Service Delivery Area 2
Regional Advisory Council
Meeting Summary September 14, 2020

View the recording of this meeting here: https://youtu.be/Tae4YnRvDm0

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. Vice Chairperson, Jenni McQueen, 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: Elizabeth Schlesinger-Devlin, Tristen Comegys, Tana Sheets, Anne Hough, Deb Hughes, Natalie McIntire, Louann Gross, Katie Ziegler, Kacey Deverell

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 suggested that the Universal Precautions training be offered as a recorded, on demand training.
         2. Members suggested that the labels and language on the website be clearer about the definition of "mandatory trainings". For example, there are trainings that are mandatory for licensure and other trainings that are mandatory for PTQ.
      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. Members shared that programs in SDA 2 have experienced delays with background screens and fingerprinting. In some parts of the SDA, staff are waiting several weeks for fingerprinting appointments and many have to travel to get to their appointment.
         2. Members suggested that it would be helpful to clarify what staff can do when they are waiting for fingerprinting and other regulatory pieces. For example, can they access I-LEAD and start training? This type of guidance would be helpful.

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 it can be hard to get questions answered from the county health department, because they close at four. Questions programs have had for the health department include wanting guidance on when to let outside visitors in the building after testing positive for COVID.
2. Members suggested that it would be helpful for SPARK to provide resources or community learning forums on topics, such as:
   a. Cleaning and sanitizing toys and finding space to let them air dry.
   b. Recruiting qualified and quality staff members.
   c. Allowing space for programs to discuss and learn from each other about how they are handling play between children.
3. Some members have heard questions about PTQ rating visits and how expectations or procedure might differ during COVID. It would be helpful for SPARK to create a FAQ document for the PTQ rating procedure and what it looks like during COVID.
4. Members asked what the rating visit options will be for programs who are not allowing outside visitors at this time.
   a. Mike shared that there are opportunities for inactive voluntary status at this time. SPARK will also consider how best to answer FAQs such as this.

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 asked if there was a specific area raters were finding insufficiencies in.
      a. Mike shared that most of the insufficiencies were related to documentation, especially peer mentoring agreements.
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. A member asked if SPARK was tracking the duration of the Help Desk calls.
   a. Kim shared that SPARK is currently tracking this data point. The current average call length is 14 minutes.
2. A member also asked if SPARK was tracking how often a caller calls back into the Help Desk after their initial call.
   a. Kim shared that while this is not something SPARK is currently able to track, SPARK is preparing to integrate a new data system that will allow them to track returning callers.

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. SPARK asked for specific feedback from those who have completed the I-SAT on the I-SAT Guide and if it was helpful.
      1. Members shared that the examples in the Guide helped them answer and rate themselves realistically and accurately.

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.
      i. Several members requested that Margaret send them a reminder about their membership status.
   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. A member shared that they applied for inactive voluntary status in May when they were not able to hold their rating visit. Their PES/Legally licensed exempt consultant still had to come to the school, even though there were not children there. The rater was not familiar with the inactive voluntary status. The member shared frustration with the lack of communication between licensing and PTQ.
      i. Mike shared that, while PTQ ratings stopped, licensing visits did continue throughout the shutdown. SPARK will share this confusion/miscommunication with partners.

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 Universal Precautions training be offered as a recorded, on demand training.
         2. Members suggested that the labels and language on Indiana Learning Paths be clearer about the definition of "mandatory trainings". For example, there are trainings that are mandatory for licensure and other trainings that are mandatory for PTQ.
      ii. Regulatory Barriers
         1. Members suggested that it would be helpful to provide guidance about what staff can do when they are waiting for fingerprinting and other regulatory pieces.
      iii. COVID-19
         1. Members suggested that it would be helpful for SPARK to provide resources or community learning forums on topics, such as:
            a. Cleaning and sanitizing toys and finding space to let them air dry.
            b. Recruiting qualified and quality staff members.
            c. Allowing space for programs to discuss and learn from each other about how they are handling play between children.
         2. It would be helpful for SPARK to create a FAQ document for the PTQ rating procedure and what it looks like during COVID.
      iv. Help Desk
         1. Members would like to see data in the future about the number of returning callers to the Help Desk.

8. **Future Meeting Schedule**
   a. To be determined, once new members are oriented.

9. **Adjournment**