



***STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN
CONSTITUENCY GROUP C MEETING
MEETING MINUTES***

Meeting Date: 05/22/24

Meeting Location: Zoom

Approval: Department of
Developmental Services
(DDS)

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 Researcher and TA Specialist, SRI International	Facilitator Technical assistance provider	Present
Anna Nguyen, CDSS SSMI of the Early Childhood and Systems Integration	Regional Center/Provider	Present
Dulce Flores Eastern Los Angeles Family Resource Center	Regional Center/Provider	Present
Gigi Ostrowsky CDE Early Childhood Support Unit	Regional Center/Provider	Present
Crystal Singleton CDSS, Office of Child Abuse Prevention	Regional Center/Provider	Present
LaFatima Jones CDSS, SSMI Office of Child Abuse Prevention	Regional Center/Provider	Present
Angela McGuire Project Director, Early Childhood Intervention, Mental Health, and Inclusion WestEd	Family Representative Technical Assistance	Present
Leslie Fox Content Area Director, Early Childhood Intervention, Mental Health, and Inclusion WestEd	Technical Assistance	Present

DDS: Nathaniel Taleon, Ashley Lambert, Cathy Schulze, Jasmine Suo, Ryan Digman

WestEd: Rebecca Halpern

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.
- Cathy Schulze provided housekeeping information for participating via Zoom and after the meeting.
- Ginger defined SSIP and the focus of these constituency group discussions.
- Ginger conducted a roll call via chat.

• SSIP Definitions and History

- Ginger provided definitions critical to SSIP:
 - OSEP: U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs
 - SiMR: State-identified measurable results
 - Phases: analysis, design, implementation
- California is currently in Phase 1: gathering constituent feedback.
- Reviewed California SSIP history from 2015 to present.
- Provided timeline of SSIP revision, ending on November 15, 2024 when new SSIP will begin implementation.

• Roles and Responsibilities

- Ginger defined the various constituent groups who are providing feedback and insight to DDS SSIP Leadership team.
 - Parents and advocates
 - Regional centers and service providers
 - State agency and community partners
- Ginger defined constituent roles.

• Identify Improvement Focus

- Ginger asked, where should California Early Start focus its improvement efforts under the SSIP umbrella?
- Reviewed the 3 child outcomes and 3 family outcomes identified by OSEP in SSIP reports.
 - Child Outcome A: Positive Social-Emotional Skills
 - Child Outcome B: Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills
 - Child Outcome C: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Needs
 - Family Outcome A: Know Their Rights

- Family Outcome B: Effectively Communicate Child's Needs
- Family Outcome C: Help Their Children Develop and Learn

- **Discussion of SSIP Data – Child Outcomes**

- Child outcomes are measured by 1) the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by program exit and 2) the percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by program exit.
- Ginger presented child outcomes data submitted by DDS to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), comparing California with national trends.
- Social emotional development outcomes: outcome 1 is now in line with national average; outcome 2 is substantially higher. Neither outcome is hitting targets, and both are gradually declining.
- Knowledge and skills outcomes: outcome 1 is above national average; outcome 2 is above national average. Neither outcome is hitting targets, and both are gradually declining.
- Meeting needs outcomes: outcome 1 is far below national average; outcome 2 is slightly above national outcome. Neither outcome is hitting targets, and both are gradually declining.
- Leslie Fox asked, can you give a sense of if California uses the Child Outcomes Summary Process to measure these? Ginger answered, it does not. Leslie then asked, how are these measured? Nate responded, California uses the Early Start Report (ESR) data system where entrance and exit scores are entered. One of the things DDS is looking at with the national TA providers is how to improve the ESR system.

- **Discussion of SSIP Data – Family Outcomes**

- Ginger presented family outcomes data from DDS comparing California with national trends. Data collection is through family reporting, such as surveys.
- California uses a sampling plan to collect family outcomes data. California's plan is approved by OSEP and the survey response rate is 10-13%.
 - Parents Know Rights outcome has met or exceeded our target but is well below national average.
 - Parents Communicating Needs of Children outcome is close to national average.
 - Early Intervention Helping Family Help Children outcome is below national average.
- Angela asked, since the graphs of Child Outcomes and Family Outcomes are presented differently, how does this change our impressions? Presented as they are, we don't see Outcomes B1, C1, and C2 are clearly lower than Outcome A. If that were visibly apparent, might that change the recommendations that are made?
- Leslie Fox noted that family outcomes, while not meeting goals, is still very highly rated. Family Outcomes is where we really expect to see change, since Early Start is very family oriented. Leslie suggested revisiting how we capture this family outcome data.

- **Group discussion**

- Ginger asked, where should California Early Start focus its improvement efforts for SSIP? Which outcomes need more attention? What issues, concerns, and problems do you see based in your experience? What needs do California's population of infants and toddlers have that may not be evident in this data?
- Angela McGuire asked, how well do the tools we use to collect this data align with what's being implemented? For instance, the family survey was designed in 2010 and updated at the beginning of SSIP implementation, but the questions may not align to actual implementation. Additionally, local education agencies (LEAs) and Regional Centers are very different in population served and relationship with the family, which makes it really challenging to analyze the data and compare to other states. Ginger responded, LEA-distributed surveys get a much higher response rate because the method of dissemination is different, also impacting the data.
- Leslie Fox noted the SSIP is designed backwards (starting with outcome and moving into infrastructure and practice) and suggests interim measures of family outcomes progress and additional ways to capture change that may not be reflected in family survey or other data capture measures at the local level. Ginger responded that it is allowable to use different language from the reported outcome, which allows for flexibility in what the state measures and how it identifies what it wants to improve.
- Angela McGuire shared concern about choosing a family outcome, as a former Early Start parent, which may come across as a "test" for families. Angela cautioned to clearly frame those questions and communications, if the family outcome is chosen.
- Dulce Flores agreed with Angela; knows that many of her families do not understand what is being asked of them.
- Gigi Ostrowsky asked, how is the child outcome data collected? Ginger and Nate responded, varies across state, but every child gets an entry child rating and exit child rating in ESR, and the change is measured.
- Gigi asked for examples of assessment tools being used. Ginger responded that many use the Ages & Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) for social-emotional outcome. Nate hesitated to share an example because there is so much variation across the state of which tools are used. This SSIP revision process is being used, in part, to determine if narrowing and standardizing assessment is doable. Gigi asked who typically does the assessment or entering the data? Nate answered, again some variability, but a trained assessment professional who may be a provider or in-house clinician.
- Anna Nguyen mentioned it is hard to choose because family and child outcomes are so interrelated. In her unit, they have been discussing how they would like social workers to be more aware of Early Start services. Nate agreed awareness of what is out there is at the core of supporting families and he will connect offline to coordinate training or other approaches.
- Ginger shared results from other advisory and constituency group meetings
 - About half-and-half split between child and family outcomes.

- Among child outcomes, preference is for social-emotional outcome.
- Among family outcomes, 12/14 selected more than one outcome.

4. NEXT STEPS

- Advisory group discussion in May and June
- Constituent group discussion in July