



Attendees

Charlie Geier, Eric McKeown, Brandon Myers, Ann Puckett-Harpold, Kerri Wortinger, Amanda Lopez, Sara Gropp, Melissa Wall

Guests: Curt Merlau, Megan Purcell, Sara Schmitt

Key Topics Discussed

A. Updates

1. We are currently the only workgroup tasked to meet. There's lots of great work going on with the Professional Development Grant (PDG) Birth through Five (B-5), and we don't want to duplicate efforts.

B. ELAC Annual Report

1. ELAC Update
 - a. Timeline: We have a little more time this year since ELAC decided not to try to get the annual report released before the legislative session begins in January.
2. PDG Report
Sara Schmitt and Megan Purcell, Purdue University
 - a. Task: Conduct statewide birth through age 5 needs assessment of availability and quality as well as programs that serve vulnerable populations
 - i. State (group that created proposal) identified 14 vulnerable populations
 1. Feds offered some guidance with 6 characteristics for each
 - b. Domains
 - i. ACF created guidance document on how to tackle the assessment
 - ii. 10 required domains to report on
 1. Including definition of terms, focal populations, gaps in data, etc.
 - a. Wanted the unduplicated number of children being served/awaiting services – have not been able to attain
 2. Focal populations section of assessment is not done yet because they're still getting access to the data.
 3. Measurable indicators of progress – Work of Michael Conn-Powers and his group
 4. Transition support – was included for both transition to Kindergarten and in/out of other services
 5. System integration and interagency collaboration – comes more with the KSMC work
 - c. Process
 - i. Identify potential sources of data



- ii. Sent data requests including to Early Child Care and Education (ECCE) coalitions
 - 1. Tried to get county level data when possible
- iii. Interim reports
 - 1. Availability and participation in child care
 - 2. Gaps in data and research related to availability and participation
 - 3. Transitions supports and gaps
 - 4. Participation in ECCE system for vulnerable populations
 - 5. Availability of high quality (HQ) ECCE programs
- iv. Final report includes all 10 domains required from grant
- v. Amanda: How did you reach out to coalitions, and what did you ask about?
 - 1. Asked about Kindergarten transition and what's being done in their communities, include those examples included in the report
- d. Data Sources
 - i. FSSA Office of Early Childhood and Out-of-School Learning (OECOSL), Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), Early Learning Indiana (ELI), First Steps, Head Start, Nurse Family Partnership (NFP), Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH), and some from Department of Child Services (DCS) including Healthy Families
- e. Things to keep in mind:
 - i. Limitations of all of the data sets.
 - ii. Comprehensive data on vulnerable populations not collected from all families in the ECCE system in systematic fashion.
 - iii. No consistent or comprehensive reporting system across agencies.
 - iv. There are no unique identifiers assigned to children entering the ECCE system so no way to determine unduplicated number of children served.
- f. Items in Needs Assessment that align with ELAC Annual Report
 - i. Young children and families
 - ii. Accessibility
 - iii. High quality
 - iv. Systems building
- g. PDG report from Purdue is not accessible to all audiences.
 - i. Charlie: That's the pitch to ELAC is that we can take the PDG report and make it accessible.
- h. Young Children and Families
 - i. This all looks the same to the 2019 ELAC Annual Report.
- i. Accessibility
 - i. Data used:
 - 1. Primary data set for general population is from ELI



2. Primary datasets for vulnerable populations: OECOSL, Head Start
3. Felt it was the best dataset to break things down by age and to include unregulated providers
- ii. ELAC will include IDOE data presented separately in the annual report
- iii. Amanda: Are the vulnerable populations just from Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) families?
 1. It includes CCDF and On My Way Pre-K (OMWPK)
 2. Curt: It references those plus TANF, SNAP, and Medicaid
- iv. Brandon: Doesn't quite understand the issue of duplication
 1. Curt: There is an instance between ISTAR-KR and another unique identifier being assigned in Kindergarten
 2. Sara: What I remember is if there's a one-week program then kids are counted. There can also be counting issues with siblings. So we had some questions about reliability and decided not to use it.
 3. Curt: Another challenge is the braiding and layering with funding and which children are being served where and how (especially part-time vs full-time).
 4. A big reason the data is a mess is because of the disparate funding mechanisms.
- v. Brandon: You do have kids in sometimes two or even three funding streams and locations. Then you have Head Starts meeting in schools so they may or may not be reported by the schools (even when we tell them not to). That could be an area of overreporting, but there could also be areas of underreporting.
 1. Amanda: We've also heard there's not a lot of guidance on counting for Pre-K.
 - a. Interesting that IDOE breaks it out into public and private counts for Pre-K.
 - b. Then there are schools that are licensed child care centers that aren't reported by IDOE.
 2. Kerri: We are one of those special cases.
 - a. We have multiple funding streams but we try to assign each kid to one funding stream so we can report by each funding stream.
 - b. Brandon: This should be getting better with the new IT initiative that should be fully up in the next year or two which will have connections to student information systems, EdFi. When that is done, schools will be required to keep this information in these systems.
 - c. Amanda: That will help to standardize the data.
 - d. Brandon: There had been no reason to compel schools to do this until now.



