



## Attendees

---

Charlie Geier, Brandon Myers, John Peirce, Sara Gropp, Amanda Lopez, Melissa Wall

## Key Topics Discussed

---

### A. Updates

1. Workgroup Updates
  - i. Charlie is joining Shine Early Learning and doing work on the national level (rather than specifically for the Indiana project).
  - ii. Kim has transitioned to Shine Early Learning with the state project, SPARK. She will remain a chair of the Data Workgroup.
2. ELAC Updates
  - i. October's meeting was in Evansville. Beth Barrett gave an update on On My Way Pre-K (OMWPK) enrollment. Regional Advisory Committees have been established.
  - ii. ELAC will begin meeting on a quarterly basis starting after the first of the year.
  - iii. Next ELAC meeting is December 12<sup>th</sup> in Indianapolis.

### B. ELAC Annual Report

1. Key Indicators
  - i. Sara Gropp shared data TCG has along with trends looking at the 16 indicators used in the county profiles.
  - ii. Purdue report didn't include cost data. Charlie said the data book is using data from Child Care Aware of America (CCAoA). It is state-level data only. We could use CCAoA and/or request data from Early Learning Indiana (ELI) like previous years.
    - a. CCAoA breaks it out for infant, centers, and other breakdowns.
  - iii. The child care access row is currently missing data. We would need to get data from Purdue and/or ELI.
    - a. ELI provided it to Purdue so let's go straight to Purdue.
    - b. Possibly have a second row or split boxes to report Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) data.
  - iv. Workforce data is not mentioned in the Purdue report.
    - a. Wait for workforce study to be released by IN AEYC.
      1. The caveat with this study is that it doesn't include IDOE's early learning workforce.
      2. Is there any data to pull from I-LEAD?



- b. State has retooled the TEACH scholarship program so that may no longer be a good proxy for county numbers in educational attainment of workforce.
- c. Separate last box into two with child care versus preschool. Remove the first two boxes and maybe only report in narrative.
- v. Do we want a fourth row to replace kindergarten readiness?
  - a. We could do affordability or high-quality.
    - 1. Enrollment in CCDF, OMWPK, unserved
    - 2. Enrollment in high-quality, number of children in Paths to QUALITY (PTQ)
  - b. John would like to see breakdown between infant and toddler and mentioned a report that said only a small percent of CCDF vouchers are used for infant.
    - 1. Split known and high-quality into separate rows and include breakdown with infant care.
  - c. Indiana Youth Institute will be visualizing the number of CCDF vouchers being used to attend a high-quality program as well as separating out preschool and pre-K enrollment, OMWPK by counties, Head Start and Early Head Start, and First Steps data.
  - d. We could do a row on funding with CCDF, OMWPK, Head Start, and Early Head Start.
    - 1. Funding amount or numbers served?
    - 2. Not sure how the county level would work.
    - 3. Could show number of children participating in a funded program versus number enrolled to show how many are paying for early childhood education.
  - e. Going with funding and those four programs for the fourth row of indicators.
    - 1. Call it "Program Participation" or "Public Program Participation"?
  - f. Where will we get this data?
    - 1. From the individual agencies, not the Purdue report.
    - 2. Is there IDOE data, special education (SPED), or Title?
      - a. Wouldn't have an idea of numbers by funded program
      - b. SPED includes children receiving hours of programming as well as those receiving speech services. About 40% receive speech services only.
      - c. Enrollment in Title would most likely reflect free and reduced lunch numbers. It probably wouldn't be a truly accurate count.
        - i. Title doesn't operate too much on a per-student level like SPED.
      - d. Perhaps show trend data in funding amount going to early education.
- 2. Additional data that we need:
  - i. Funding from FSSA
  - ii. Workforce report data from IN AEYC



3. Structure this year's report so that it is streamlined and more user-friendly than the large Purdue report.
  - i. Executive Summary – include overview of process for this year
  - ii. Children & Families
  - iii. Accessibility
  - iv. Affordability
  - v. Funding
  - vi. Recommendations
    - a. Refer to recommendations of Purdue and KSM
  - vii. Interactive one-pager
    - a. Add overview at beginning
    - b. Then tabs at top of other sections would like to that section where additional county information is available.
    - c. Do we need to include county data?
      1. We believe coalitions and general audiences like the county data.
  - viii. Timeline
    - a. Done by February meeting and then finalize in April for approval which meets the June 30<sup>th</sup> timeline, or it could be finalized in February.

### Action Items

---

1. Request data from FSSA, IN AEYC, and Purdue.
2. Bring workgroup back together in January to review draft.

### Next Meeting

---

February 6, 2020 | 1:00pm – 3:00 pm Eastern Time | SPARK Interim Headquarters