

CENTRAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS

Provider Issues Comm Meeting

7/10/15 Date

Name	Agency	Changes to current contact info
1. Teri Williams	collab for kids	
2. Natalie Newlin	RediPlay	
3. Angela Diet	SPDE	
4. Megan Ferris	SAB SIIISC / EDHHE	
5. Crystal Scott	Talking Time	
6. Patti Sebanc	Sycamore Services	
7. Terri Holmes	parent	
8. Debbi Davis	SPDE	
9. Stacy Hynes	LPC	
10. Sandra Foltz	PSA	
11. Molly Creek	KOI	
12. Kari Newell	EDHHE	
13. Debbie Stacy	SPDE	
14. Heidi Heidi	OTE	
15. Judy Conway	AOT	

LENIKAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS

Provider Issues Comm Meeting

7/10/15 Date

Name	Agency	Changes to current contact info
1. Bob Milk	Alford	
2. Nancy Moore	HSDI	
3. Wally Andrew	ESC	
4. Katarina Flewett	UPCC	
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		

**Cluster G Provider Issues Committee Meeting Agenda
July 10, 2015**

Outcome Statement: Families are presented with adequate information to make an informed choice regarding the selection of provider Agencies and location of services.

Performance Standards:

1. Families in all areas of the cluster will have available providers for needed services.

Performance Measures: Profile reports and First Steps data system reports will be utilized in the measurement of this performance standard.

- 1) Introductions (if needed)
- 2) Approval of minutes
- 3) Action Item Updates
- 4) SPOE Updates
- 5) Provider Recruitment
- 6) Annual Meeting Recap
 - Training Opportunities
 - Little 7
 - Burmese Interpreters
- 7) Announcement/Close

**CENTRAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS
LOCAL PLANNING & COORDINATING COUNCIL
Provider Issues Committee Meeting Minutes
July 10, 2015**

Present: Debbi Davis-SPOE, Judy Chowdry-ACT, Jason Berty-Children’s Therapy Connection, Deb Miller-Accord Therapy, Angela Dick-SPOE, Molly Cleek-KOI, Natalie Newlin-PediPlay, Holly Andria-Crossroads, Teri Williams-Collab for Kids, Megan Perria-CDHHE, Crystal Scott-Talking Time, Patti Sebanc-Sycamore Services, Terri Holmes-parent, Donna Holtz-PSA, Kjarri Newell-CDHHE, Nancy Moore-KOI, Stacy Holmes-Council, Polly Hines-SPOE, Katarina Groves-Council

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Items
Welcome & Introductions	Katarina called the meeting to order and introductions were made.	
Approval of Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group reviewed minutes from the previous meeting. Donna made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Patty seconded. The motion carried, and the minutes were approved. 	
Action Item Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No items require follow-up at this time. 	
SPOE Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbi reported on and referred to the data elements that were previously emailed to the group. Referrals are up about 5% for the Cluster. Hendricks is up about 7%. Morgan County has also seen an increase. Debbi also noted that due to the conversion to ISPOE, she has been unable to get Intake and IFSP numbers. She pointed out that SPOEs will soon meet with Shirley Huntsman, the new First Steps Program Director. She is hopeful that they will find a way to gain access to this data again. Child count numbers were taken from state profile reports due to lack of access of this information from the ISPOE system. The one day child count is also increasing. • Debbi also noted that the “cost per child” data were included. The March 2015 quarter saw an increase in average cost per child of about 6% over the previous quarter. This is the biggest increase we have seen to date. It is not known whether this is cause for concern. We will continue to monitor this data. Debbi also reminded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbi said that she would make the suggested changes to the draft document and resend this information to the group.

everyone that they were sent data about their agency's cost per child. She has had discussions individually with those that have a high cost per child to help determine what factors may be impacting this data.

- Debbi also reviewed child outcomes data which included cumulative data for all Clusters including Cluster G. Previously for a few of the outcomes, we were slightly below the targets. However, for the most recent quarter, we were at or above all of the targets.
- Debbi directed everyone's attention to a draft document that outlines SPOE/SC/AT and agency responsibilities at different points from referral through record closure. Debbi stated that this document was developed after it became clear that SPOE staff were sometimes confused about who was responsible for what/when. This document is intended to be a reference for SPOE staff and agency providers so everyone has the same understanding. Debbi encouraged everyone to submit suggestions for changes to this document to her. Someone already suggested that the process for vision services be added. Nancy questioned whether the section that describes the agency's response to the referral is what happens currently. She did not believe that it happened as outlined. Nancy felt that agencies should feel more comfortable offering alternatives when the agency does not specifically have the service(s) available that were recommended. Debbi agreed that there could be more discussion prior to the initial IFSP and that this would be addressed with coordinators. Patti noted that the timeframe (one day) was a little tight to develop alternatives. Debbi suggested that if the agency needed additional time to develop alternative recommendations, they should let the SC know. SC's will be encouraged to be flexible with agencies when this is the case. Various

members in the group pointed out that the timeframe for an agency to respond is not consistently 24 hours. In their experiences, this varies. Angie noted that the timeline the SC is faced with may not always allow for lengthy discussion. The committee conversation evolved into a discussion about the utilization of DT-Cs, how and when they can provide services, and when this might be an appropriate option. Debbi encouraged agencies to let the AT know if they are proposing an alternative service because a specific provider has a unique skill set that would make them a good fit for family's/child's needs. Debbi and Polly agreed to remind AT providers to be as flexible as possible, especially considering the provider shortages in some areas.

