Illinois Early Learning Council
Hard to Reach Subcommittee
Notes

Present: Carie Bires, Tom Layman, Choua Vue, Mike Stripens, Gloria Harris, Tracy Occomy Crowder, Ireta Gasner, Natalie Tucker Phone: Kathy Villano, Cerathel Burnett, TeeNeka Jones, Dawn Thomas, Bernard Cesarone, Donna Emmons

Review work plan

At this time we are working on Goal 3, Objective 1 to develop a conceptual framework that defines hard-to-reach families and identifies demographic data sources consistent with the definition. We are considering that after this objective, we will be using this information to develop a list of program and system approaches, modifications, or models that engage hard-to reach families (obj. 2) and recommending policy and/or funding changes to serve more hard-to-reach families (obj. 3).

Discuss the Updated Tables

Since the last subcommittee meeting, the co-chairs have been in conversation with researchers from IECAM and Chapin Hall to discuss the measurability of each of the categories identified at the last meeting. Based on their feedback, Tom has expanded the table of categories to indicate if each category is measurable at the community and program level as well as if these populations are: 1) at risk, 2) underserved, and/or 3) hard to find/reach/serve. These categories have been sorted based on the frequency of meeting each of these questions and availability of data. The subcommittee discussed each of these categories. The subcommittee agreed on the placement of many of these categories. These notes will highlight areas of discussion based on the updated table (Hard to reach categories, v3.docx emailed 11/13/12 at 4:38).

Children whose families have DCFS involvement, including foster care. In addition, Mike suggested that we look at parents who have aged out of the system. The subcommittee discussed challenges for aged-out adults and their distrust for programs for their children. Mike, Carie, and Ireta will look into this further. The item remains as a hard to reach category.

Children from families in poverty or deep poverty. While the subcommittee noted that these families may not be hidden, they can be hard to reach based on parents' awareness of resources available. The item remains as a hard to reach category.

Parent Education. This item is currently on page 2 (we referred to the items on the back, which are things we may want to look at later, as the 'parking lot'). This item was brought up with the phone calls with IECAM and Chapin Hall as a potential data source to use because of its' high correlation with a parent's awareness of programs or desire for participation—parents may not see value in the education system based on their own

experiences. It was also discussed that this parent piece will become more important with QRIS.

Cultural/linguistic diversity items: Children whose families do not speak English "very well", low incidence languages, children in immigrant families, children in migrant families. The subcommittee discussed some overlap among these 4 groups related to language, specifically cultural and linguistic diversity. It was agreed that these groups can be hard to serve, and some groups will face greater challenges than others (e.g., hesitation to provide SSN from immigrant families).

Children in the care of others items: Children from low-income families in relative or license exempt family child care; children from low-income families being raised by grandparents; children being raised by other relative. In Chicago low-income communities, about ¼ of all 3-5 year olds are in the care of a relative during the day rather than in the classroom. This is probably necessary to meet the work needs of families, but we should encourage the children's enrollment in part-day preschool programs as part of their child care day. We do know who these children are and could provide more communication that they can be in both. Transportation is a barrier in all cases.

Many children are in the care of grandparents or other relatives, for example, because of incarceration, deportation, or other family reasons. Many of these living situations are informal, and may not be reflected in the data. All children in care of others are "parking lot" items for now.

Children living in violent communities. The definition of communities needs work (see topics of discussion below). In addition to considering recommendations for serving children, we need to consider recommendations for how to better support those working within these communities, especially within communities experiencing high violence.

Geographically Isolated. Two types, each with their own barriers: rural isolated and urban isolated (from transportation and resources). In both cases, access to proper transportation is an issue.

Second page items, or the "parking lot"—Are these items properly placed?
- It was noted that migrant families are missing. This population was grouped on page 1 with cultural/linguistic diversity. This may be a separate category as the work moves forward. Bernard is checking what data may be available for this item.
- *Court/Incarcerated.* Remains on pg. 2. Also, noted that a case in which a child's parent is deported may be grouped with this item—care of relative.

A few other topics of discussion:
- We need to recognize that in addition to hard to reach many of these populations are hard to count. For example, we know how many children with disabilities are receiving services, but we can only estimate how many children with a disability there are, based on SSI data. Oftentimes, it is important to have these counts or other data in order to receive funding.
- We will look at these categories in 0-3 and 3-5
- How do we define community? This came up when we discussed community violence and geographically isolated families. Generally, programs define community based on locations that hang together. We will need to work on this definition. From

the data we could use measures such as zip codes or PUMAs (Public Use Microdata Areas—used on the census).

Next Steps
- Update table to include these changes. At the next meeting we will discuss 'why these children are hard to reach, and how do these categories align'. We will then recommend that the Family and Community Engagement Committee approve the list of categories at the next meeting.

Next meeting
- December 6th, 2012 from 9:30 to 11:30;
Thompson Center, Room 15-145 (OMB 15th Floor)
100 W. Randolph
Chicago, IL 60601
- Theresa Hawley will be joining us to discuss 6-8 communities of high need to focus on with Race to the Top.
- We will also aim to get a regular schedule posted so everyone will have more advanced notice of future meetings.

Next meeting of the entire Family and Community Engagement committee: Thursday, January 24, 2013 (Time & Place, TBD)