

Early Intervention Advisory Council and Stakeholder Meeting

Meeting Minutes

May 8, 2019

I. Call to order

Lori Mago called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

II. Roll Call

*Jody Beall, Carrie Beier, *Sheana Behringer, Julie Brem, *Kellie Brown, *Jessica Cray/Hayes, Melissa Courts, Cindy Davis, Nathan DeDino, Dionne DeNunzio, *Icilda Dickerson, Jody Fisher, Diane Fox, Taylor Hammond, Arley Hammons, Earnestine Hargett, *Kim Hauck, Chad Hibbs, Bonnie Hubbard-Nicosia, Susan Jones, Megan Kloss, Sarah LaTourette, Briana Luscheck, *Lori Mago, Karen Mintzer, Najma Mohamoud, Caley Norton, Michele Price, *Jenni Remeis, *Erin Simmons, Jessica Smith, Pam Stephens, Kay Traenor, *Susannah Wayland, Brittany Williams, Erin Wladyka,

III. Approval of minutes from last meeting

IV. Open issues

a) Introductions and DODD updates

Federal Reporting: DeDino informed the group that Ohio's Part C application was submitted May 1 and DODD should hear if there are any issues in the next couple months, with funds being distributed in July. He also informed the group that clarifications for Ohio's Annual Performance Report (APR) were submitted April 16. Finally, DeDino indicated that Ohio's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) was submitted March 29. He thanked the group for their continued input regarding SSIP activities and informed them that the entire SSIP, as well as a two page summary, have been posted on the EI website, as have reports and summaries for all previous year's submissions.

EIDS Rewrite: DeDino reminded the group that the rewrite of the EIDS application was discussed at the March meeting. He indicated that work for the rewrite had been delayed from what DODD originally thought. He thanked the group for all of the feedback they provided at the previous meeting and indicated that the feedback would be used when work for the rewrite begins.

Budget Allocation: DeDino informed the group that allocation tables were distributed in April that were based on previous the previous years' allocation amount. He indicated that it will probably be the middle of end of June before the budget is final. He explained that a new allocation table will be distributed and county proposals will be updated if Ohio EI does receive an increased budget.

ODH: Dedino informed the group that as there have been some leadership changes at DODD, Anna Starr has stepped in to provide leadership to the Home Visiting program for the time being.

EI Rule Implementation: Dedino informed the group that the rules were final filed and DODD staff were grateful to the stakeholders for the invaluable input during the past year. He also indicated that DODD is working on a variety of trainings and resources regarding the rules.

TA and Training Updates: Fox provided updates regarding the Principles of Service Coordination course. She indicated that DODD is currently piloting the course, and that the suggestions provided by the group have been incorporated, including using a variety of methods to accommodate all learning styles, as well as the ability to test out of the course.

Fox also informed the group about the support DODD is providing to the field regarding the rules. She indicated that the rules and forms have all been posted on the EI website, that DODD is in the process of creating an IFSP guidance document, and that online modules for each rule are available online. Each online module highlights the changes to the rule and includes an assessment piece so that participants can get PDUs. Fox also explained that DODD is holding facilitated webinars for each of the rule, where anyone in the EI field can submit questions ahead of time that will be answered on the webinar. After the webinar is complete, DODD compiles a document that includes all of the questions submitted prior to the webinar, as well as those asked during the webinar, and posts the document with questions and answers on the EI website. Fox indicated that in addition to all of this, DODD will be providing a “Rocking the Rules Road Show” to provide in-person support after counties have had a little time to implement the new rules. She explained that all of the dates and locations have been secured, and that DODD will be including this information in an upcoming EI Program Updates.

Fox thanked Erin Simmons for being a part of the procedural safeguards rule recording and indicated that DODD is looking for more opportunities to involve parents in trainings and guidance if anyone knows parents who would like to participate.

Fox indicated that the new rules would require a department approved tool for the family-directed assessment (FDA). She explained that some counties are currently using standardized tools, but some are using tools they created, and that all non-standardized tools would need to eventually be approved. DODD is creating a rubric to assess whether each tool meets the FDA requirements, which will first be piloted on the standardized tools and some existing county tools. Fox explained that because all tools will not be approved by July 1, counties can continue to use their current tools at that time. She asked for input regarding timelines for submitting tools for approval, as well as for DODD to approve them. The group discussed and decided that all tools should be submitted by the end of 2018, and that DODD should complete the approval process and begin requiring the use of approved tools beginning in July 2020.

DODD EI Program Consultant/Developmental Specialist: DeDino informed the group that DODD also has an open position for EI Program Consultant/Developmental Specialist that would be open through the end of the week if anyone was interested.

Appointed Members: DeDino reminded the group that the terms for all required members of the EI advisory council come to an end June 30. He explained that the governor’s office has asked that anyone who is interested in serving another term fill out an application, which he

encouraged current members to do. He also indicated that there are some positions from state agencies that are federally mandated and must be appointed by the governor's office.

b) Annual Performance Report target setting

Taylor Hammond explained that targets need to be set for the performance indicators as part of a six year State Performance Plan (SPP). She indicated that OSEP has not yet communicated the requirements for the SPP that will span FFY19 through FFY24, but that she expects the requirements for targets to remain similar, which basically are that the targets for the final year must be higher than the targets for the initial year of the SPP for each indicator. Hammond provided a handout that included Ohio's percentages for each indicator over the past five fiscal years, as well as the minimum, maximum, and average for each, as well as a handout with two potential proposals for targets for each indicator. She explained that she provided the proposals as a starting point, but how the targets were set would be completely up to the group. She also informed the group that she had examined both the target and the actual percentages for the child and family outcomes indicators for every state and found that there was significant variation from state to state in both. She indicated she would like to first have a quick discussion about which indicator area(s) the state wants to focus on over the next SPP/APR cycle, and then go into discussing targets for each individual indicator.