- Some issues were also raised regarding agencies holding potential spots for children who have not been determined eligible at the time the agency is contacted, i.e. prior to the assessment being complete. The difficulties with this process were noted both for SCs and for agencies. Debbi asked how soon agencies would want to be notified of potential service needs of a child. Some in the group felt that it would be good to wait until the actual service needs were determined by the AT before checking agency availability. Debbi agreed to get a process nailed down with SCs. She anticipates that the AT schedule will ease somewhat which will also help with this issue.
- Jason asked for clarification around what is described in the draft document under initiation of services. Specifically he asked what was meant by "referral." Debbi explained that she was leaving that open for agencies to interpret. Some agencies might consider the referral to be when they are verbally informed that they will be on the IFSP while others may prefer to wait until they actually receive the IFSP

	<p>document. Either interpretation is fine, as long as the service starts within 30 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jason also pointed out that there is a discrepancy between what is stated in DSP 101 versus current practice when adding a service to the annual IFSP. Debbi said that she believes that the DSP training failed to get updated when clarification was given around this issue. She said that the 30 day start is from the parent signature date on the change page. • Jason also suggested including the exit skills inventory process to the draft document. • Debbi agreed to make the suggested changes to the document and resend it to the group. • Debbi reminded everyone that the AT/Agency Communication Guidelines document is also available for reference. 	
<p>Provider Recruitment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbi brought up concerns with provider availability in Hendricks County. We are beginning to have difficulty covering IFSP services in this county. Debbi asked the group for ideas/thoughts about this issue and wondered whether they perceive it to be a temporary or longer term issue. Patti felt that it represented a broader issue of provider recruitment and retention for the program at large. Issues with competitive pay and credentialing barriers limit the ability of the program to recruit and retain providers. Nancy pointed out that they are doing some provider sharing in other regions. Debbi asked how well this is working. Nancy said it is working by using the MOA to spell out who is responsible for which tasks. Patti addressed the idea that there may be a need for another agency in Hendricks. She felt like this was not the case because there seems to be a shortage in one discipline (speech) rather than across all disciplines. Nancy said that in other clusters, it has been approved to do a one-time speech consult on a plan. This option does not lock the agency in as the lead 	

	<p>agency, but offers the family some service until other options become available. Debbi said she will ask Bridget from Cluster B how this has worked in their cluster.</p>	
<p>Annual Meeting Recap</p>	<p>Katarina summarized the conversation from the Annual Meeting.</p> <p><u>Training Opportunities</u> – With the changes in training for the First Steps Program, Katarina pointed out that there might be a way for the LPCC to assist agencies with this. She reminded the group that the committee used to organize training from brown bag info sessions to larger scale provider conferences. It was suggested brown bags that move around the cluster might be a good idea. Katarina asked that the group send her topics and ideas. She also asked the group to let her know whether they have (or know of) space that we could use for training. Jason recalled there being an issue with offering topics that were discipline specific and wondered if discipline specific trainings could be offered. Consensus was that we could begin looking into short training and look down the road at providing a larger conference.</p> <p><u>Ancillary (Little 7) Services</u> – Difficulties with ancillary service providers continue. Many have not been brought up to speed on current FS practices. It was noted that oversight of these providers has been lacking. Debbi pointed out that there are not very many independent ancillary providers left in the system. It is a relatively small number of providers. Deb thought maybe a brown bag would be a good idea for this group. It was suggested that they be required to attend one meeting per year to remain credentialed. It was also noted that it is a delicate balancing act since there are so few of them. If we press them too hard, we may lose the ones we have. It was suggested that we share guidelines with them in an effort to get compliance. The group agreed that a face to face meeting with this group might be helpful. Molly pointed out that this would also give them the opportunity to share their concerns. The group wanted to begin planning a meeting for the Little 7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katarina and Patti will connect to develop a “Little 7” meeting. • Debbi will talk to LTC about extending the SPOE rate for interpreter services to other FS agencies.

	<p>providers. Patti agreed to assist with planning this meeting. Katarina will connect with Patti to begin planning.</p> <p><u>Burmese Interpreters</u></p> <p>Debbi shared that the SPOE has an agreement with the Language Training Center (LTC) to provide translation services for Burmese families. LTC has waived the 2 hour minimum for the SPOE and offers a one hour minimum. Debbi thought it might be worthwhile to approach LTC to ask them to expand SPOE agreement to First Steps in general. If they were unwilling to expand the reduced rate, Jason wondered if the SPOE could facilitate interpretation for agencies through LTC so that they could receive the reduced rate. Agencies could be billed after the fact. Debbi thought this might be an option also. Deb suggested getting some written items translated that could be used with families.</p>	
<p>Announcements/Close</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katarina asked for updated agency sheets to be submitted by the end of the month. • Katarina asked those that have not completed an LPCC participation form to do so. • Angie shared that the SPOE has new staff members. Kesha will update the staff contact list and the information will be updated on teamwork. 	<p>Next Meeting:</p> <p>October 2, 2015 at the ProKids Office.</p>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Holmes