



**Service Delivery Area 5  
Regional Advisory Council  
Meeting Summary September 9, 2020**

View the recording of this meeting here: <https://youtu.be/TGHDbkSfw9c>

**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, Mary Cundiff, 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: Ann Feldhaus, Debra Gaetano, Mary Cundiff, Sue Ragains, Jessica Greulich, Della Micco.

**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. Mary 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 shared that it has been hard to find some of the mandatory trainings because the names recently changed.
    2. Members also shared that it can be hard to search and find trainings because of the way they are listed and the long training names.
    3. Members suggested that SPARK and partners explore if there is a way to filter or label the trainings differently to make them easier to locate. For example, it would be helpful for users to have the ability to filter the trainings that are required for them, for licensure, program type, and PTQ level. It may be helpful to include subcategories by program type.
  - 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 expressed concerns about delays in the fingerprinting process.
      - a. Members in Evansville shared that the accessibility to timely fingerprinting appointments has improved somewhat. Members in other parts of the SDA reported continued significant delays.
  - iii. COVID-19: The purpose of this agenda item was to give members space to discuss concerns related to COVID-19.



**Service Delivery Area 5  
Regional Advisory Council  
Meeting Summary September 9, 2020**

1. Members shared that they know of programs who have had staff members exposed to COVID, which requires them to quarantine. This has led to problems with staffing and finding substitutes.
2. Members also shared that the cost of gloves and other personal protective equipment is skyrocketing, leading to increased expenses for programs.
3. Some programs are struggling to fill enrollment, which has led to a loss of revenue.
  - a. Early Learning Indiana's [Let's Get Back to Work](#) campaign has resources for marketing and providing information to families to help them feel more comfortable about enrolling their children.
  - b. A 4C of Southern Indiana representative shared that their referrals are up. Programs can contact 4C for help to fill open spots.

**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 1<sup>st</sup>, 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 31<sup>st</sup>, 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 1<sup>st</sup>, 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

**Service Delivery Area 5  
Regional Advisory Council  
Meeting Summary September 9, 2020**

- 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 shared that many providers are confused about how to trigger their visit.
  2. While SPARK sends reminder emails in advance, many programs expect an email around the time they actually need to trigger their visit. It would be helpful for SPARK to send a reminder the week before the rating visit needs to be requested.
  3. Members shared that they had heard about programs who reached out to [PTQ@indianaspark.com](mailto:PTQ@indianaspark.com) and the Help Desk and did not receive a response.
  4. Members shared that some programs who completed rating visits in March never received their Level 4 certificate.
  5. Members shared that programs are missing having a coach on-site before visits to help confirm and assure programs that they have everything they need for the visit.
- 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 1<sup>st</sup>, 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.

**Service Delivery Area 5  
Regional Advisory Council  
Meeting Summary September 9, 2020**

- 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 have heard from other programs that they reached out to the Help Desk and did not receive calls back.
  - 2. RAC members and the public provided additional feedback via Zoom poll.
- 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 31<sup>st</sup>, 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 were very helpful.
    - 2. Some members shared that they did not use the Guide because they completed the I-SAT during a live session and received support from a SPARK coach.

**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. No additional public comment.



**Service Delivery Area 5  
Regional Advisory Council  
Meeting Summary September 9, 2020**

**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 SPARK and partners explore if there is a way to filter or label the trainings differently to make them easier to locate. For example, it would be helpful for users to have the ability to filter the trainings that are required for them, for licensure, program type, and PTQ level. It may be helpful to include subcategories by program type.
  - ii. PTQ Rating Procedure Update
    - 1. While SPARK sends reminder emails in advance, many programs expect an email around the time they actually need to trigger their visit. It would be helpful for SPARK to send a reminder the week before the rating visit needs to be requested.
    - 2. Members shared that they had heard about programs who reached out to [PTQ@indianaspark.com](mailto:PTQ@indianaspark.com) and the Help Desk and did not receive a response. SPARK should look into this further.
    - 3. Members shared that programs are missing having a coach on-site before visits to help confirm and assure programs that they have everything they need for the visit.

**8. Future Meeting Schedule**

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

**9. Adjournment**