



Attendees

Marissa Manlove, Terry Green, Lisa Kipker, Mandy Zimmerman, Amanda Lopez, Melissa Wall

Guest: *Natalie Brake*

Key Topics Discussed

A. ELAC Updates

- a. Tomorrow (11/9) is the ELAC public meeting. It is open to everyone, and there is a livestream option available. The next annual report will be presented. Different this year is that ELAC is not producing the county profiles, but Early Learning Indiana (ELI) has a data center that is working to produce county profiles.
- b. Multiple workgroups are scheduled to present documents tomorrow including the Funding Streams Workgroup funding table.
- c. At the October ELAC meeting there was discussion about reassessing the goals, structure, and work of ELAC. Marissa is unclear about what the future holds based on what she's heard discussed at the October meeting.
- d. The Early Learning Summit had about 350 attendees with two-thirds being from non-early learning organizations. Sixty counties were represented. Overall, it has been well received. ELI is hosting a webinar on Tuesday (11/13) about how to share the economic report (released at the Summit) with stakeholders or potential partners.
 - i. The documentary "No Small Matter" previewed a clip at the ELAC Summit. It was one of the most requested items after the conference. The full documentary is expected to be released some time in 2019.
- e. The Child Development and Well-Being Workgroup created an early brain development recorded webinar. It is under the resources tab on the ELAC website.

B. National News

- a. Lisa participated in Head Start's first ever grant writing session, and met Dr. Bergeron, the new director of the Office of Head Start.
- b. There is a new Early Head Start national competitive grant funding opportunity which would bring more money to infants and toddlers. It is due December 1st.

C. 2018 Workgroup Priorities

- a. Funding Tables Feedback
 - i. How to clarify first chart on page 2? Scrap it.
 - ii. In the box on page 1, change to "Total Served by Public Funding."
 - iii. Change title of pie chart to "Public Funding Sources."
 - iv. Reach out to UWCI to send out as a resource.



- v. Purpose: This document outlines what there is and what the constraints are. It helps to show where can we improve collaboration and possibly blending and braiding.
- b. Blending and Braiding Presentation to ELAC
 - i. Questions for the presentation to ELAC: How to present it? Who would present it? What is the message to share with ELAC?
 - ii. Marissa: The concept of the blending and braiding project originated from the January 2017 kick-off. Discussed was how to help providers better understand how to blend and braid funding sources. ELI stepped in and provided some funding to expand the project to a coaching project with a pilot group of providers on how to better help them blend and braid funding sources.
 - iii. The need was identified through ELAC, and then it was explored through its partners. It is important to stress how it came about as it is a great example of how ELAC can partner with state partners in an advisory role.
 - iv. It is important to emphasize what the overarching goal was. Knowing that we need more money, we examined exactly where the providers needed more money and connected that to specific goals the providers had.
 - v. The project also examined the fiscal responsibility side of it to make sure people can use the money in the best ways.
 - 1. The project found that there are pieces of policy that make it difficult for providers to use the money well. This point helps to discuss with a conservative mindset.
 - vi. The goal of the project was to provide tools to providers.
 - vii. A surprising takeaway from the project was that even high-quality programs are challenged by financial business practices.
 - 1. Natalie: We equated high-quality program with high-functioning business skills, but that assumption proved not to be true. These things are not working hand in hand.
 - viii. Marissa: Some of my members (of the Indiana Philanthropy Alliance) have been asking questions about Paths to QUALITY (PTQ) requirements such as having a bachelor's degree in early childhood for the director when they may need a business background, different skills.
 - ix. Recommendations from the project:
 - 1. They're not from any particular partner or the Funding Streams workgroup.
 - 2. Next step would be, who do each of these recommendations go to?
 - 3. Where do the tools fit to get to the providers?
 - 4. They're not in order of effort needed or magnitude of potential impact.
 - 5. Recommendations come from the provider perspective and potentially family perspective.



- x. Next steps:
 - 1. TCG will work with ELI and Marissa to finalize the slide deck, share that out, and then decide who's going to take which slides.
 - 2. What handouts or resources would be good to share with ELAC in advance? (report or slide deck, etc.)
 - a. Share report
 - b. Share tools if requested
- xi. Natalie is waiting to decide who needs to look at the remaining tools. She hopes to have all of them reviewed by the December meeting.
- xii. Would it be helpful to have a provider perspective? Lisa's organization participated in the project.
 - 1. Marissa: Would it be good to share what was helpful as a result of this project from the provider perspective?
 - 2. Natalie: It would also be good to share that this (participating) was time consuming, and this is a reason for why these things get dropped. (Time to focus on business items.)
 - 3. Lisa: It would be good to note that they had tried many of these things previously and are still struggling to stay financial stable/in the black/etc.
- xiii. Good for Marissa to mention in meeting tomorrow that we would like to present at the December meeting.
 - 1. Once confirmed, send information to Lisa so she can come.

Action Items

- 1. Funding streams tables will be shared at the November ELAC meeting.
- 2. Finalize slide deck for presentation of the blending and braiding project at the December ELAC meeting.

Next Meeting

TBD