



FIRST THINGS FIRST

Ready for School. Set for Life.

Policy and Program Committee Meeting Minutes

Call to Order

The Regular Meeting of the First Things First – Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board was held on Thursday, May 31, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. The meeting was held at the Hilton Garden Inn, 4000 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85012.

Chair Powell called the meeting to order at approximately 1:10 p.m.

Members Present:	Dr. Pam Powell, Bill Berk, Gayle Burns, Dr. Randal Christensen, Amy Corriveau, Coleen Day-Mach, Julianne Hartzell, Naomi Karp, Kenton Laffoon, Cindi Alva, Designee for Laurie Smith, Alan Taylor, Kim Van Pelt, Brad Willis
Members Absent:	Mary Ellen Cunningham, Toni Harvier, Dr. Eva Marie Shivers
Advisory Committee Members:	Dr. Michael Kelley, Co-Chair of the Early Learning Advisory Committee Jeanette Shea, Co-Chair of the Family Support and Literacy Advisory Committee Pat VanMannen
FTF Staff Facilitators:	Karen Woodhouse, Dr. Amy Kemp, Sandy Foreman, Cami Ehler, Kelley Murphy, K. Vilay, Rhian Evans Allvin, Michelle Katona, Catherine Kirk

Chair Powell welcomed the Committee and reviewed the agenda.

Consent Agenda

Chair Powell called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from August 11th and November 18th 2011. Member Van Pelt motioned to approve the consent agenda and Member Day-Mach seconded. Motion carried.

Early Childhood Research and Evaluation National Advisory Panel Report

Dr. Kemp presented the recommendations and information on the FTF Logic Models and on the First Things First (FTF) Early Childhood Research and Evaluation National Advisory Panel Report (National Panel). First Things First is a system effort involving many partners, undertakes many strategies and helps with coordination across the state. With the complexity involved in such an effort, there won't be a "one size fits all" evaluation approach. FTF needed an evaluation plan that would be complex and which would provide short and long term evaluation approaches. The National Panel Advised we look at implementation and outcomes and that we fund evidence based programs. The National Panel made eight long term and nine short term recommendations. Ensure states with highest stats implemented in cost effective manner. A copy of the National Panel Executive Summary was provided to the Committee and was reviewed.

Sub-Committee Update on FY13 Workplans

Cami Ehler gave a review of the Family, Friend and Neighbor Sub-Committee work. Meetings will continue in September.

Chair Powell provided an update on the Cultural Responsivity Sub-Committee.

Chair Powell recognized Jacqueline Power who is being honored as the National Distinguished Principal of the Year, representing Arizona by the National Association of Elementary School Principals. She'll receive her award in Washington, D.C. in October 2012. In addition to that she received an award from the Blackwater Elementary School for Title I School of the Year.

Discussion and Possible Approval on Recommended State Level Benchmarks for School Readiness Indicator

Chair Powell called on Karen Woodhouse and Leslie Anderson, Facilitator who led the discussion on the Development of Benchmarks for the School Readiness Indicators.

Karen shared that First Things First, at the request of the National Panel worked on formalizing logic models for the benchmarks and has been provided for the Committee's reference and will be included in the report of the National Panel.

Karen Woodhouse announced that Regional Forums on the First Things First Benchmarks will begin in June across the state.

First Things First defines the benchmarks as our targets with the indicators being our measurement of progress. The ten indicators are a measure of what we want to do by 2020. The benchmarks are the target we are striving for by 2020. Benchmarked for all ten of the indicators but not all will be ready for the Board Meeting in August 2012.

We began over two years ago with the Arizona Early Childhood Task Force and have continued the work and the plan is coming into place. We convened the Sub-Committees across the board in March and had each work on all the indicators. The March meetings primarily focused on what the data looked like for each benchmark/indicator. In April, the Sub-Committees worked to develop and recommend state level benchmarks. Karen referenced the timeline for the indicators and benchmarks.

First Things First is looking at population level changes in our communities to look for shifts, with investments from First Things First and Partners. Is it noticeable in communities and do we need to redirect funding and measuring progress. The National Advisory Panel did tie back to indicators and benchmarks. The Sub-Committees landed on administrative data available across state. Did not select any data sources that could not be tracked at the regional, county or community level. There are basically four phases, building of knowledge examining data sources available actual work of looking at data and establishing baseline, identifying what benchmarks should be and final phase of forwarding to Board for their approval and implementing.

Member Christensen suggested benchmarks not only be First Things First ownership but to get buy in from numerous agencies, schools, providers, philanthropy, etc. Data is already being collected by other agencies and we have to be engaged partners. Should be a much broader effort.

Karen introduced Leslie Anderson, Facilitator and turned the floor over to Leslie.

