Service Delivery Area 1
Regional Advisory Council
Meeting Summary September 16, 2020

View the recording of this meeting here: https://youtu.be/MDIseNsot6c

1. **Call to Order and Meeting Overview**
    a. SPARK Project Director, Mike Bachman, made welcoming remarks orienting participants to the virtual platform and purpose of the Regional Advisory Council meeting.
    b. Chairperson, Martha Rae, called the meeting to order and provided an overview of the agenda items and meeting goals, and discussed meeting/Council systems and procedures.

2. **Introductions**
    a. Members introduced themselves by sharing their name, professional role, and stakeholder type (program, community partner, etc.).
    b. Members who were present included: Linda Curley, Joyce Dix, Jeannine Hornback, Lisa Timmerman, Martha Rae, Paige Gramenz, Sara Miller, Ramal Winfield

3. **Reviewed Old Business**
    a. At the beginning of each Regional Advisory Council (RAC) meeting, the Council reviews action items and recommendations from the previous meeting and discusses progress made.
        i.   You can view past meeting minutes and recommendations for each Service Delivery Area (SDA) on the SPARK website: http://indianaspark.com/regional-advisory-councils/.
        ii. Jenni summarized the feedback/recommendations made by the Council at the last meeting related to communication/outreach, business management support, the PTQ rating procedure, and other miscellaneous recommendations.
    b. Prior to this RAC meeting, members from SDAs across the state requested that the RACs discuss the following pressing issues:
        i.   Mandatory Trainings: The purpose of this agenda item was to give members space to ask questions and provide feedback and suggestions related to mandatory trainings for licensure.
            1. Members asked why programs are required to complete CPR training each year, when the certification is valid for 2 years. Members asked if this requirement could be changed.
            2. Members shared that they used to get CPR training through the local CCR&R and it was much more cost effective. There are places in SDA 1 where it costs more than $90 per staff person.
            3. Members suggested that SPARK explore how to make mandatory trainings more easily accessible. For example, it would be helpful to have Universal Precautions as an on-demand training.
            4. Members also wondered why early childhood education programs are held to a different standard than K-12 educators. For example, K-12 educators can take Universal Precautions online and are not required to complete CPR training each year.
                a. Mike shared that some of the differences in requirements are because K-12 schools have a nurse in the building.
            5. Members suggested that it might be helpful if directors could participate in a "train the trainer" model for Universal Precautions. That way they could train their staff members.

    ii. Regulatory Barriers: The purpose of this agenda item was to give members space to provide information about regulatory barriers they are facing during this time and any suggestions they have to address these barriers.

        1. Several members expressed concerns about the delays in fingerprinting appointments. Some staff are waiting weeks for an appointment. These delays are leading to citations for some programs.

           a. A couple members also shared that their programs faced issues when staff completed a fingerprinting appointment and were told after the fact that their prints were unreadable.

           b. Some members have also experienced unprofessional vendors who have stood staff up for appointments or who have turned people away.

        2. Members asked SPARK to consider how they can serve as a bridge between providers and other system partners. Members also wondered if there was a forum or platform SPARK could establish to allow programs to regularly voice concerns to SPARK or other partners (Discussion Board Learning Forums, etc.).

        3. Members also suggested that SPARK provide learning forums for providers to discuss what they are doing to address barriers.

    iii. COVID-19: The purpose of this agenda item was to give members space to discuss concerns related to COVID-19.

        1. Members shared that one of the biggest challenges with COVID is the time required to clean the space and materials.

        2. Members shared that cleaning supplies and personal protective equipment are very expensive and hard to find. Members suggested that SPARK provide opportunities for programs to discuss resources they have found to address this issue.