- vi. Broke down the data by type of care (program type) with a different breakdown than ELAC – set from ELI data.
- vii. Has everything broken down by type of care, age, and county
- viii. Accessibility for Vulnerable Populations
 - 1. Map of percentage of infants/toddlers in poverty receiving funded care
 - a. Curt: Interesting to note that there's a correlation with that map and the target counties for infant mortality
 - 2. We tried to create a map of vulnerabilities and resources using the ISDH data to inform that.
- j. High Quality
 - i. Uses same datasets as ELAC
 - ii. Total programs by Paths to QUALITY (PTQ) level
 - iii. Mapped percentage of programs that are HQ
 - iv. Have enrollment data of children in care and HQ care
 - v. Percentage of children in poverty receiving HQ care
 - 1. Issue of provider level versus child level data – see with this map in Newton County that a child is going to a HQ program outside the county
 - 2. Need a unique identifier for provider and child and to link those
 - a. Curt: And add in Workforce data to link all three
 - b. Curt: Found that a majority of children on CCDF are enrolled in programs that are Level 1 or Level 0
- vi. Highlights of Gaps in Data
- vii. Highlights of Findings
 - 1. Recommendations – very similar to what ELAC has been providing
- k. Other charge to this workgroup at the ELAC meeting was to do a crosswalk to review key indicators and decide on those indicators as well as merging of the sources for the next meeting
 - i. Curt: Thinks when the charter comes through, we'll be able to specifically say where did the data come from. For example, students at risk of developmental delay and pulled First Steps data but only for those in Medicaid.
- l. Amanda: Is your work done?
 - i. The new proposal for PDG Phase 2 is due November 15th.
 - ii. Currently just a blank space in the report for vulnerable populations, and it'll need to be put in as soon as we get it.
- m. Charlie: If you were to go back and do it again, is there anything you'd do differently?
 - i. It took a lot longer than we expected.



- ii. The start-up was tough. Trying to figure out where to start. We did a good job of chunking things, but we definitely went in circles on things to get access and start.
 - iii. It would have been helpful to have a meeting or email that went out to all the agencies to explain what was going to be happening.
 - iv. Curt: What would make a difference is a proper data governance model. Because people are protective of data, it's always a challenge to request and receive data.
3. PDG Data Roadmap Workstream: KSMC Solution Primer – Early Look at Roadmap Themes
Curt Merlau, KSM Consulting
- a. Other projects we're working on: IDOE Linked Initiative and EdFi, Ob Navigator project, other items in the PDG such as online application
 - i. We've also worked alongside the Management Performance Hub (MPH) and the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) to work on a connected government and connected society.
 - ii. So our deliverable with OECOSL and PDG focused on systems-level analysis.
 - b. High-level activities
 - i. Discover and understand B-5 programs in select agencies
 - ii. Discover and document data systems powering programs
 - iii. Understand current data sharing relationships and barriers
 - 1. Looked into the data sharing rules expected by each state and federal program
 - iv. Craft recommendations for data sharing across programs
 - 1. Identified state agency level recommendations and shared those with relevant agencies that our findings touched on, besides what you'll see today.
 - a. Charlie: Can you let us know how the state agencies responded to this?
 - i. Curt: Data is seen as proprietary and protective because they don't understand what data lives elsewhere. So they don't see the connections yet. They're focused on what data they need for their work. By starting these conversations and including MPH, we're starting to open eyes to this.
 - ii. Amanda: Did you talk to the IT people or the Program people?
 - 1. Curt: We talked to technical and non-technical people involved (CIOs, program administrators, etc.) and catalogued all of the databases and who is the vendor.
 - c. B-5 Data Roadmap Discovery Approach
 - i. Program Overview



- ii. Operational Systems
 - 1. Charlie: How is this different from what MPH is doing?
 - a. Curt: MPH has select datasets from participating agencies. We went straight to the agencies to see what data they had.
- iii. Data Sharing Links
- iv. Technical Analysis
 - v. Have created a knowledge tool that layers the technical analysis findings and business analysis findings – minimal viable product due at end of November
- d. Executive Overview
 - i. Similar to what Purdue has identified and what you have recommended in the past
 - ii. Primary recommendation: Before integrating data, establish a data governance committee to solve the above problems and facilitate ongoing, system-wide data sharing.
- e. Definition of ECIDS
 - i. Ultimately recommended an Early Childhood Integrated Data System
 - ii. It isn't a case management system, doesn't store personally identifiable information (PII), but what it does is store and maintain reports from across agencies.
 - iii. 22 states have some form of this.
 - 1. Positive side is that funds available through PDG can get us here.
 - iv. Easiest model would be a hybrid data system.
 - v. We did recommend a unique child identifier for any child in a B-5 program.
 - vi. Amanda: Previously there were issues with this because of TANF requirements. Is that still an issue?
 - 1. Curt: Because of lack of data governance, that's definitely an issue. In the majority of the 22 states, they are including their TANF data.
 - vii. Charlie: Do you know of a timeline for how long this would take?
 - 1. Curt: Establishing data governance could take a year to two years. Big questions that are left unknown that the state must answer is who is going to organize the data governance committee, which doesn't typically reside in one agency. Then identify what questions are we going to have answered, etc. There's work that could be done on the technology side, but we have to start with the data governance side.
 - viii. Amanda: When we looked at this before with MPH, there was a delay in being able to access the data. How real-time can this be?
 - 1. Curt: That would depend on what questions they want the ECIDS to answer, and then agencies agree to timelines. Head Start presents a



