



Present:

Tonia Carriger, Betsy Delgado, Mary Gardner, Dr. Nancy Holsapple, Nicole Norvell, Kerri Wortinger

1. Call to Order

- Betsy Delgado, Chairwoman, called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm.

2. Approve January Meeting Minutes

- Motion to approve: Nancy
- Seconded: Mary
- Vote: Unanimous ayes

3. 2019 ELAC Annual Report

- The 2019 Annual Report has been submitted to the Legislative Committee. Once it is accepted, the state will post it to its website.
- Once it is published on the state website, ELAC will post and disseminate per the communications plan.

4. Presentation on Indiana Help Me Grow

- *Shannon Garrity, Children's Program Director, Indiana State Department of Health*
 - Provided a presentation on Help Me Grow and the status of its implementation in Indiana
 - The vision of Help Me Grow (HMG) Indiana includes:
 - Assisting families, physicians, and other community-based providers in identifying developmental or behavioral concerns in children;
 - Statewide resource directory with a feedback loop to identify gaps and services;
 - MOMS Helpline is the centralized call center to connect families with specialized programs and services focused on their needs.
 - HMG was brought to Indiana because, as a state, the average age of diagnosed developmental disability in children is currently after the age of three. Furthermore, there was not a good way in our state to track referrals and if referred services are effective for families.
 - HMG is a systemic model that leverages existing resources in order to develop and enhance a comprehensive approach to early childhood system building in any given community.
 - In 2012-2013, ELAC and the Child Development and Well-Being workgroup began to research HMG.



- Indiana leveraged two funding streams to bring HMG to the state: Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (ECCS) and MIECHV Innovation.
- Indiana pushed faster implementation than the typical HMG implementation schedule, by utilizing ELAC workgroups and other active groups they could tap into.
 - The ELAC Child Development Well-Being workgroup serves as their leadership team and the ELAC Data Coordination and System Integration workgroup serves as their data group. ELAC workgroups have been instrumental in helping with oversight and implementation.
 - HMG Indiana took their first call in October 2018.
- HMG Indiana had their first National site visit in January 2018 and their second site visit in February 2019.
- HMG Indiana has 2 care coordinators/navigators that conduct screenings.
- HMG is piloting in 9 counties: Lake, LaPorte, St. Joseph, Elkhart, Grant, Madison, Delaware, Marion and Scott.
 - Indiana is a single-entry point
 - Even though they have a single-entry point, each county does look/operate a little differently. For example Marion County has WIC clinics that are doing screenings. This is a good example of meeting families where they are, reducing stigma, and using non-traditional partners.
- Indiana was the first HMG affiliate to engage evaluators to assess implementation of HMG.
- Implementation study strengths include:
 - Strong partnership between the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH) and the Department of Child Services (DCS);
 - Blended funding to support implementation;
 - Organizing entity transparency with workgroups;
 - Partnership with 211 and MOMs Helpline;
 - HMG Indiana staff;
 - HMG affiliate network;
 - HMG forum;
 - Shared statewide vision;
 - Existing partnerships and systems.
- Implementation study challenges include:
 - Conflicting project timelines;
 - Staff turnover;
 - Difficulty recruiting workgroup members;
 - Abstract nature of HMG development;



- Partners' understanding of HMG;
- Workgroup meeting attendance;
- ELAC leadership transitions.
- Indiana was chosen to host the HMG National Forum on May 11-13, 2020. The Forum will be held at the downtown Marriott location next to convention center.
 - HMG Indiana will be leaning on and leveraging partnerships and relationships to help with planning, etc.
 - They are the youngest affiliate to be hosting.

Question from Nancy: How did you pick your pilot counties?

Response from Shannon: They were chosen based on the MIECHV needs assessment from 2010. We are also preparing other counties for eventual expansion statewide.

Question from Betsy: How long is your pilot? When will the data be released?

Response from Shannon: We have been taking calls for 7 months. When we presented at the National Forum last week, our evaluator said that they may have findings by the end of the summer that can be made public.

Question from Betsy: What is the oldest state affiliate? Can we get some of their data?

Response from Shannon: Connecticut was the first state and is the national location. California is the next oldest, but only certain counties have implemented. We can work on getting some data. Indiana is a member of a community of practice on framing messaging. Workgroups will likely help with this once they reconvene.

Question from public, John Peirce: Is the National Forum of any value to counties other than the 9 pilot counties and will they be invited?

Response from Shannon: Yes. While the forum is focused on HMG, it's really about a comprehensive early childhood system. It will be open to the public for a fee to attend. Affiliates will put on the breakout sessions and we will bring in additional speakers. HMG Indiana can influence who we bring in for keynote speakers, etc.

Question from John: Is there a role going forward for the Data workgroup or Child Development and Well-being workgroups who were helping with Help Me Grow?

