Indiana Early Learning Advisory Committee

Attendees

Kim Hodge, Lori Frame, Brandon Myers, John Peirce, Ann Puckett-Harpold, Sara Gropp, Melissa Wall

Key Topics Discussed

A. Updates

1. Workgroup Updates
   i. New representatives will be joining us from Indiana Youth Institute (IYI) and Early Learning Indiana (ELI).
2. ELAC Updates
   i. Next ELAC meeting is February 24th in Indianapolis at Goodwill of Central & Southern Indiana.
      a. Data Workgroup will ask for feedback and direction for 2021 Annual Report as well as present status of 2020 Annual Report work.
3. National Updates
   i. None

B. ELAC Annual Report

1. 2020 Report – We've received data from Purdue that they used for the Preschool Development Grant (PDG) report. We've had additional data requests go out to agencies, but they're a little different than previous years. Will provide final report to ELAC at their May meeting for approval.
2. Young Children and Families Section
   i. First section is pretty consistent with past years. We have county-level information for all data points.
   ii. Percent of income is highlighted because the cost data we've used in the past, we do not have in this year's report.
      a. Kim's takeaway is that we use the state level averages in the Cost of Care report. Then use the ELI Data Center to show county level.
      b. Lori feels that her county's data would look a little different which really shows the importance of having county level data.
   iii. This is the fifth ELAC report. Do we want to show any trends?
      a. Kim thinks we should show trend charts.
         1. John agrees.
3. Accessibility and Quality Section
   i. Purdue didn't include data from IDOE as we had in previous years. IDOE data will be reported but separately in this year's report.

www.elacindiana.org

ii. We have county-level information for all data points.
iii. Kim: With IDOE information separated, we may need to provide more context here about changes from previous years' reports.
   a. John: Question on that, which methodology will we take moving forward?
      1. Kim thinks we may want to keep it separate like this year.
      2. John mentions the recommendation for data sharing in the PDG grant application.
      3. Kim mentioned that the state didn't receive additional funding for implementation of those recommendations, however the state is looking to change data systems in 2021 so that might be an opportunity to bring that up.
   b. Ann thinks it is good to keep IDOE separate as more school districts add more preschool centers.
iv. Question on charts – would like to add number with the percentage.
   a. Agreement that sharing both will help with clarity.
v. John: Not sure the last sentence under the table about program overlap will make sense to the reader.
   a. Sara: Do we want to keep that italicized in the actual report?
   b. Kim: I think we need to include some sort of explanation for the two numbers this year. That might include an example of a scenario, so people understand what duplication looks like.
   c. Kim: Purdue had a page of considerations about data. That's something we may look at, the language they used, to align with our explanation.
vi. Trend charts in this section – workgroup wants to keep
   a. Sara: Not sure about trends because we don't have the deduplicated data from ELI this year.
   b. Members are interested in showing the trend of school-based numbers increasing.
vii. Question asked about if birth to age 3 are being served in schools?
   a. Ann P-H says that is starting to happen with examples in Martinsville and Franklin Township.
   b. John says this could be an area of focus for the 2021 annual report. He wonders if teachers are getting pay parity and how this may be impacting other programs. We could look at the implications of this data in future reports.
   c. Sara – When we add the IDOE data, do we discuss the benefits and downsides to that?
      1. Kim: It's definitely an area of interest.
4. Workforce Section
   i. We have all the county-level data for these sections.

    a. John: Does "preschool worker" mean working with three and four-year olds or birth to five?

      1. Sara will confirm with DWD the definition of preschool worker.

5. Affordability Section

    i. Clarify that high quality is part of the total number (20,562).

    ii. John: Do we discuss all of the funding sources that make up the total $17.1 million for On My Way Pre-K (OMWPK)?

      a. Kim: If there's data available, it would be nice to discuss non-governmental funding as well.

    iii. Sara: We also have these funding sources separated by race/ethnicity and single age for Child Care Development Fund (CCDF), OMWPK, Head Start/Early Head Start (HS/EHS).

      a. John likes to have disaggregated numbers.

    iv. Sara: Which indicators do we want to highlight (at the beginning of this report section) if we split them up?

      a. Kim: Funding is new so that might be the one to highlight.

      b. Sara: Seeing these numbers sounds like a lot of money when we know it's not enough.

      c. Lori: Do the OMWPK program and CCDF do as much as Head Start and Early Head Start?

        1. John: Doesn't believe so.

        2. Sara: We can go into more detail about what each of these programs do.

    v. John: Make note that Indy Preschool Scholarship Program (PSP) is being folded into OMWPK moving forward.

      a. Sara will look up effective dates to see when the changes are happening if not already.

6. Data Still Needed

    i. Tuition costs by county from ELI Data Center

      a. Kim: We can request a dataset from the Data Center or refer readers of the report to the dataset. Which option we take depends on what ELI can provide.

    ii. Recommendations

      a. Need to review and summarize Purdue recommendations and then decide whether to provide our own content or additions.

7. Dashboard

    i. Sara believes there are some data missing from what has been included before.

    ii. Kim: It would be helpful to keep the dashboard similar to previous years. If it is totally different, then we may need to rethink some things.

    iii. Ann: The more that we can be consistent instead of switching, would be helpful for the audience we're trying to reach. A one-pager that's clear and grabs attention,

along with an interactive dashboard that stays consistent while improving is most helpful to our cause.

    iv. Kim: Keep us posted on how different the dashboard would look like. We want to remain consistent if at all possible.

        a. Exclude the visuals that will look different based on the data we have. It might scale things down.

        b. Remove those this year, and we'll decide moving forward what to do for future reports.

    v. Sara: Removing certain data might make this look very close to the ELI Data Center.

        a. Kim: I think that's a conversation we continue to have.

    vi. Sara wants the workgroup to think about what they want to share at the county level.

        a. Lori: I know the programs are looking at age by the county level.

        b. Sara: I think the Purdue data does have an age breakout by enrollment.

            1. John agrees that it's valuable.

8. 2021 ELAC Annual Report

    i. This will be discussed at the ELAC meeting on February 24th.

    ii. The workgroup should think about Betsy's feedback on making the report more digestible.

        a. Ann also mentioned a one-pager.

    iii. Thoughts on what to keep and what to change moving forward?

        a. We will continue this discussion at the next month's workgroup meeting.

Action Items

1. Kim will reach out to Lauren at ELI about a dataset from the Data Center for tuition costs by county.
2. Sara will let the group know what the dashboard would look like in its current form with this year's data.
3. Workgroup to send any feedback on report draft to Melissa by February 14th.

Next Meeting

March 17, 2020 | 1:00pm – 3:00 pm Eastern Time | SPARK Interim Headquarters