4. SPARK Project Highlights

    a. Each quarter, SPARK staff highlights SPARK features that have been implemented recently or will be launched in the upcoming quarter to gain insight, feedback, concerns, suggestions, and recommendations/agreements from the public and RAC members.

    b. Spotlight: PTQ Rating Procedure

       i. Mike provided an update the PTQ Rating Procedure.

       ii. In mid-May, the Office of Early Childhood and Out-of-School Learning sent communication to all programs with guidance about the PTQ rating process. This messaging also included information about inactive voluntary status, when that would expire, and what programs will be expected to do when that status expires.

       iii. SPARK followed up with additional information in June about the five step PTQ rating process. This messaging was included in the SPARK Connect newsletter, sent via email to all I-LEAD users, and sent via text to all those signed up to receive text messages from OECOSL.

       iv. This messaging included the reminder that as of July 1st, SPARK would be managing the rating process.

       v. In their messaging, SPARK included links and visuals, which aligns with recommendations received from the RACs in the spring.

       vi. SPARK's messaging was also added to the Hoosier Childcare banner.

       vii. Any program that was set to expire between July 2020 through March 2021 was sent email communication with next steps.

    viii. SPARK has uploaded over 30 PTQ Success Tools in the Resources section of Indiana Learning Paths. These tools include:
1. The standards and evidence the rater is looking for (Readiness Checklist)
2. Confirmation Checklist
3. Peer mentoring agreement (Level 4)
4. Supplemental documentation and guidance

    ix. SPARK is also engaged in a calling campaign to all programs with an expired PTQ rating. SPARK coaches are providing information about the PTQ rating process and related supports, as well as other SPARK supports.
1. As of August 31st, SPARK has successfully contacted over 250 programs with expired ratings to provide guidance and help them through the process.

    x. Since SPARK took this process over on July 1st, 426 ratings have been approved.
1. 19% of programs have received insufficiencies during their rating visits. An insufficiency means that, during the rating visit, the rater found that the program was not fully meeting an expected standard. Programs are given 90 days to correct the insufficiency.
    a. This rate of 19% is similar to the rate in July-August of 2019, which was 16%.
    b. SPARK will continue to track this data point to assess if this process is working.

    xi. Questions/feedback from RAC members and the public:
1. RAC members suggested that SPARK better tailor the information included in the reminder emails to programs. For example, it would be helpful if SPARK only shared the Readiness Checklists that were relevant to the program.

c. Spotlight: Help Desk
    i. SPARK's Deputy Director of Operations & Strategic Integration, Kim Hodge, presented on the Help Desk. She provided data and implementation updates. Some of the data highlights included:
1. The Help Desk has served 959 callers since April 1st, with an uptick in calls after July.
2. The most common support categories for these calls were PTQ Support (55%), Indiana Learning Paths (24%), and I-LEAD (9%).
3. The Help Desk connected 26% of callers with key partners to meet their support need.
    a. 229 callers were connected to Early Learning Indiana.
    b. 22 callers were connected to IN AEYC.
    c. 4 callers were connected to their local CCR&R.
4. The Help Desk connected 13% of callers with a SPARK coach.
5. The Help Desk resolved 61% of the callers' support needs during the first call.
6. The Help Desk received most of their calls during weekdays (Monday-Friday) and received two calls on Saturdays.
7. The time of day with the highest number of calls was from 10:00am-2:00pm, with a peak in the early afternoon, which aligns with most programs' nap schedule.
8. SPARK also launched a Help Desk customer satisfaction process. Approximately 7 days after calling, SPARK sends callers a follow-up email to assess their satisfaction. SPARK plans to send this survey sooner in the future.
    a. 91% of callers who answered the follow-up survey said SPARK made it easy to find an answer to their question.

b. 80% of callers reported that their question or need was resolved.
c. 85% overall satisfaction rate.
d. The Help Desk currently has a net promoter score of 52. The industry standard is 50.

    ii. Questions/feedback from RAC members and the public:
1. RAC members suggested that SPARK create a FAQ document that includes the top ten questions the Help Desk receives.
2. RAC members would like to see the number of calls that require additional fallow-up support to reach an answer or resolution.