Response from Shannon: Yes, we definitely have some asks. We want these groups to continue to play a role.

Question from Betsy: What are next steps?

Response from Shannon: We'll start Forum planning in June. We have some data to share with the workgroups when they reconvene.



Question from Betsy: Do you feel comfortable moving forward with the Data Workgroup and CDWB Workgroup?

Response from Shannon: Yes, very much so.

Response from Betsy: So we'll look forward to hearing more from you. We'll move forward with the Data Workgroup and CDWB Workgroup.

5. Family Engagement Workgroup

- *Presentation and Recommendations on CCDF Enrollment, Co-Chair John Peirce*
- John provided a history of the project: Appointed ELAC member, Nicole Norvell, asked the workgroup to help assess the family-friendliness of the Office of Early Childhood and Out of School Learning's current CCDF policies. She suggested that the Family Engagement workgroup might act as an external reviewer to help with this process. The workgroup was asked to help investigate why some families start but do not successfully complete the application/enrollment process for CCDF.
- The group approached this issue by exploring "behavioral economics" and "psychology of scarcity".
- The workgroup made recommendations related to:
 - Changes to the intake agencies' cover letters and the enrollment process to make these documents more family friendly;
 - Exploring possible partnerships and collaborations that could potentially help increase the throughput rate;
 - Procedural changes to improve the enrollment process;
 - Additional information gathering activities.
- Brookings has researched effectiveness of text messaging in New Orleans and found significant improvement in completion of eligibility forms.

Question from Betsy: I need some clarity on the purpose of this project/issue. Is it that 50% aren't receiving the voucher?

Response from John: They're dropping out at various points during the process of application or waitlist period.

Response from Nicole: There are several points at which they might fall off. Some move away, some don't come to the appointment, some forget to bring certain documents. There's not really one point we lose people more than another. We did some additional research ourselves and worked with Division of Family Resources (DFR). They have been able to do both virtual and in person appointments. They're still losing about the same amount of people at different points. Our last enrollment was cycle was better after we made some procedural changes. Our successful completion rate improved from 50% to 61%.



Question from Betsy: So you have started to make some of the recommendations?

Response from Nicole: Yes. We are working with DFR and we've been able to allow our agents access to DFR's eligibility documentation system. We are working to build interfaces with other state systems to reduce duplication of what we're asking families for. This also feeds into the work with our Preschool Development Grant (PDG). We did some texting last year with On My Way (OMW) Pre-K. It was mainly Pre-K managers reaching out directly, not a robo-text system. We are working with a company on mass texting and seeing some interesting results. We'll be able to compare texting one-on-one versus robo-texting effectiveness. Some of the PDG funding is set aside for a texting application that could be used across multiple state agencies. We have done a demo with a particular vendor.

Response from John: Tulane has some good research that found texting back and forth with families uncovered additional barriers.

Question from Betsy: Is there a way to capture what you're seeing from texting and some of these other experiments? As you implement the workgroup's recommendations, how do we measure the change?

Response from John: We didn't have any specific recommendations on that.

Response from Nicole: We want to be cautious about how many changes we make at once so we know which change made the difference. So, we'll roll out a few changes at a time before each enrollment period. Some of the group's recommendations on language were really good for us and they were changes we could make pretty quickly and see what happens. It'll be good to measure that and then dive deeper once we see the results. Intake agents are great at providing feedback on what they're seeing.

Question from Betsy: I wonder if it would be worth some people trying to go through the process and seeing where they get hung up?

Response from Nicole: There are some system challenges if we tried to do that. We had originally talked to the workgroup members about that possibility but their lens and knowledge would be very different than our typical target family.

Response from John: That's why we thought about tapping partners other frontline partners. They could possibly connect us to clients who have not successfully managed the system.

Question from Nicole: Would there be a way for us to do a match with DFR with non-active families? I can check with them.

Response from Kerri: We, and other programs, could sit down with our families as they go through the process, and get real-time feedback on barriers.

Response from Nicole: We expect that one of the barriers is that they must do an in-person appointment. That'll change in 2020 when they are given a virtual appointment option. We are creating a unified CCDF and OMW Pre-K online application. We will use the recommendations from this project as we create the online application.



Question from Nancy: How do families learn about CCDF?

Response from Nicole: Families receive information about CCDF from other agencies (Medicaid, TANF, SNAP, etc.). We haven't done much widespread marketing, because we always have a waitlist and don't have enough spots for everyone.

Response from Nancy: The Department of Child Services (DCS) and Healthy Families Indiana could share this information.

Response from Nicole: Yes, we have a close partnership with DCS.

Question from Nancy: When you have vouchers available, how are they released? At the county or state level?

Response from Nicole: The funding is a block grant. We do slots by county but try not to let largest counties take the most.

Request from Betsy: John, please share the Tulane and Brookings research you discussed. Get it to Amanda to share with the Committee.

