



## Attendees

---

Kim Hodge, Son Dao, Sarah Mihich, John Peirce, Sara Gropp, Amanda Lopez, Melissa Wall

## Key Topics Discussed

---

### A. Updates

1. Kim extended an invite to Indiana Association for the Education of Young Children (INAEYC) for someone to join the workgroup or be a guest to discuss the workforce component of early childhood education.
2. Son Dao is a new workgroup member. He is the data specialist for SPARK Learning Lab.
3. John: Is now when National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) typically releases their annual report?
  - i. Kim: Not sure. Charlie is engaged with NIEER, so I will reach out to confirm.

### B. ELAC Annual Report

1. Review draft report
  - i. Introduction and Executive Summary
    - a. The executive summary including the state dashboard will be available as a separate document. The standalone document was a suggestion made by the Committee, and the workgroup chose to recreate this state profile to remain consistent with previous years' reports.
    - b. Before this year the bottom four items on the state profile were on Kindergarten readiness and have been changed to affordability.
    - c. The percentage of income a family pays for child care has moved to the bottom row (historically in the top row). The indicator of percent of single-parent households has been added to the top row.
    - d. This state dashboard is not available at the county level; however the information is available at the county level on the interactive dashboard.
    - e. Sarah: Is it possible to include a disclaimer or note to indicate that some if not all indicators are available in the online dashboard?
      - i. Kim: I think that would be good to be proactive.
    - f. John: Percent of households where all parents work, should we extend that to caregiver?
      - i. Sarah: I'm curious how the Census defines "parent".
      - ii. Sara: Census doesn't actually use the word "parent". It talks about householder.



- iii. John: It might be good to note somewhere that “parent” includes caregivers.
- iv. Kim: Would it be better to change it to “adult”?
- v. Amanda: Keep it as is here, but we can clarify later in the full report.
- g. Amanda: Another change from previous reports is the first indicator in the second row. That’s just showing data from Early Learning Indiana (ELI) without combining with Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).
  - i. Melissa: Add an asterisk to indicate that it can’t be compared to last year because of partial data/difference in data from previous year.
  - ii. Kim: Keep comparison to 2015.
- h. John: Is it important to say why this information is important in this section?
  - i. Amanda: There is room on page 6 to mention the significance of investing early. In the past, similar language was discussed in the “quality” section of the report.
  - ii. Kim: Thinks that is a good place to add it, especially if this is all they see (and don’t read the whole report).
- i. John: Add “Indiana employers” in box with the \$1.8 billion figure.
- j. John: Is the comparison helpful between college and early childhood education? Or would it be more helpful to explain why it costs so much?
  - i. Amanda: I’ve typically presented that data point as when they send their kids to college, they’re at a much higher earning level than at the beginning of their career when they’d send their children to child care.
- ii. Young Children Section
  - a. Sara extended the years for the trend data, often back to 2010.
  - b. Data was added on poverty rate of all children under 18.
    - i. Delete poverty level graphic and leave footnote.
  - c. Data highlights have been added focusing on top 5 counties.
  - d. John: Do we have an estimate on caregivers other than parents?
    - i. Amanda: We’ve reported it in the past. We know it’s been going up, but we also can’t break it out by age group. It’s only available as caregivers with children under 18.
  - e. Sarah: Maybe it would be helpful to indicate in the report that they could find additional information on the dashboard.
    - i. Sara: We have a little more there, but not too much to point to on the dashboard.
- iii. Accessibility & Quality Section
  - a. Originally IDOE’s enrollment was included in key indicator boxes, but an outside reviewer felt that was more confusing. So we have removed it from the highlight boxes, but it is still included in the text.



- b. John: I wonder if it would help to give an example of an instance where a child would be counted more than once.
- c. Amanda: Provided an example of how children might not be counted by FSSA but included by IDOE.
  - i. Add an example at the end of the first paragraph where we talk about lack of unique identifiers, and also include language about how some children aren't counted by FSSA.
  - ii. Sara: Perhaps we pull out specific examples of duplicates and those not counted by FSSA.
- d. ELI uses different labels for program type compared to how we've labels things in the past.
  - i. Amanda: Perhaps we change the label from "preschool" to "exempt". Also in the footnote we don't include FSSA and maybe it should also say that it doesn't include IDOE.
  - ii. Kim: That is true that "preschool program" is not just any school-based program. It's not all exempt programs in that label either but changing to "exempt" would be better.
  - iii. John: Or maybe "other"?
  - iv. Kim: Either way we could clarify further.
  - v. Kim: I'll follow up with ELI to see if they have any thoughts on this.
- e. Need to move map from page 14 as it doesn't align with school-based numbers.
  - i. Amanda: Could put the case study examples here with the extra space.
- f. Keep IDOE information separate on different pages and add subheadings.
  - i. Amanda: Perhaps creating a flow chart of where the data is coming from could also help clarify what's going on.
- g. The data on quality was provided by FSSA because it wasn't included in the Purdue report.
- h. John: Do we want to talk about the reason why we've seen an increase in programs participating (i.e., tiered rate, participation in OMWPK)?
  - i. Workgroup agreed.
- i. John: Thinks we might change the language at the top of page 16 as we're not only talking about classrooms.
  - i. Sara: We talk about all children earlier in the sentence, so we'll rephrase that.
  - j. Kim: I think it would be good to remove the "CCC" on the graphic as it's really just important in the database and probably not to the readers.
- iv. Workforce
  - a. Add dollar sign to chart with income level compared to poverty level.



