

NH Interagency Coordinating Council

Minutes

February 6, 2015

Attendance: Charna Aversa, Diane Bolduc, Peg Cantor, Jen Doris, Linda Graham, Sharon Kaiser, Michelle Lewis, Ruth Littlefield, Eileen Mullen, Kerry Wiley, Kati Winder, Doug Osterhause

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:33am by Charna Aversa with Housekeeping and Introductions. The address list was circulated for updates and verification. Minutes from the last meeting were approved and the Nominating Committee reported no new nominations.
2. SPARK - The needs assessment can be accessed on the SPARK website and indicates gaps in service reported. These are screening, affordable child care, full day kindergarten, ability to stay home with sick children, economic stability. These are somewhat varied depending on geography within the state. The final DRAFT on shared competencies in 7 different areas will form the base of shared competencies for professionals working in early childhood. SPARK is working on a professional development system. Eileen reported that she met yesterday with Cliff Davis (Endowment for Health) to discuss the feasibility of one large professional development system encompassing behavioral health, social emotional health, and physical health. Charna indicated that there is concern about the SPARK Needs Assessment Executive Summary as it relates to FCESS. Linda explained that it reports that, while the national estimate of children needing FCESS is 13%, due to state fiscal constraints NH served 4.4% in 2011-2012. The national estimate comes from an Easter Seals study and included those who are environmentally challenged; this is not a group included in NH criteria. Although "at risk" is defined and clarity is provided later (in the full report), this does not happen until page 80. NH does see a gap in the birth to one age group. Additionally, concern was expressed that, while the percentage of children is served is fine, there is concern that the amount of service available to each child is insufficient. Kerry is asking for input on what the ICC believes would be an accurate statement for which we might advocate inclusion in the Executive Summary; in order to do so Michelle suggested we take time to read the actual

Needs Assessment. The group agreed and after statements are received a conference call will be arranged (~2/13/15).

3. Care Management Advisory Group - Linda said that Tom Harrington (consultant) will be reviewing each FCESS program for effective business practices and will then be making recommendations regarding Family Cost Share. Kerry reported that the Managed Care Organizations (MCOs) are being provided with the ICC agendas and will come either when we request or when they see relevance.
4. APR - Kerry reported that the APR does not require a corrective action plan if Transition Plans were done early due to the change in timing between the prior regulations and the new / current regulations. However, they will show in the Annual Report. There is a move to a Grad 360 System for reporting. BDS is waiting for the final report post- OSEP feedback.
5. The Application for Part C funds will not require public hearings this year as there are no proposed changes.
6. Family Outcome Survey data collection - currently there is no information on family income nor is there information about how poverty level families are served. Kerry said that the FOS would be an anonymous way to ask about family size and income level but wondered if there is another way to gather this data. One concern is that the FOS only goes to a sampling of families and, of those, only 48% return the FOS. Discussion ensued as to whether Intake might be an appropriate time to gather this information and / or whether it could be done as part of the IFSP process. The IFSP process would mean that the information would only be gathered on eligible children. Regardless of when it would be done, concern was expressed about the additional work; this would increase the cost of doing business without increasing the resources. Another concern is that asking about income / family size is part of family assessment. However, since services are provided without regard to income it is unclear why this would be needed. Kerry summarized that the consensus is that the FOS is not the appropriate way to gather this information. She said she would bring the matter to the Quarterly meeting. Of FCESS. It was also noted that we need a better understanding of what evaluators do / should do as family assessments.
7. Ruth reported that the Annual Report is available regarding Special Education. Regarding Indicator 6 (where pre-school children are served, where are the children besides those in special education), and how often are they served (daily, 2x/week, etc.). 50.36% of children served receive services in a regular childhood setting. 18% spend none of their time in a regular childhood setting, receiving

services only in a special education classroom. Regarding early childhood transitions, from 7/1/14 to 10/31/14 there were 284 referred from Part C with 96.4% in compliance (i.e. 8 children were not in compliance). Where compliance was not 100% they are working with districts to determine why. There is concern about the upcoming year due to turnover in the SAUs' staff. The SEE Change grant training is progressing. They are working on evidence-based practices and how to increase parental involvement. This connects to the SSIP.

8. Kerry reported on the SSIP (State Systemic Improvement Plan). It ties to Indicator in Part C and to Indicator 17 in Part B. It was difficult to find an area on which to focus. There is a difference in the amount of improvement made by whites and non-whites (grouped together to be able to find a statistical significance) and between genders. The SSIP is due to OSEP in April of 2015. OSEP wants alignment between Parts B and C. The Office of Minority ***** was able to offer ideas and free training. There will be continued participation on workgroups on minority equity. Cultural awareness training will occur (free to key people - ICC and Quarterly meeting participants). Then they will choose trainers who could, in turn, train staff and be part of a "circle of trainers". This would be at no cost. The trainers could also charge to train folks outside of the system. Thus far BDS has been unable to find anyone with whom they could consult regarding the gender piece. Concern was raised within ICC regarding the cost of such training in terms of losing billable hours. Additionally, Ruth asked about reviewing the COSF process; at entry the HELP or IDA is used to inform the COSF but at exit the scoring is informed by ongoing practice. Also there is a need to look at how much change is needed to move the indicator. Kerry said that they are looking for coherent, evidence-based strategies to try; these may be adjusted as we move forward. She also offered the possibility of free training on increasing comfort with asking sensitive questions. It was noted that even free training has costs in terms of lost revenue (lost billable hours); this could be balanced if the training meets relicensure needs of staff. Ruth said that Part B has been given an extension and that they are also looking for strategies.
9. Watch Me Grow - the question was once again raised as to whether ICC could be the advisory group for WMG. There is a Steering Committee that meets quarterly. The Family Resource Centers do outreach to communities to do Ages & Stages and Ages & Stages Social Emotional. The grant for set-up has expired and they are hoping to increase referrals to FCESS. It is unclear how many children have been referred to / eligible for / served by FCESS through this process. The idea would

be for the Advisory Group to meet 2 times per year to promote the principles of WMG. Thoughts expressed were that it seems an insufficient amount of time and that our representation may be too narrow. Should people be interested, there is information on the WMG website that might help inform the question of whether ICC could do justice to this task. Finally, it was pointed out that we had already said no and suggested SPARK as a more appropriate location for this Advisory Group.

10. NEXT STEPS:

- SPARK needs assessment - read, send feedback, attend conference call..
- Further consider if / how to obtain information regarding family income / size.
- Send ideas for SSIP strategies for culture and / or gender.
- Determine how to communicate to SPARK that we consider them the best option for a WMG Advisory Group.

11. Review family assessment process used in FCESS.

12. Meeting was adjourned at 12:31 pm; moved, seconded, and approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Bolduc, M.Ed., LCMHC