|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **12.17.24** | **ICC Service Quality Committee** | | |
| **Charge:** | **Track transition metrics and identify opportunities to reduce disparities, monitor federal reporting and disaggregated reporting to improve equity (incl. SPP & APR).** | | |
| Topic | How | Who | Time |
| Welcome & Call to Order | * Call to order – 9:23 * Attendance (establish quorum) * Quorum established at 9:23 * Review Meeting Minutes from meeting before   + Meeting minutes from 11.19.24- approved at 9:26   + Meeting Minutes from 10.29.24- approved at 9:26 | Mallorie Brown, Colleen O’Brien |  |
| Icebreaker | Introductions: | Non-Members present: Cathy Leslie, Molly Gilbride, Elizabeth Small, Emily White, Dina Tedeschi |  |
| Review Meeting Agenda | Agenda:   * 1. Review proposed cadence of meetings   2. Review Meeting minutes and vote   3. Review Charge- Track transition metrics and identify opportunities to reduce disparities, monitor federal reporting and disaggregated reporting to improve equity (incl. SSP & APR).   4. Presentation: Review Data Completeness data for Indicator 3 (Emily White) |  |  |
| Open Items and Notes | Emily White EI Division Director presentation on data completeness for indicator 3. Data completeness refers to the percentage of children that are included in indicator 3. Why does this matter? Complete data are higher quality data and yields better data-based decisions.  -What do you think led to the increased number of children being evaluated?  What can we do to maintain this improvement?  Are there more children returning to public school systems? A lot more families are returning to in person services. There were a lot of families that had young children during the pandemic and didn’t return their children to school, these families are promoting services for young children in the state to other families.  Less turnover in staff may promote more consistency with BDI being completed.  What do you think keeps us from meeting these expectations? What ideas do you have for improving?  Discussion: Guidance given in 2011 potentially dissuaded people from doing exit evaluations (only children with an established condition). If the second evaluation does not have to follow the same eligibility tool rules then it would help improve this. We did BDI’s during the pandemic and didn’t enter them into the system. Need to discuss the why behind these data. Discuss the importance of BDI scores to guide intervention. The Division talking about this more has helped.  What does the incomplete score mean? What errors lead to an incomplete BDI score? This info might help programs. Outreach to Pediatricians to get children into EI earlier.  What have we learned from other higher performing states?  New Jersey requires two evaluations every 6 months for every child. Most high performing states require 2 evals in some fashion.  This guidance is not necessarily for eligibility evaluations, just an evaluation. If this is something that is importance, but also if there was updated policy and procedures that there was a second evaluation for every child that was in EI for 6 months or more. An option for parents to opt out of this. Discussing with the field the importance of this for how to use it. Our agency is |  |  |
| Meeting Close | Meeting adjourned 10:00am |  |  |