- b. No feedback for this section.
  - v. Affordability
    - a. We haven't received TANF information. It has been pulled but needs to be reviewed before it is received by the workgroup.
      - i. Kim will follow up per the email Sara received.
      - ii. Because of this, figure 22 can't be updated for the 2020 report.
    - b. Need to confirm whether or not the On My Way Pre-K (OMWPK) dollars include CCDF funding.
    - c. Amanda: We haven't discussed before why TANF funding has decreased.
      - i. Sara: Might need to see if the reporting has changed over time.
    - d. John: Change call out box from "Indiana's funding" to "public funding".
  - vi. Recommendations
    - a. Amanda: Covid-19 is highlighting the need for an integrated database.
      - i. Kim: Could be a great use case of our challenges. This is an opportunity for application highlighting a need.
      - ii. John: Where would be the best place for it?
        - 1. Sarah: Perhaps mentioned in the executive summary and again in the recommendations.
        - 2. Amanda: Possibly expand on it further in the accessibility section as well.
  - vii. Definitions
    - a. We'll need to make sure to adjust these based on our discussions.
  - viii. Communications Plan
    - a. TCG will draft and present a plan at next meeting. Expect it to be similar to previous years while keeping in mind what information people might be looking for given the current health crisis.
2. Review dashboard
- i. Need to spell out what "SDA" is.
    - a. Kim: We've gotten some feedback that it's not always informative to have that information. Certainly adding more information about what it is will help people understand.
  - ii. The workforce page is new this year.
  - iii. Sarah: Where are sources mentioned?
    - a. Sara: They're mentioned in the hover, and there is a source document on the website.
  - iv. John: Do we discuss that this is a projected workforce deficit just based on keeping up with the current number served and not expanding capacity?



- a. Amanda: We discuss this in the report. I'm not sure how to add that to the dashboard.
- v. Next Steps
  - a. The report will be discussed with the Committee at their next meeting on May 27<sup>th</sup>.
    - i. We want to provide the document to ELAC well before that meeting.
  - b. A new draft will be provided to the workgroup by April 17<sup>th</sup>, and the workgroup will provide feedback by April 24<sup>th</sup>. The final version will be submitted to the Committee by May 8<sup>th</sup>.
- 3. 2021 Annual Report Update
  - i. There is a call scheduled with the Committee on Friday to discuss the 2021 ELAC Annual Report priority areas. They decided that this year's timeline will move back to releasing the report this fall in time for the budget session. Because of the shortened timeline, they suggested we hone in on a few key areas. The Committee appreciates recommendations from the workgroup to inform their discussion and decisions.
    - a. Kim: Do we want to provide our notes from the March meeting, or do we need to refine anything before Friday?
    - b. John: I think we should go ahead and have our regular annual report, but maybe we also include the status of early childhood education due to Covid-19?
      - i. Kim: I do feel like there's an opportunity for us to tell that story, but how to put it in our report is a question. Also how to get the data so quickly while the crisis is still currently ongoing?
    - c. Amanda: Looking at the previous meeting's notes, we discussed looking further at the workforce. There's also the Purdue University study wrapping up and whether we want to discuss those findings. We also talked about the Indiana Business Research Center's child care desert data.
    - d. Kim: I think many of those are all still valid. Child Care Aware is doing a lot of great work that we could potentially work with. The meeting on Friday will also show us the Committee's priorities.
    - e. Sarah: Last meeting we also discussed not knowing who our audience is. So that's additional guidance we still need.
    - f. Kim: The timeline is shortened, and we want to get moving on 2021 so let's look at our next meeting for early May to focus on this.



### Action Items

---

1. TCG will create a draft of the communications plan.
2. Kim will ask ELI about definitions of program types.
3. Kim will follow up with FSSA on remaining data requests.
4. Kim to ask Charlie about NIEER report.

### Next Meeting

---

May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020 | 1:00pm – 3:00 pm Eastern Time | Virtual Only