

Meeting Summary: CIMS Part C Project Team

Friday, May 11, 2007, 10:30 AM–1:30 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
Anne Dallaire	Macomb ISD
Connie Davidson	Menominee County ISD
Sharon Dietrich	MDE
Karen Fales	MDE OSE-EIS
Shelly Grenier	Menominee County ISD
Julie Lagos	Parent Representative
Mischelle McManus	MDE OECE-FS
Tony Thaxton	MDE OSE-EIS
Lis Weston	Public Sector Consultants Inc.
Jessica Wolf	MDE OECE-FS

MEETING GOAL AND OUTCOME

The goal of this second meeting was to refine the service provider self-review (SPSR) process for (1) maximum clarity and efficiency at the local level and (2) greatest utility of resulting data, both state and local. The meeting agenda covered the following areas:

- SPSR team composition, responsibilities, and activities
- KPI analysis and rating process
- Child record review
- Policies and procedures review
- Improvement planning
- Using the data compiled in CIMS (reporting)

The team had a fruitful discussion of the SPSR team and the KPI analysis and rating process—so fruitful, in fact, that there wasn't time to cover the remaining areas. The team decided to cover these at its next meeting on Wednesday, June 6, from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM. That meeting will also be at the EOT&TA office with a video link to Menominee.

DISCUSSION OF SPSR TEAM

Composition

The team reached consensus on the following attributes of the SPSR teams for cohort 1:

- The *Early On* coordinator must be on the team and manage its operations. He/she determines when, where, and how the team will perform its duties.
- At least one parent of a Part C child (current or former) should be on the team. If that parent is employed by any Part C stakeholder (e.g., the intermediate school district [ISD]), the *Early On* coordinator should strive to include another parent who is not so employed.
- At least one service provider should be on the team.
- If the *Early On* coordinator is not employed by the service area's education agency, he/she should enlist a team member from that agency. Although the formal role of the ISD in the Part C SPSR has not yet been determined by the MDE, service areas are mindful that education is the lead agency for *Early On*.
- The *Early On* coordinators should consider enlisting the ISD's Part B monitors to serve on the team in order to share their experiences implementing the SPSR for Part B while learning more about Part C and its stakeholders.
- Stakeholders from different agencies should be invited to participate on the team.
- A team must have at least three members; there is no limit to how large a team may be, but groups larger than 12–15 individuals are more difficult to manage.
- The *Early On* coordinator recruits volunteers for the team based on these guidelines and his/her determination of the best people for the task.

The frequently-asked questions (FAQs) for the project will be updated to reflect these guidelines.

Responsibilities and Activities

The project team reached consensus on the following responsibilities and activities of the SPSR teams for cohort 1:

- The SPSR team is responsible for
 - analyzing the key performance indicator (KPI) preliminary report,
 - rating the KPI probe questions by a consensus process, and
 - developing the improvement plan to address any deficiencies.
- The *Early On* coordinator should convene the SPSR team in the fall to acquaint team members with the SPSR process and their responsibilities in it.
- The *Early On* coordinator should convene the SPSR team in the early part of the year (between February and May) to perform their duties.
- Minutes of the SPSR team meetings should be kept.
- The team does not have to reconvene once these activities are complete.

The FAQs for the project will be updated to reflect these guidelines.

Continuous Improvement Protocol (CIP) for the SPSR Team

In order to evaluate the composition and activities of the SPSR team for future cohorts, responses to the following questions will be required upon completion of team activities and will be entered into the electronic workbook:

- Was the SPSR team's size appropriate for its tasks?
- Was the SPSR team's composition appropriate for its tasks?
- Did the team meet an appropriate number of times?
- Did the SPSR provide direct or indirect benefits to children or the *Early On* program?
- Were the data, tools, and processes used in the SPSR the right ones for the tasks?
- Are there suggestions, comments, and lessons learned for future cohorts?

KPI ANALYSIS AND RATING PROCESS

Lis Weston introduced the project team to the analysis and rating process prior to the information gathering processes so members would understand the ends of the SPSR before considering the means. Team members were presented with preliminary reports for KPIs 1 (Child Find) and 5 (Transition), completed with bogus data. Team members were also introduced to the rating rubrics drafted for this exercise. Ms. Weston invited the project team to act as an SPSR team for the purposes of this exercise.

Feedback on Information Gathering Components

As part of the analysis process, team members were briefly acquainted with the instruments that will be used to collect data for the KPI preliminary reports. Team members noted several concerns.

- Some of the data requested is not even collected in some service areas. The mere fact of their presence on the report drew concern that the SPSR was setting unrealistic expectations for service areas, and that perhaps there were "requirements" that had not been communicated to the field. The group was reminded that the long-term purpose of the SPSR is to bring about best practices, not merely to measure compliance with state and federal regulations. Nonetheless, the team recommended that data questions on the KPI preliminary reports be labeled with "required" or "best practice" to minimize panic on the SPSR team.
- The sheer quantity of data to be analyzed on the KPI preliminary reports was daunting to several team members. They were reminded that the SPSR is conducted once every three years, and that it takes the place of the self-assessment previously used in the Michigan Education Grants System (MEGS). Team members were also encouraged by the prospect of training and support throughout the SPSR process.
- Several team members inquired about the validity and accuracy of the data collected on the information-gathering instruments, engendering a discussion about what to do if data are wrong, or if the introduction of other data can affect the SPSR team's deliberations.
- The "policies and procedures review" component was confusing to some because its title implied that an agency's policies might come under scrutiny. The team decided that "document review" is a simpler and better name.

Feedback on Rating Rubric

Team members found the rubric easy to follow in general, particularly for those probe questions that had an absolute answer (such as identification rate). Here are suggestions for improving the rubrics for use in cohort 1.

- Make sure each of the probe questions appears alongside the pertinent rating description on the paper version of the rubric that will be used in the SPSR meeting(s).
- Parents may rely more heavily on the rubric because they do not generally have the background knowledge of *Early On* procedures that may be discussed as part of the SPSR analysis and rating. Therefore, the rubric should provide enough context and explanation of procedures and government requirements/expectations for a parent to participate meaningfully in the deliberations.
- Rubrics should contain clear guidance about the consensus process so that all members of the SPSR team understand their own ability to influence the ratings. This understanding will also be fostered in the SPSR team orientation.

These guidelines will be factored into the rubrics as they are completed.

CIP for Rating Rubrics and KPI Analysis and Rating

Because the KPI analysis and rating activity and discussions took longer than anticipated, the team did not have time to develop CIP questions. They will be formulated in an upcoming “homework” activity for the team.

NEXT STEPS

Team members agreed that working together on the analysis and rating process was very instructive and beneficial. They decided to make the next meeting long enough to reach consensus on the remaining forms and processes using similar meeting tactics. Lis Weston will prepare some work for team members to do in advance in order to make the most of the actual meeting time.

Because the forms and processes will not be made final before the June 6 meeting, the computer system used for the SPSR (electronic workbook) will likely be delayed until December. This delay will have very little impact on the SPSR activities, however, because the process activities in the fall do not require access to the system.