The group discussed how data for the indicators were collected and how percentages were calculated, as well as reasons for changes in percentages over the years. The group suggested focusing on the social-emotional child outcomes indicator due to the increased focus Ohio EI will be placing on mental health in the coming years. A member of the group also suggested focusing on the knowledge and skills child outcomes indicator, explaining that if the provider teaches the parent, the parent can then better help their child, which ultimately will lead to better outcomes. Hammond indicated that DODD had been discussing placing an increased emphasis on indicator 5, which is the percentage of children under one the state serves. She explained that while overall child counts have been increasing, the number of children under the age of one served by Ohio EI has decreased. She also suggested that some of the changes included in the new rules, such as NAS as a diagnosis, may lead to increases in the number of children served under the age of one. The group agreed this was another area on which they would like to focus.

The group decided to use the two proposals for targets as a starting point for discussing the individual indicators. Both proposals included targets for the first year that were the percentage for the most recently submitted APR rounded down to the nearest whole number. The first proposal suggested increasing targets once after three years, and the second suggested increasing targets once after two years, and again after four years. After discussion, including a reminder that these targets are able to be revised in future years, the group decided to utilize the targets presented in one of the proposals for each of the indicators, as outlined below. Hammond indicated she would bring a table with all of the chosen targets to the next meeting for review.

- **2 - Services in natural settings:** Proposal 1
- **3A SS1 - Social-emotional:** Proposal 2
- **3A SS2 - Social-emotional:** Proposal 2
- **3B SS1 - Knowledge and skills:** Proposal 2
- **3B SS2 - Knowledge and skills:** Proposal 2
- **3C SS1 - Appropriate Action:** Proposal 1

- **3C SS2 - Appropriate Action:** Proposal 1
- **4A - Parents know their rights:** Proposal 1
- **4B - Parents communicate child's needs:** Proposal 1
- **4C - Parents help their children develop & learn:** Proposal 1
- **5 - Child count birth to 1:** Proposal 2
- **6 - Child count birth to 3:** Proposal 2

c) EI Monitoring verification standards review

Melissa Courts indicated that DODD had previously created a verification standards document as a tool for the Data and Monitoring Road show training offered a couple years ago. She explained that the document was not meant to be all-encompassing, but rather was intended to provide a list of specifically what DODD looks for in verifying compliance with the three compliance indicators (45-Day Timeline, Timely Receipt of Services, and Transition). She informed the group that DODD is updating this document to be consistent with new state rules, and that since the federal requirements hadn't changed, there are no changes to the actual indicators, but there may be changes to implementation and documentation based on Ohio's new rules. The group split into smaller groups to discuss the tool, including the following questions:

- Does the documentation listed accurately reflect compliance with this indicator? What should be added or removed?
- Are there additional requirements we should be reviewing?
- Is the verification tool easy to use? How could it be improved?

The groups added all of their feedback on a copy of the tool which Courts collected, as well as reported out on some of the overarching themes/topics they discussed, which included questions about what completeness meant in some areas; clarification around hospital discharge documents for documentation of diagnoses; questions about verification of and suggestions for documenting the child assessment date; questions about the FDA offered date; questions around consent for the TPC; and a suggestion to create a different version of the document that could be used as a tool/checklist for service coordinators and supervisors when reviewing records. The group also suggested reviewing the tool again in a year or two after counties had been implementing new rules for a while.

d) Local outreach and reporting review and discussion

DeDino reminded the group that \$1 million had been distributed to local programs for outreach each of the past two years, and indicated that, if the budget increase passes, these funds will again be distributed over the next two years. He mentioned that DODD thought it would be a good time to check in and get feedback. The group remained split into smaller groups to discuss the following questions regarding local outreach:

- What has worked well and what have the challenges been during the past two years?
- What are the most effective activities to generate quality referrals?
- How can we standardize the activity report? What are reasonable data to collect?

The groups documented all of their feedback and reported out on some of the main things they discussed:

- Leaving the local outreach to the local programs works well

- Getting doctors and hospitals to understand EI is a challenge, but visiting doctors' offices is helpful for outreach
- It's difficult to track whether referrals are a result of specific outreach activities
- There are a lot of differences among counties regarding what types of local outreach activities are occurring
- Some counties need to do a better job of mass/community screening
- Some counties need to work better with day cares, etc.
- Having one specialist for outreach in a county works well
- It works well to try to get into activities that are already going on in the community
- It would be helpful to have more information regarding what is and isn't allowable
- More consistency is needed with messaging
- More communication regarding the difference between EI and HV is needed
- Maintaining relationships is important
- We need to make sure feedback to referral sources is quality and that referral sources can easily distinguish whether feedback is from Central Intake or the SC
- More information is needed regarding what is happening on the state level

e) Closing and partner updates

Jessica Smith indicated that she and a speech therapist in her county will be partnering with a local pediatrician to do the ADEP.

V. Adjournment

DeDino adjourned the meeting at 1:15 p.m.