d. Spotlight: Indiana Self-Assessment Tool (I-SAT).
    i. The I-SAT is a program-level self-assessment tool, completed by a program leader. It includes seven standard areas with 50 quality indicators. Programs can choose which sections and quality indicators they want to assess and focus on.
    ii. After completing the I-SAT they connect with a coaching content coordinator, review their results, and discuss the supports available. They can then connect with SPARK's tiered supports as appropriate.
    iii. The I-SAT was launched in April. As of August 31st, SPARK has received 126 I-SAT submissions, which represent 135 programs.
1. 3% of programs recognized by OECOSL (any program licensed, registered, or CCDF exempt) have submitted the I-SAT.
2. 44% of participants completed the I-SAT through a live session with SPARK. 56% completed it independently using a self-study tool.
    iv. I-SAT participants also completed a customer satisfaction survey.
1. 76% felt prepared by taking the Preparing for Program Assessment pre-requisite training.
2. 71% felt the I-SAT Guide was helpful.
3. 86% felt SPARK made the experience easy.
4. 82% overall satisfaction rate.
5. 37 Net promoter score.
    v. RAC members and the public provided feedback on the I-SAT via Zoom poll.

5. RAC Membership Updates
a. Margaret Smith, RAC Coordinator, provided an update on RAC membership transitions.
b. SPARK thanked the current members for their service and contributions over the last year, especially in helping SPARK establish the RAC structure and get the Councils up and running.
c. Around half of the current members will be completing their term this quarter and cycling off of the Council.
d. A membership application for new members was released in July and closed in early August.
e. New members were notified in early September.
f. All members will participate in virtual orientation sessions over the next two months to kick off the next year.
g. The RACs will reconvene with their next public meeting in November.

6. Public Comment
a. Members of the public shared that in the past local police agencies and other businesses (local insurance agents) provided fingerprinting. Members wondered if this possibility could be explored further.

    b. A member of the public suggested that the recommendations discussed during the RAC meetings be shared on the website, with the identified action plan.

        i. This information can be found in the recommendation summaries posted on the SPARK website. Past recommendation summaries can be found here: http://indianaspark.com/regional-advisory-councils/regional-advisory-council-sda-1/

7. **Agreements**

    a. Based on what was presented, RAC discussion, and public comment, the RAC brought forth the following recommendations/agreements for SPARK Learning Lab and/or partners to consider:

        i. Mandatory Trainings

            1. Members suggested that the annual CPR requirement be changed, as the certification is valid for 2 years.

            2. Members suggested that SPARK explore how to make mandatory trainings more easily accessible. For example, it would be helpful to have Universal Precautions as an on-demand training.

            3. Members suggested that it might be helpful if directors could participate in a "train the trainer" model for Universal Precautions.

        ii. Regulatory Barriers

            1. Members asked SPARK to consider how they can serve as a bridge between providers and other system partners. Members suggested that SPARK establish a forum or platform establish to allow programs to regularly voice concerns to SPARK or other partners (Discussion Board Learning Forums, etc.).

            2. Members also suggested that SPARK provide learning forums for providers to discuss what they are doing to address barriers.

            3. Members of the public shared that in the past local police agencies and other businesses (local insurance agents) provided fingerprinting. SPARK will discuss this possibility with partners.

        iii. COVID-19

            1. Members shared that cleaning supplies and personal protective equipment are very expensive and hard to find. Members suggested that SPARK provide opportunities for programs to discuss resources they have found to address this issue.

        iv. PTQ Rating Procedure

            1. RAC members suggested that SPARK better tailor the information included in the reminder emails to programs. For example, it would be helpful if SPARK only shared the Readiness Checklists that were relevant to the program receiving the email.

        v. Help Desk

            1. RAC members suggested that SPARK create a FAQ document that includes the top ten questions the Help Desk receives.

            2. RAC members would like to see the number of calls that require additional follow-up support to reach an answer or resolution.

8. **Future Meeting Schedule**

    a. To be determined, once new members are oriented.

9. **Adjournment**