

Meeting Summary: CIMS Part C Project Team

Wednesday, June 6, 2007, 10:00 AM–2:30 PM
Early On® Training & Technical Assistance (EOT&TA) Center, DeWitt

ATTENDANCE

Name	Affiliation
Jeannie Anderson	Gratiot-Isabella RESD
Sister Barbara Cline	EOT&TA
Barb Corbin	Kent ISD
Sam Cornelius	Cheboygan-Otsego-Presque Isle ESD
Connie Davidson	Menominee County ISD
Sharon Dietrich	MDE
Karen Fales	MDE OSE-EIS
Shelly Grenier	Menominee County ISD
Jason Hardacre	Wayne State University
Allan Knapp	Interagency Information Systems
Julie Lagos	Parent Representative
Michael McCartan	St. Clair County Community Mental Health
Mischele McManus	MDE OECE-FS
Lis Weston	Public Sector Consultants Inc.

MEETING GOAL AND OUTCOME

The goals of the team's third meeting were (1) to finalize the child record review (CRR) and document review (DR) forms for use in cohort 1; (2) to discuss improvement planning; and (3) to discuss training and technical assistance. The team completed its work on the CRR and DR, reaching consensus on the questions that would remain on those forms for the first year. The draft training plan was reviewed, but there was no time for discussion of it or of improvement planning. Because there is little time left in the preparation phase of CIMS Part C and no further meetings are scheduled, those issues will be refined by PSC and the MDE with virtual collaboration by team members.

DISCUSSION OF SAMPLE SIZE FOR CHILD RECORD REVIEW

At the beginning of the meeting, the group discussed the MDE's decision requiring service areas to select 10 percent of the snapshot count of their *Early On* case files for the service provider self-review (SPSR) child record review. This decision came about as a result of strict federal requirements for valid sampling plans. Project team members from large or urban service areas objected to this decision because of the burden it will put on them to gather and prepare all the materials and perform the reviews. PSC reminded team members that for the SPSR, the child record review process can take place over six months instead of two, as it was for the self-assessment that service areas have been doing yearly since 2004; they were also reminded that the SPSR is completed by service areas only once every three years. Nonetheless, the sample size issue engendered much

discussion; the MDE will investigate whether an upper limit can be established on sample size for service areas with large *Early On* populations.

DISCUSSION OF DATA FORMS

Child Record Review

The team reviewed the entire CRR form, question by question. In so doing, they identified several redundancies and clarified many more items to make them more suitable for use in the field. Several points were noted for universal consideration in the SPSR:

- It is important to indicate whether a question has its basis in statute or regulation, or whether it has been inserted to encourage service areas to employ “best practices” for improved outcomes for children. Ideally, each question should make reference to either the regulation or a pertinent peer-reviewed study. While such detail is not possible for the beginning of cohort 1, PSC and the MDE will attempt to add an indicator for each question showing the category to which it belongs.
- Any question about meeting a timeline should be followed by a question about whether exceptional family circumstances were involved.
- Questions on “child outcomes” were deemed redundant to the child outcomes data that Wayne State University is collecting; all such questions should be removed.
- Questions pertaining to documentation of service delivery will likely draw criticism from those in the field who deliver services; they have never been formally required to “prove” service delivery before. The team acknowledged, however, that this is the essence of true accountability in the field and it is important to keep such questions as part of the SPSR.

Continuous Improvement Protocol (CIP) for the Child Record Review

The group discussed the questions that should be asked *about* the CRR form and process in order to gather data for improving the system in the future. The questions agreed upon by the team are listed below.

- Was the quantity of records used for the child record review appropriate?
- Were the questions on the child record review form easy to understand and answer?
- Which question(s) were problematic and why?
- Were there opportunities for teaching or learning during the course of completing the child record reviews?
- Approximately how many hours did it take to complete all the record reviews?
- If you have comments on any aspect of the child record review process, please enter them here (with a space provided on the form).

Document Review

As with the child record review, the project team reviewed the document review (DR) form question-by-question to identify redundancies or areas for clarification. Several questions about interagency collaboration were eliminated because the information can

be derived from the Michigan Education Grant System (MEGS). Language on several questions was clarified. In general, the group shared the following observations and concerns:

- While there is ample “paperwork” going on in the *Early On* field, there is little uniformity or standardization. Service areas generally keep logs and checklists if doing so suits their specific needs, but the state should expect to see much room for improvement in cohort 1 in the area of documentation.
- Team members suggested that the MDE provide some advance training to service areas in cohorts 2 and 3 so they can begin keeping some of the documentation that they will be asked to report on in coming years.
- Instructions for the DR should provide numerous examples of the types of documentation that service areas will be examining. For instance, many DR questions inquire about policies or procedures that are “in place.” With some facilitation, members of the team realized that they can and should look to employment and orientation manuals, letters of agreement, and documentation used by the administering ISD to determine their DR answers. Such instructions will be included on the DR and in the FAQs.
- Questions about the content of local interagency agreements drew criticism from team members for two reasons: (1) The state-level interagency agreement has not been rewritten in over a decade, providing no guidance for relationships at the local level, and (2) The questions currently ask about agency participation in public awareness activities but not in service delivery to children in need, while the group believes that service delivery is an issue equally worthy of scrutiny.

Continuous Improvement Protocol (CIP) for the Document Review

The group discussed the questions that should be asked *about* the DR form and process in order to gather data for improving the system in the future. The questions agreed upon by the team are listed below.

- Were the questions on the document review form easy to understand and answer?
- Which question(s) were problematic and why?
- Were there opportunities for teaching or learning during the course of completing the document review?
- Approximately how many hours did it take to complete the document review?
- If you have comments on any aspect of the document review process, please enter them here (with a space provided on the form).

REVIEW OF TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLAN

Without much time remaining in the meeting, PSC briefed the team on the tentative plans for training and technical assistance (TA) for cohort 1 service areas. As with other new developments in *Early On*, the training for the SPSR will be handled by EOT&TA staff, who will themselves be trained by PSC in early August. Training for the *Early On* coordinators in the 19 cohort 1 service areas will occur at two day-long sessions in mid-August. They will receive instruction and a binder of materials to help them get started

with their activities; in addition, all materials and communications will be posted on the EOT&TA website.

The group discussed the possibility of inviting the ISD Part B monitors from the 19 service areas to attend the training if they wished, but the dates will likely conflict with their own training. The group also suggested that a third training be planned for early fall, in the event that some in cohort 1 are unable to participate in August, but no decision was made on this item. Finally, the team was in favor of developing a special presentation or training session for the parent participants on SPSR teams.

NEXT STEPS

There will be no more formal meetings of the project team, although PSC will seek their counsel and input on improvement planning and other aspects of the SPSR. In addition, members of the project team will be asked to serve on the user acceptance testing (UAT) team and to recommend others to assist in the testing.