Response from Betsy: The Committee will revisit this topic in about 6 months to discuss any progress.

6. Funding Streams Workgroup

- *Funding Analysis, presentation from workgroup member, Terry Green,*
 - The original purpose of this workgroup was to get a handle on who is funding young children in Indiana. There are still some numbers we can't quite get a handle on yet, but we're working on that.
 - Presented funding analysis document, narrowed to birth-five. This document provides a brief and general overview of federal and state funding sources available for early childhood education in Indiana including an overview of the program, a description of its flow of funds, total amount of program funding provided to Indiana, total number of children served with those funds, and a separate table with funding source eligibility information.
 - The workgroup is interested in expanding their work to look into additional funding sources such as businesses.
 - This is the beginning of the work, which continues with the next presentation on blending and braiding the funds.

Question from Betsy: How do these funding sources compare to other states?

Response from Terry: We haven't fleshed that out, but we certainly could.



Question from Dianna: Were the numbers presented from state agencies' budgets?

Response from Terry: The data was from a few different sources, as indicated in the document.

Comment from Kerri: It would be interesting to look at other states and their supplemental funding streams. I would be curious to see more about community foundation funding.

Response from Terry: Those are things we've talked about, but it is difficult to capture. We've also talked about comparing preschool versus infant/toddler.

Response from Betsy: Disaggregated funding by age would be interesting.

- *Blending and Braiding Funding Project Presentation, Amanda Lopez and Lisa Kipker*
 - The workgroup took on a project to look at the needs of providers especially around business management practices including blending and braiding of funding streams. They wanted to identify what supports were needed to help programs better leverage multiple funding streams.
 - Early Learning Indiana received some funding from Lilly Endowment to support this project by contracting with Transform Consulting Group. The workgroup served as an advisor.
 - The project consisted of coaching, system building, and policy analysis/recommendations.
 - 10 diverse programs were coached.
 - All programs were PTQ 3 or 4.
 - Programs represented a number of OMW counties.
 - All programs were certified to accept CCDF, which allowed the opportunity to blend and braid funding.
 - Different program types were represented (home, center, ministry, etc.).
 - For many programs, this was the first time they explored philanthropic funding.
 - Programs were able to implement data tracking systems and market to increase enrollment.
 - Common challenges faced by programs included:
 - Business infrastructure;
 - Communication and marketing;
 - Data tracking systems;
 - Dedicated staff and time;
 - Fundraising.
 - Coaching occurred for 9-10 months with at least monthly visits.
 - Project successes:



- Increased knowledge and confidence - 38% of organizations felt confident and as though they were doing well at the beginning. That number increased to 79% by the end of coaching.
- Through the work, business development tools were brought forth and others were created. Tools were created to meet the needs of different skill levels.
- Tool categories include: Understanding your program's finances, increasing and diversifying your funds, and marketing your program.
- The group created several business management support tools that could be shared with programs statewide and embedded within the current training and technical assistance supports.
- The committee was provided 10 systems recommendations and policy implications.

Question from Nicole: Can you speak more about the recommendation of restructuring funding for CCDF and OMW Pre-K?

Response from Amanda: It was related to how reimbursement is issued. We recommend changing from attendance-based reimbursement to enrollment-based reimbursement.

Response from Nicole: There would be some barriers to this, especially with federal regulations.

Response from Amanda: We researched the federal regulations to confirm that this was possible and agree that there would need to be some additional provisions in place. Programs sometimes have trouble tracking down families who have not "swiped" in to account for attendance.

Response from Nicole: I just encourage everyone to remember that this is a block grant. We have to make policy decisions considering whether we want to serve as many children as we can or a smaller amount (looking at attendance based versus enrollment based). It's something to consider when we're thinking about making these changes.

Response from Amanda: There was also a concern about the On My Way Pre-K parent copay being waved during the school year, but not during the summer and that was affecting children continuing to participate in the On My Way Pre-K program.

Response from Nicole: An OMW Pre-K child can get funding through the summer. However, programs are allowed to charge families overage. Copay should not change during their eligibility period. So that shouldn't be happening. Overages are different and can change at any time.

Question from Betsy: So, some children are being supported by more than one program/funding source. I'm wondering if we have redundancies in what we are asking families to do with the swiping and attendance. This mirrors what we were talking about earlier with CCDF and DFR.



Response from Terry: This is a huge issue when providing transportation. We have to track families down to approve/swipe.

Response from Kerri: I would say that there are things we could brainstorm, but each center is going to be different with what works. Some centers can do swiping while others can't.

Response from Terry: For us, staffing is an issue too in terms of swiping and attendance.

Response from Lisa: We have one staff person that is responsible for ensuring that all families are swiping when they enter and check their child in. It's a big staff commitment.

