



STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN
MEETING 2 FOR CONSTITUENCY A
MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: 08/20/24

Meeting Location: Zoom

Approval:

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 Federal technical assistance provider	Present
Anna Mark Researcher, SRI International	Facilitator Federal technical assistance provider	Present
Diana Maffei	Parent representative	Present
Robert Rochin Family Resource Center Network of California	Family Resource Center	Present
Samantha Hebermehl	Parent representative	Present
Yvette Baptiste, Chair of FRCNCA, Executive Director of Eastern Los Angeles Family Resource Center	Family Resource Center	Present

DDS: Cathy Schulze, Jasmine Suo, Joni Hasselbring, Nathaniel Taleon

WestEd: Rebecca Halpern, Ross Adams

2. MEETING LOCATION

Online, Zoom

3. AGENDA

• Welcome and Introductions

- Nate Taleon introduced the purpose of the constituency groups: to gather feedback on the SSIP. Nate provided context on the process and the advisory and constituency groups that are participating.
- Jasmine Suo provided housekeeping information for participating via Zoom and after the meeting.
- Ginger conducted a roll call via chat.
- Ginger defined the purpose of today's meeting: review the tentative SSIP theory of change and to provide input and feedback on proposed plan.

- Ginger reviewed the SSIP public input process with advisory and constituency groups.
- **SSIP in Program Context**
 - Ginger recapped the theory of change model and contextualized the SSIP process within the model.
 - A complete SSIP includes:
 - Choosing an outcome as a focus of work.
 - Implementing and selecting one or more practices that have been shown to improve that outcome.
 - Implementing strategies to support practitioners' ability to use those practices.
 - Ensuring that the program infrastructure can support the plan.
 - Impact has been defined as helping families help their children develop and learn.
- **Defining the Outcome**
 - SSIP will improve how Early Start helps its clients' families help their children develop and learn.
 - Reasoning for this outcome is:
 - A child's outcomes depend on family engagement and participation in the child's development.
 - Providers' practices impact families first, so the measurement is closer to the intervention.
 - Families need support and SSIP focus can draw program and public attention to their needs.
- **The New Plan**
 - The actions must align with the realities of Early Start infrastructure in California, such as resources, organizational capacity, and readiness.
 - SSIP team has developed a preliminary theory of change:
 - Impact: Early Start helps more families help their children develop and learn
 - Practices:
 1. incorporating a family-directed assessment into IFSP process;
 2. standardizing IFSP template;
 3. including family-directed goals and improving monitoring process; and
 4. adopting family coaching as the standard service model for early intervention.
 - Yvette Baptiste asked if all developmental domains are included? Ginger answered yes, probably, but it is yet to be officially determined.
 - Ginger asked group to think about what practices do we and our partners need to implement to make an impact?
 - Yvette asked if we know the percentage of providers using family coaching. Ginger answered that we do not know this. We do not have a good sense of what providers are doing when working with families. The

plan is to pilot a coaching model and collect the needed preliminary data.

- Diana Maffei asked how we will support families that are less able to help their children? Ginger asked Diana to provide some examples or strategies. Diana did not have answers but encouraged the group to be mindful of those families.
- Yvette encouraged group to begin to talk about standardizing practices within the field. Ginger agreed that the form of family coaching and the required components must be defined.
- Nate provided context of family-directed assessments as a federal requirement and standardizing IFSP template through a family-centered practice lens. Ginger elaborated that these practices set the stage for implementing family coaching.
- Diana asked what the family assessment might look like. Ginger explained there are different models implemented in other states like New York. This is one of the elements that would need to be developed to meet California's needs. Nate continued that family-directed assessments should already be taking place because the Early Start model is family-centered.
- Yvette asked if the family assessment would occur after the developmental assessment? Nate answered these assessments should be co-occurring because the assessment under Part C should include family resources, priorities, and concerns.
- Yvette shared concern that developmental assessment is being overshadowed by the family assessment. Ginger explained that the developmental assessment would still occur. Nothing will change; it will only be more fully defined.
- Samantha asked what the current standard of practice is and how it's different from the family coaching model? Nate answered there is no standard evidence-based practice throughout the state at this time.
- Robert asked if there will be a re-assessment at some point? Ginger answered that, yes, the family assessment will be reviewed during the regular IFSP review process.
- Ginger asked participants to consider what capacities are needed to make these practices effective and how to build them. What do staff and families need to know to ensure practices are implemented successfully? What are some challenges?
 - Diana shared letting families know what to expect is a big consideration. Ginger agreed and shared an idea from yesterday's advisory group about creating an app for families.
 - Yvette suggested having an ongoing monitoring in place to ensure standards are being met.
 - Yvette shared concerns about cooperation among regional centers, service providers, and families. How will the system communicate holistically? Ginger asked Yvette if she had any strategies in mind. Yvette suggested leveraging the unique strengths each of these components bring.
 - Diana asked how to encourage vendor buy-in.

- Samantha encouraged us to be very mindful about how family assessment is communicated, as parents often feel judged and stressed out with current practices. She suggested regular “check-ins” rather than evaluations or assessments to determine the resources the family may need to meet goals. Ginger explained the proposed plan is not to change what families do and in fact would not be monitored, but to change what providers do to support those families. Samantha continued to suggest that all communication to families should be framed as empowerment.
- Robert echoed Yvette’s concern and asked if we can monitor and evaluate interagency cooperation? Ginger asked if Robert had any ideas. Robert suggested looking at other programs that do this as a model. Yvette reminded the team that local interagency councils exist to monitor and evaluate cooperation.
- Ginger asked group what system features (conditions) must be in place to build capacity and implement selected practices? In what order should features be developed or adopted?
 - Diana advised to grow vendor capacity, perhaps by doing professional outreach at colleges.
 - Yvette shared including FRCs in rate reforms.
- **Concluding Discussion and Recommendations for Implementation**
 - Yvette recommended looking at EBPs to implement family support when funding is low.

4. NEXT STEPS

- State Leadership Team continues to complete an infra-structure analysis, finalize theory of change, and draft the improvement plan.
- Advisory Group meeting number five scheduled for late September.
- Constituency Group meetings are scheduled for the rest of this week and in October.