



STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN SECOND MEETING FOR ADVISORY GROUP

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: 05/23/24

Meeting Location: Zoom

Approval: Department of
Developmental Services

(DDS) Staff

Recorded By: WestEd Staff

1. ATTENDANCE

Name	Stakeholder Group Categories	Present/Absent
Ginger Elliott-Teague, PhD Senior Researcher and Technical Assistance Specialist, SRI International	Facilitator Technical assistance provider	Present
Anna Mark, MEd Senior Education Research and Technical Assistance Specialist, SRI International	Facilitator Technical assistance provider	Present
Kathy Hebbeler, PhD Senior Principal Education Researcher, SRI International	Facilitator Technical assistance provider	Present
Leslie Fox Content Area Director, Early Childhood Intervention, Mental Health, and Inclusion WestEd	Technical assistance provider Parent representative	Present
Catarina Fishman, PsyD Psychologist Alta California Regional Center	Developmental-Behavior Pediatrics Regional Center	Present
Denise Godfrey-Pinn, PhD Psychology Consultant/Mental Health Liaison Harbor Regional Center	Regional Center	Present
Donna Perry Assistant Director of Early Start, Intake and Early Childhood Central Valley Regional Center	Regional Center	Present
Guiseppe Ancona Program Manager, Intake and Assessment Inland Regional Center	Regional Center	Present
Guadalupe Magallanes-Angel Associate Director, Early Childhood Education San Gabriel Pomona Regional Center	Regional Center	Present
Laurie Jordan Rainbow Connection Family Resource and Empowerment Center	Family Resource Center	Present

Maria Rivas Client Services Manager Harbor Regional Center	Regional Center	Present
Patty Salcedo Director of the Desired Results Access Project and PEPTI		Present
Susanna Curry Pediatric Behavioral Health Consultant Shasta Community Health Center	Developmental-Behavior Pediatrics	Present
Rafael Hernandez-Perez Case Management Supervisor North Bay Regional Center	Regional Center	Present
Barbara Newman Counselor Central Valley Regional Center	Regional Center	Present

DDS: Nathaniel Taleon, Cathy Schulze, Joni Hasselbring, Ashley Lambert, Hope Beale, Erin Brady, Maricris Acon, Anne DeMedeiros, Marcy Okada, Mayra Ochoa

WestEd: Rebecca Halpern, Angela McGuire

2. MEETING LOCATION

Online, Zoom

3. AGENDA

• Welcome and Introductions

- Nate Taleon introduced the purpose of the advisory groups: to gather feedback on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).
- Cathy Shulze provided housekeeping information for participating via Zoom and after the meeting.
- Ginger defined focus of these group discussions to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the role of the SSIP in early intervention and consider where to target improvement efforts.
- Ginger conducted a roll call via chat.

• Early Start System Theory of Change

- Kathy Hebbeler reviewed what a theory of change entails, starting with defining the desired outcome for children provided services through Early Start and backing out through family, service provider, state agency actions to achieve those outcomes. The theory of change is developed to identify necessary practices and resources to meet Early Start success goals, so that organizations (state agencies) can identify systemic changes needed to support desired outcomes.
- For SSIP revision, first the outcome is chosen as the focus of the change work. Then one or more practices that support that outcome are chosen for implementation. Finally, strategies and program infrastructure changes are identified to improve those practices and ensure the system can support the plan.
- SSIP for a state lays out the plan for
 - Developing system infrastructure
 - Implementing supports for changes in practice
 - Measuring whether the supports are improving practices
 - Identifying if the outcome is improving
- Ginger shared examples of Theory of Change models for two other state SSIPs.
- Ginger acknowledged that data fidelity for Child Outcomes is a challenge in California because there is tremendous variety in the assessments used; no one assessment is required for use throughout the state. For Family Outcomes, response rates can be problematic and responses may be nonrepresentative.

• Assessing Need and Readiness for Outcome Improvement

- Ginger suggested some questions to evaluate the need and readiness for system improvements.

- For “need,” Ginger asked the group to consider these questions: For which outcomes are there data that reveal a need? Would addressing this outcome significantly improve the lives of families and children?
- For “readiness,” Ginger asked the group to consider these questions: Is there a sense of urgency to address the needs revealed in the data? Do state representatives, practitioners, families, and constituents “own” the problem and want a solution? Are staff, offices, and regional centers ready to adopt strategies to improve this outcome?
- **Review of Child Outcomes Data**
 - Ginger reviewed the California data for Child Outcomes
 - There is a 30-percentage point variation across regional centers in California and in each of the three outcome areas. This indicates a problem in assessment and reporting practices across the state.
 - When analyzed by race, American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Black children consistently show the lowest ratings.
 - When analyzed by gender, girls exit at a higher rate than boys.
 - Denise asked, were the results by regional center correlated with the demographic characteristics of the communities within the regional center catchment areas? Ginger responded that they haven’t compiled the data on that yet.
- **Review of Family Outcomes Data**
 - Ginger reviewed the California data for Family Outcomes
 - California ratings are substantially below the national averages for all three Family Outcomes.
 - Response rates vary quite a bit year-to-year. Looking at response rates at the Regional Center level is problematic because of the small number of responses each Regional Center gets (most RCs receive fewer than 40 responses out of hundreds of families).
 - Regional Centers’ ratings averages vary between 90% and 70%.
 - The validity of family surveys vary substantially from year to year.
 - Rafael asked, how does California Department of Education (CDE) disseminate surveys in comparison to surveys sent by DDS? Ginger responded that CDE distributed surveys in person, whereas DDS sends by mail. Moving forward, CDE will use the same distribution method as DDS.
 - Barbara asked, could DDS/CDE consider texting families to complete the survey? Nate responded that DDS is considering many options.
 - Leslie advised that consent from families to disseminate surveys via text must be obtained in advance or it is a federal violation.

- **Constituency Group Feedback**

- Parents and advocates identify improving child outcomes as long-term goals, particularly to support and strengthen families to speak for and help their children.
- State agencies and communities identify an interrelatedness of family and child outcomes and do not want to select a set of outcomes yet. Of 7 members, one preferred family outcomes and one child outcomes.

- **Group Discussion**

- Ginger asked, where should California Early Start focus its improvement efforts?
- Denise asked, if the focus is on family outcomes, which family gets the focus if a child is in out-of-home placement? Ginger answered, whichever family the child is living with and through which they are receiving services. Denise responded that often children move throughout their Early Start services, leading to missing data.
- Susanna suggested the outcomes “Families understand their child’s strengths, abilities, and needs” or “Families help their children develop and learn” because family is key in supporting appropriate skills and behaviors to meet needs.
- Denise mentioned the difficulty in separating child and family outcomes since the child cannot progress and function without the support of the family system.
- Patty agreed with Susanna about the focus on a family outcome because that could drive services more towards a family coaching model as well as more considerations of the data collection methods.
- Leslie asked if any of these outcomes can be aligned to other initiatives DDS is undertaking.
- Giuseppe commented that training service coordinators on social emotional outcomes and family outcomes related to social emotional would be helpful.
- Nate issued a Zoom poll to Advisory Group members to vote on their preferred outcome. Nate shared the results:
 - 46% chose family outcome: Help children develop and learn
 - 24% chose child outcome: Social-emotional skills

4. NEXT STEPS

- Advisory Group discussion in June
- Constituency Group C discussion in June