2. Workgroup to review and approve funding tables before next meeting.

### Next Meeting

---

Thursday, November 8, 2018 | Early Learning Indiana | 10:00 am – 12:00 pm ET