- different challenge because they report directly to the feds. In some states, the systems work directly with the Head Start grantees.
- ix. Charlie: Other than TANF, were there any hiccups with any other data systems?
 - 1. Curt: We expected to see very antiquated data systems which we did. But the bigger challenge was how Agency General Counsels interpret statutes. Currently they interpret things very conservatively. Feds are wanting more data sharing and collaboration but aren't providing guidance on how.
 - x. Ann: Of all the states you've looked at, who is doing it best?
 - 1. Curt: Pennsylvania or North Carolina in terms of technology and the people.
 - 2. Amanda: North Carolina is featured a lot in education data sharing.
 - f. Looked at cohort states: Minnesota, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Utah, North Carolina
 - i. The Early Childhood Data Collaborative Study is a great report to reference.
 - ii. Georgia's technology is underutilized because they didn't invest on the people side. You have to change people.
 - iii. Utah has a similar story.
 - iv. Pennsylvania has a different program structure.
 - v. There is one state that reports on the classroom rather than the seat which can get around the braiding of funding challenges.
 - vi. Charlie: Interesting that these are all conservative states.
 - vii. States generally have the least data sharing linkages established with health data because of HIPAA.
 - g. Use Case: Distinct Child Count
 - i. This would come with an ECIDS.
 - h. Data Recommendations
 - i. Short Term
 - ii. Long Term
 - 1. Would love to see Indiana push it to overlay a CRM system on top of ECIDS to facilitate data requests and referrals. Closest example is DC with homeless people and families.
 - i. Data Governance
 - i. Provided recommended structure
 - 1. Unknown is the convening entity
 - a. Often it is a voluntary body.
 - ii. MPH is pushing agencies to link and share but each state agency is at its own place on data sharing and governance.
 - iii. Provided collaboration and coordination recommendation
 - iv. Amanda: Who sits on those committees? It is public agencies or public private?



1. Curt: What we recommended was a mix where you include coalitions and researchers to inform and advise.
 - a. Amanda: Public agencies, researchers, and some community coalitions
 - b. Curt: Sometimes those community coalitions might not be in the governing committee but a subcommittee or workgroup.
- j. Amanda: Have your recommendations been shared?
 - i. Curt: Our recommendations have been made. It was sent at the end of August and are being built into Phase 2.
- k. Amanda: it seems like this report is still very focused on child care rather than a larger system.
 - i. Sara: That's because we could only report on data we could receive.
 - ii. Amanda: What would be examples of that data?
 1. Sara: Information from DCS in the foster care system, etc, or the homelessness question and the quality of care those children are receiving.
 2. Amanda: Is that written in your report? What questions you wanted to answer?
 - a. Sara: It's not that explicit, but we share multiple times that we ran into issues of data not being there or not connected with other systems.
- l. Curt: The bookends are kind of DOE (school) and ISDH (births) and everything in between is fuzzy.
- m. Curt: We did present all of our findings to all agencies' CEOs and CIOs, and they're all interested in continuing this work.
- n. Amanda: Are there things agencies could be doing as they're rolling out these new data tools (I-SPROUT, kindergarten readiness assessment, etc.)?
 - i. Curt: That's like programmatic level challenges, but in theory, if they take the KRA then that information would be linked into the system. Instead of matching to ILEAD-3 data years later.
- o. Charlie: If you were to go back and do it again, what would you do differently?
 - i. Curt: Probably getting everyone in the room to discuss a vision and an end goal before starting. Maybe start with cohort interviews first to discuss big vision.
 - ii. Charlie: I think we could take that angle for this upcoming report.
 - iii. Curt: Nicole was good at asking what is the value of this recommendation to other agencies. (Value to ISDH to participate, etc.)
 - iv. Curt: Maybe a survey to determine attitudes toward data before starting. If you can't change behavior, then technology change can be all for naught.
- p. Ann: I appreciate the work, but it's so labor intensive for something that doesn't present immediate value.
- q. Amanda: Has the stakeholder group been receptive to your recommendations?



Action Items

1. Send out guests' slides with meeting notes

Next Meeting

November 18, 2019 | 2:00pm – 4:00pm Eastern Time | Indiana Youth Institute