Comment from Betsy: I'm getting a little anxiety with what we're asking of our families. Nicole, could you get on a call with this group to go through the policy recommendations and see what would happen if we did or didn't follow them?

Response from Nicole: Yes

Response from Amanda: We didn't go through the tools. That is something we could go through on that call too.

Question from Betsy: So are those tools something we can share? Are they available?

Response from Amanda: Yes, that was the intent. We can discuss how we might be able to share them within the system.

7. 2019 Legislative Update that Impacted OECOSL, Nicole Norvell

- Pre-K Legislation
 - Nicole provided a handout to Committee about the timeline for implementation of the new OMW Pre-K changes:
 - It is a little complex, because it has multiple start dates.
 - The application has changed online, so families can apply in any county.
 - Information was sent out to providers that are PTQ Level 3 or 4 to let them know how they can apply to be an On My Way Pre-K provider.
 - Extended eligibility enrollment doesn't go into effect until next year, because we need to make systems changes including payment systems because they'll be completely state funded.
 - In July 2019, numbers of enrollment will be posted by county, region, etc. That data will update every month until we stop enrolling, and then it'll change the next school year.
 - We just released another set of capacity building grants for counties that have not received capacity building grants and need to increase the number of eligible programs.

8. PDG Birth – 5 Federal Grant Update, Nicole Norvell

- Nicole shared a handout with the Committee about the strategic planning process .
- All contracts have been executed.



- Purdue University is doing the needs assessment.
- They have a vendor to facilitate the creation of a strategic plan.
- Most of the strategic plan topic areas come out of required areas from the grant.
- Needs assessment and strategic plan are being done in parallel due to the timeline. They will need to be complete before many of the other grant activities can be done.
- Purdue will be providing interim deliverables, so workgroups can get data.
- They only have 12 months to do all of these plus additional activities beyond the assessment and plan.
- A portion of the June ELAC meeting will function as a stakeholder feedback session and to reflect further on what is going on with the grant.
- A lot of great projects are going on beyond the strategic plan that will be really helpful.
- The state is working with several partners like First Steps, ISDH, and IAEYC.
- The funding is touching 15-20 entities. It is exciting to reflect on the whole birth to five system to do some things better.

9. 2020 ELAC Annual Report Planning, Charlie Geier

- The Data Workgroup has been instrumental in pulling together data, providing visualizations, and gathering feedback for the annual needs assessment.
- We're about a month or two behind where we are typically, but we're not so far behind that we'd say we're nervous. We just need to get on it.
- Next steps:
 - Feedback from the Committee to inform what data we want to focus on with this needs assessment.
 - In previous years, the workgroup released a survey to workgroups and the Committee for feedback.
 - Then data requests can go to partners for the data.

Comment from Kerri: I think it would be good to send that survey out to the workgroups again, and perhaps dedicate part of the June meeting to getting our feedback.

Question from Betsy: Can we send the survey out before the meeting, or do you need to get our feedback first?

Response from Charlie: I think we can go ahead and send out what we had last year with a few tweaks. Then we can review the responses at the June meeting.

Question from Betsy: How do we connect to the PDG work Nicole's already doing with that needs assessment so it's not redundant?



Response from Charlie: This is a unique year with a lot of data being collected by different groups. Part of our work is identifying themes or trends that we want to focus on. I want to be conscious of those things too.

Question from Betsy: How much time do you need during the next meeting?

Response from Charlie: 30 minutes will be enough.

Question from Betsy: How are we working with Management Performance Hub (MPH)?

Response from Charlie: I think MPH is a great partner, but we haven't been able to engage them much so far. It's always good to at least reach out, but we've had limited success.

10.2019 ELAC Schedule, Betsy Delgado

- Next meeting is scheduled for June 13th at 10:00 am at Goodwill.
- August meeting will be held in South Bend (exact location and date TBD).
- Tentative meeting in Evansville later in the Fall (date is TBD).
- The Committee is hoping to be able to livestream for future meetings and will work on that.
- I want the appointed Committee to have. Planning retreat for us. The United Way of Central Indiana is doing a two generation summit in Indianapolis on June 11th. This may be an opportunity to perhaps hold a Committee retreat that week. Amanda will reach out to the members for their availability. If that doesn't work, we will look at other dates.

11. Public Comment

Question from John Peirce: Are there any updates on the CCR&R or kindergarten readiness assessment contracts?

Response from Nicole: The CCR&R awards were posted this morning.

Response from Nancy: The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has selected a kindergarten readiness assessment vendor, but the contract has not yet been executed.

12. New Member

- Tonia Carriger will be taking over the appointment for Lacey Kottkamp as the new Indiana Head Start State Collaboration Office Director.

13. Betsy called to adjourn meeting at 4:10pm.

14. Next Meeting: June 13, 2019 at 10:00am at Goodwill of Central and Southern Indiana.