



## Attendees

---

Charlie Geier, Kim Hodge, Curt Merlau, John Peirce, Sara Anderson, Melissa Wall

## Key Topics Discussed

---

### A. ELAC Annual Report

1. ELAC Update
  - a. The ELAC has asked the Data Workgroup to reconvene to begin work on the 2020 Annual Report. We are behind our typical timeline for this process. Particularly interesting this year is the Professional Development Grant Birth to 5 (PDG B-5) work which involves the generation of a strategic plan and needs assessment. So we need to decide what needs to happen this year.
2. PDG B-5 Work and Deliverables
  - a. ELI has provided quite a bit of data to Purdue back in May for the needs assessment.
  - b. Charlie has seen a draft of Purdue's needs assessment, and it is quite large (50-75 pages). Could we take that and create an executive summary and visuals? Then look at what's missing to identify what we need to fill in that was important from previous years.
  - c. Curt is part of one of the stakeholder groups on the PDG B-5 project and has been working with Purdue on that since their deliverable is somewhat related. Purdue report is now at 128 pages and the deadline for that is soon.
    - i. It's not displayed like the ELAC report. There will be another group that will take all the deliverables and put graphic design to that.
3. 2020 ELAC Annual Report
  - a. John – Next session is not a funding session (budget session). So perhaps we focus on 2021 Report being out by November, and this one out a little late. What happens to the recommendations we make? Can we ask for feedback from key audiences like legislative council or Governor's office to know if anyone's paying attention? (Not for this year's report but next year.)
  - b. Kim – Thinking about our data with layering the DOE data that we've used in the past, working with Purdue, they went against the ELAC report because of how the DOE data is layered on top. Perhaps we should do a crosswalk with the Purdue report and the ELAC report to decide where to focus efforts (and talk about where data is and isn't aligned).
  - c. Charlie – Do we have those partners come together with us to talk it through?
    - i. Kim – I think that's a good next step.
    - ii. Charlie: In-person if possible.



- iii. With the time constraints, the former ELAC report can't be reproduced. Maybe we look at the 16 indicators and see if those are covered.
- iv. John – I think all of that sounds good given where we are.
- v. Kim – I know that our data request typically takes 6-8 weeks to fulfill, and we're under resourced.
- vi. Curt – The data roadmap (part of PDG work) is due at the end of August. We're analyzing every database in the B-5 system that they've been given access to. There will be findings there that will help to inform quality of data, etc.
- vii. Charlie – Can your team come in to talk about that at the August meeting?
- viii. Curt – I think we'll at least have some preliminary findings to share at that time.
- d. Charlie – Perhaps we include a report of past recommendations, and flag areas where we struggle to get data.
- e. For the ELAC meeting on August 14<sup>th</sup>, we could have a report on direction and what we think we need to do, approve that, then get feedback. Report to the Committee that we're looking at indicators from the needs assessment as a base, crosswalk what we've done in past to identify gaps, then move forward from there.
  - i. The partner meeting would be after that.
  - ii. John – Need time to produce a sufficient report.
- f. Charlie – Unique year. Doing a longitudinal piece to what's been collected in the past doesn't seem as relevant. Curious if there will need to be additional data requests.
  - i. Kim – Thinks Early Learning Indiana focused on what they typically turn around for ELAC.
  - ii. Curt – Do you know what's been requested from the agencies? Purdue knows what they've request.
    - 1. See what Purdue has requested and crosswalk with what has been done in the past and include in report to Betsy in August. (We'll know X% has already been collected.) – Ask for data list.
    - 2. Call before the 14<sup>th</sup> to look through that.
- g. John – If people are trying to compare with new ELAC data, there will be new pull dates correct?
  - i. Charlie – Yep.
  - ii. Sara – Perhaps we just notate the differences.
- h. Does the PDG needs assessment include county-level data?
  - i. Charlie – Thinks there is some.
  - ii. Curt – You can see some in availability and participation by county. Also, the vulnerable population request will be organized by county.



- i. Charlie – We need this year to have a unified voice. Highlighting the PDG B-5 work is essential. Getting into the data nerd conversations about sources being different can work against us in an advocacy situation.
- j. John – Since there will be a one-year gap in how we've been reporting perhaps we can set up an opportunity this winter to evaluate what we've done in the past. If it's time for change in 2021, do an assessment before getting into the next report cycle.

### Action Items

---

1. Kim will present recommendations to ELAC on August 14<sup>th</sup>.
2. TCG to reach out to Megan Purcell (Purdue) to request data list.
3. TCG will crosswalk Purdue data list with ELAC annual report data list and identify any gaps.
4. Schedule 30-minute phone call before August ELAC meeting to discuss crosswalk findings and narrow down talking points for the ELAC meeting.
5. Invite Purdue team and KSM Consulting to attend August Data Workgroup meeting (preferably in-person at Indiana Youth Institute).

### Next Meeting

---

TBD