Early Learning Hub of Linn, Benton & Lincoln Counties
Data & Evaluation Work Group Meeting Minutes

MEETING COMMENCED	9:30pm, March 9, 2016 Old Mill Center, Corvallis
MEETING CALLED BY	Lynn Hall
WORK GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT	Jerri Wolfe, Tami Tracer, Cindy Bond, Anna Menon, Rich Waller
VERSION	Final
RECORDED?	No

Agenda topics

DISCUSSION ITEM	Kindergarten Assessment Data

Presenting KA data to the Governing Board: Jerri went to a Governing Board meeting and proposed -

1. Alphabetical Order

2. Last 3 years, all measures

3. Indicate scores, lowest 10% in each category

This is what the Governing Board approved:

1. List by county, district, school

2. Last 3 years, all measures

3. Indicate scores, lowest 10% in each category

Indicate highest 10% in each category

Include "n"

The Governing Board asked us to also highlight schools with scores in the highest 10%.

The Governing Board wanted to see the "n" numbers, because in our region, some "n's" may be small, particularly in rural areas.

We are also reviewed the recently available 2015 - 2016 KA data comparing the EL Hub region with the state. We are specifically interested in the "Approaches to Learning" categories. Considering the past three years of data, EL Hub averages for Approaches to Learning hasn't varied much, and we align with the state average.

When we look at the "Math" categories, we see exactly the same outcomes: numbers haven't changed much, and we are right at the state average.

However, in the "Literacy" category (letter sounds), the EL Hub is lower than the state in all three years, but like the state our scores are increasing. In the English Letter Names portion of the Literacy category, we don't see much change, and we are close to or above the state average.

We know that in previous years, the focus in preschool has been on "Approaches to Learning", and not so much on the letters and numbers. Now, the state is emphasizing the importance of all three categories, and we see that our approach has failed to bring us up to the state average for literacy at Kindergarten. It will be important to look at 3rd Grade Reading scores to see if there is improvement at that point.

We also found that economically disadvantaged, limited English proficiency, males, special education, Hispanic, and Native American kids scored lower than the EL Hub average, but the details are somewhat disguised by the way that the data is being presented. We would like to review this with the Governing Board and make them aware of what we are seeing.

The state is looking for a targeted strategy rather than a universal strategy, and they want the Hubs to approach the problem with that thinking. They believe that by working with the underachieving populations, we will be helping the entire population.

We had proposed sorting the data alphabetically because we were trying to get away from county divisions and the historic problems that come with it. We wanted to put the funding where it was needed without any biases. The Governing Board has a different perspective.

DISCUSSION ITEM	Young Children in Need

Our Hub had the opportunity to apply for Preschool Promise (PP) funds, and the state put together a data book to use for writing the proposal. The PP data book ranks Hubs according to needs and preschool capacity. We opted out of applying for the PP funds, but we are looking at the methodology used for the data book.

The data book indicates no sources, and we expressed our disapproval to the state. Sources are necessary to understand the data.

The Governing Board needs to see several layers of data: KA scores, Reduced and Free Lunch scores, 3rd Grade reading scores, CCO numbers, DHS "Hot Spots", etc.

What are the data points that the state is using? Tom George, ELD Research Analyst, answered our questions and will, hopefully, be joining us for some meetings. He puts together the data, but has no context for how it is used. The EL Division has only one research analyst, so he is frequently working under great time constraints. He would like to join our committee and, hopefully, we can help him get some context for the data.

Do we have the opportunity to pick which data points are going to be part of our scoring process? Some of our rural population's data are being completely "blanked" out by larger populations in other areas of the county. How do we report our disputes with their data back to the state? Through our Hub Coordinator and through our state liaison, Tab Dansby.

Some of the other hubs are using the PP data book methodology to help them drill down to determine exactly which schools to fund. They hired researchers to analyze their local data.

The Hub did not apply for the Preschool Promise funds because we didn't have schools that were "ready" to participate in this funding. There is a process to get ready for this particular type of funding, and our schools are not there yet. We are currently working with our schools so we are ready to apply for the next round of funding. Additionally, at the time the PP data was gathered, we didn't have enough licensed, star-rated child care providers in our region to qualify.

We are working with our providers to increase the number with a star rating.

DISCUSSION ITEM	Epidemiologist Intern

Anna Menon is our new Epidemiologist Intern that we are sharing with the Benton County Health Department.

Anna considers herself a social epidemiologist, and wants to learn about working with data in a community.

She will be located at Linn-Benton Community College, and Peter Banwarth will be her Preceptor.

She'll be working about 8 hours a week during the school year, and about 12 hours a week during the summer.

Anna will be compiling data for us, reviewing numbers, and working specifically with this committee.

DISCUSSION ITEM	EL Hub Website

Review of the website, including where the D&E Committee information is stored, where the partner resource data is being kept, and what the "Our Region" section represents.

What would you like to see included in this Our Region section?

- PowToon "videos" showing what the data indicates, and what we did to combat the problem.

-	Infographic .pdf forms that the community can download and view.
-	Download data files from other sources, so our partners can view it all in one place.
-	Create an archive for past data, so we don't drown in too much data.
-	An "executive summary" of the data, with the actual data and resources behind it.
-	Add past data that our partners have created for meetings that we could make available for our partners.
-	Create an "index" to the data, so that partners could hunt for specific data instead of trying to guess what source the data might be in.
-	Focus on the data that is important for our Hub, and make that front and center.
-	Link to the Regional Health Assessment

NEXT MEETING	TBD
Two potential next meetings: April (KA data review for the subgroups) and asking Peter's group to come and review the Regional Health Assessment, and/or May (new quarterly report of Hub data to review), with lots of DHS data and child care quality data. We will look for the anomalies to see what the Hub needs to be focusing on.	
Do we need to report to the Governing Board at any point? After our April meeting, we will have updated KA charts and 3rd Grade Reading and USDA Free & Reduced Lunch data for the GB.	
A standing meeting appears to be the most practical with a calendar reminder. In the past, we did not shift our meetings between counties. For now, we will move between Lincoln and Benton counties with two meetings in Benton county, and then one in Lincoln county.. LeAnne will send a Doodle poll to the people that absolutely need to be here, like our DHS rep, and try to set-up a standing meeting. The best days for the people present are the first Monday of each month in the morning. Our next 2 meetings will be: April 4th in Benton County and May 2nd in Lincoln County from 9:30 to ll:30am.	
MEETING ADJOURNED	11:25am