Leslie briefed the Committee on the information and review to begin and asked that everyone feel free to contribute at any point.

Comments on Indicators:

#1: This is the only indicator identified by all 31 Regional Partnership Councils as a priority indicator. The five domains are also nationally recognized. The Governor's Office, Board of Education, First Things First and the Department of Education are working together through a workgroup to define "school readiness". The conversation came about through the collaboration in working on the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant. The workgroup is also looking to develop an assessment prior to kindergarten entry. The development of benchmarks is moving along but may realistically take a few years before they are finalized and possibly longer before they can be implemented across the State. Apart from this partnership, the Virginia Piper Trust Fund set aside \$3 million to instigate a kindergarten developmental plan. Members share a concern with the timeline of "three years" and ask that as much as it can be moved up, that we do so. The full scale of a kindergarten assessment tool may take a few years to be created, approved, implemented but First Things First and partners will work diligently to complete the process as soon as possible.

#2: The bulk of participating agencies enrolled in Quality First will have gone through the rating process by 2020, having started in FY 2013. It was suggested there is need for more marketing that there will not be enough funds for every program enrolled in the Quality First regulated system and that programs may participate with the rating system without being enrolled in Quality First. First Things First is looking across states to figure out how accreditation and rating scales come together and are looking at agencies like National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) for a national perspective.

#3: Certification determination is primarily done through an Early Intervention Program (EIP)/Instructional Education Plan (ISP) and possibly a 504 plan but there are other methods as well. The benchmark of increasing by 1% changes is expected to happen over seven years. Though not initially encouraging it is what's realistic but though this number seems small but the actual number for the total population actually reaches a good number of children Statewide. The language of the indicator and intent may need to be changed to include that the number of children enrolled with special needs/rights, and may need to change the language referencing the denominator of how the percentage was reached. Note that we need to discuss that indicators two and three reference the number/percentage of children enrolled but we need to reflect on the financial issue of families who can afford to put their kids in rated programs. It's a "catch 22" as it's not talking about capacity, only enrollment. Trajectory may be higher numbers of rating with lower enrolled numbers this is part of the complexity. The overall ownership/philosophy is to move numbers. First Things First can be the leader but other agencies need to participate. First Things First can decide what benchmark to move but other funders are needed to participate.

#4: Suggestion was made to use the Child Care Resource and Referral as a data source because the information contained is updated constantly and to drop use of the National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies (NACCRRRA) as the information is not always reliable. Quality First participants must be regulated and we can now collect data on what families pay for care but we need to consider that what families pay may not be the actual price of care or what providers charge because of subsidies families receive. Keep in mind that when you raise quality of care the cost of care goes up and we may need to add an explanation of this in the intent. Member Berk suggested that if we do a cost study on care we need to be upfront that even First Things first is not paying for the cost of quality. There is a difference in doing a cost study vs. cost of quality study. One service may not be all service families use. The indicator is looking at overall cost to families and we're aware families likely do use more than one service for care but the indicator helps keep a tab on cost. The benchmarks are a goal, still need to look at contributing factors, NOT that we reach or didn't reach the number identified in the intent. First Things First is still looking at the data and we can change course as we go along.

#5: Suggested changing language from identified developmental delays to screened and eligible. The intent is to capture kids we missed and to get more kids screened so kids get identified by kindergarten. This indicator is supported by the Arizona Department of Education. Clarifying this is the "universe" of all kids screened. The Sub-Committees identified that Arizona Early Intervention Program (AZIP) would report on kids screened and referred to them. Not sure we could identify all data sources so started with AZIP. Suggest kids get to AZIP because there is a concern we're not capturing all screenings done. Every Home Visiting models are doing ages in stages (80% or so). Maybe contract to share/capture this data. Required newborn screening and repeated until three years old, not captured here maybe and/or not just and in language. The Health Committee also struggled with determining which data sources to use and was aware we may not have captured them all.

#8: Benchmark 2020 will correct typo from "75-80% of children age 2-4 at a healthy weight (BMI) to receiving well child visits at age 15 months." The national standard also references 15 months.

#9: Noted that there is a 30-70% disparity between kids in state on/out of reservations. The acceptance of oral health strategy is in 17 Regional Partnership Council Strategies. The Health Advisory Committee will continue looking at this data.

#10: looking at indicator – safety and health and well-being. (well-child care and immunization guideline knowledge) can't add this question in 2012.

Next Steps and FY13 Meeting Dates and Adjournment

Chair Powell thanked everyone for their continued support, contributions and their many volunteer hours.

Chair Powell announced the tentative dates of July 19th or 26th for the next meeting. Information will be forthcoming

Chair Powell adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:45 p.m.