

**Using Data and Indicators to Evaluate the Success of State ECCS Systems Building
Activities:**

How Two State ECCS Grantees Evaluate their Implementation Plan

April 26, 2006

JOSEPH ZOGBY: Good Afternoon. Welcome to this third in a series of webcasts sponsored by the ECCS program. This webcast is titled Using data and indicators to evaluate the success of state ECCS systems building activities, how two state ECCS grantees evaluate their implementation plan. We will hear presentations from the Washington State and Indiana ECCS grantees about their approach to evaluating their ECCS initiatives. Those of you watching and listening on the web have the opportunity to submit questions. After the presentations are complete we will give the presenters an opportunity to respond to the questions. At the end of this session, once the presenters have had a chance to respond to key questions, Kate Johnson from Project Thrive will describe some of their plans for developing resources related to this topic. It is useful to note that we chose these grantees because they have both clearly put considerable thought into how they will evaluate their plans and what data they will use to assess their success at building a comprehensive early childhood system. The approaches they are using are somewhat different and that reflects differences in the context in which they operate and the goals of their plans. While you're all required to evaluate your plans, we understand that the evaluation plan you develop will look different depending on your circumstances, the resources you have available, and what you are trying to achieve. Now I would like to turn the session over to the presenters. We will begin our presentation with Lorrie at Washington State.

LORRIE GREVSTAD: Good morning to some and good afternoon to others from Washington State. This morning I'm going to share some information with you about what's called our Kids Matter plan, it's a combination of our early childhood systems grant, a partner with our Head Start state collaboration office, and the build initiative and the foundation for early learning and our evaluated for organizational research services. On slide number two, I'm going to share with you the context for our work. Today we're going to be talking about the tenets and some pillars of our plan and some of the hallmarks. We that as Joe just state, it's important for both Indiana and Washington to share a little context about what make the process we've gone through a little bit different for each of us.

On slide number three, you will see that talk about our framework as a tool for bringing people and organizations together, helping us to reduce fragmentation across systems and policy guidance for us with decision makers and how we can continue to strong programs, services, schools, and communities. The system piece of this is significant because for Washington we really identified through our stakeholder process across all the different components of ECCS, that we needed to work at a systems level. So you will here us frequently refer today about that systems level or the system of systems as well look across all of the components of the ECCS grants. On slide number four, are the tenets of our plan. This was a joint systems building effort but was built upon looking at established work across the state and across all of the different components of the plans. It's a cross systems, cross state agency participation with large community inputs.

On slide five, you will note the names of the people that have been part of our merger, in terms of the partnerships that have come together to create Kids Matter. On slide 6, the primary evaluator that we have as a consultant who has helped us to frame this work and their contact name. On slide number seven, these are the pillars of the plan. We shared this with you so much to look at it in detail, but to recognize the importance of identifying that we were building on existing science as well as existing state and national initiatives. That became significant to informing the framework and for some of the foundation work behind our evaluation. In slide number 8 are the hallmarks of the plan. Again giving more context to this was a systems approach and a collaborative effort. The framework and plan was to serve as an overarching bridge not only comprehensive but to be integrated and we'll talk about that in a little bit. Defining common goals and outcomes and focusing on accountability and evaluation.

Slide number 9 identifies that kids matter is a framework of prioritized outcomes. And I would just say to those still working to develop their evaluation how significant that was. No surprise to a lot of you. When we asked stakeholders across all the components to prioritize, they said everything was important and we should do everything. And when you're really working at this level and across the system or systems it's impossible to do everything. We really had to force people to do some prioritization. That resulted in our outcome map, slide 10. If you print out on the screen, if you printed out and also at the website shared at the end of the presentation is our full executive summary, you can see that it's easier to read. The framework was done, again, because we were asked by

stakeholders to identify a way to represent this work in one page showing that all the different components as well as moving to outcomes and strategies.

Slide number 11 is simply taking one of the components in this case it's early care and education, and pulling it out so that people who wanted to look at the framework for activities as well as outcomes or to focus moving from a state to a local level could have a visual that just looks at the component pieces that they're interested in. You'll note that both side 10 and 11 are color-coded so people can follow which component. Framework is being addressed. Regarding our approach to evaluation because this was a decision in Washington by our stakeholders that we needed to do this as a systems development grant really designing the framework as a system of systems and that's where we really need to aim high and frame high. The pictures and some of the charts you'll see in the outcome map in the executive summary are result of a lot of stakeholders saying that in terms of understanding the context as well as when we moved to accountability and evaluation, that we needed to aim high and make the tent large enough that everyone fit in. The overarching bridge I described earlier. In doing that for us in Washington, it eliminated a lot of challenges around people worried whether they would be seen in the plan or outside of the plan. But this made it inclusive enough that it was there for everyone to identify where they were. And framing it high was the recommendation of a lot of business and philanthropy and following through on that is important because of evaluation coming up in conversation. It is stakeholder driven and systems focus. And at this point I would like to turn it over to Hallie Goertz. She'll talk about some of the specifics of which we've moved into evaluation following the context I've just shared.

HALLIE GOERTZ: Thank you, Lorrie, hello, everyone. I'm a member of the evaluation team here at Organizational Research Services and I'll start by giving a little bit of brief context about the evaluation and then we've actually recently concluded a data collection effort around the awareness of utilization of the kids matter framework in Washington state. I'll be sharing with you some of the results from that survey as well. So as Lorrie mentioned our approach to evaluation has largely at this point been focused on systems level change and on slide 13 you'll see our approach to evaluating the systemic change. Our interest lies in looking at what we have termed influence in leverage outcomes. Influence outcomes would be changes in groups, communities, organizations and the like that support or sustain resulting changes in people's lives. So these types of outcomes could look at changes in public will, policies, services, partnerships and public awareness.

Many things which Kids Matter has sought to accomplish and we're looking at changes in public, private investments and private philanthropy or leveraged outcomes. Basically we start with the Kids Matter strategies that Lorrie touched on in the outcome map which we believe to the broader system change, the focus of our evaluation. Those changes in systems will lead to changes for parents and caregivers and then changes within families and for the children in those families resulting in the goal of Kids Matter that children are healthy and ready for school. On slide 16 you'll see the level of -- excuse me. Of the focus of our evaluation based on this very basically what we're saying is that we would look at these three levels in regards to what -- when we're looking at what Kids Matter has achieved so we're starting with the first level looking at who is using the framework. Then

we're looking at changes that result from that use and finally we're -- our theory states that changes at the child and family level will result from those systems level changes. So again, because this is a systems building grant, we're maintaining that by using Kids Matter the changes in the system and infrastructure in Washington state will change providing the community -- allowing the community to provide needed services for children and family resulting in individual level changes for children. On slide 16 you'll see the three evaluation questions that we're seeking to answer. Again, we're starting with looking at how the framework is being used and implemented which we have baseline data. The next phase, which we're just now embarking on is looking on how the systems in Washington state have changed in ways that support Kids matter outcomes and goals.

The third question is beyond the scope of what we're looking at in our evaluation. But this is something that we would hope would be measured at the agency level. That next step at how things are changing in the lives of children and families as a result of these changes in infrastructure. So on the next slide, slide 17 going back to that first question of how the framework is being used and implemented we believe that's an important question because we want to learn the extent to which Kids Matter has been successful in strengthening systems building change efforts and it will provide some additional guidance to us as we continue the development of ongoing systems building efforts in Washington state. On slide 18 you'll see a first step that we've taken in answering this question. We've started to document the work of earlier doctors and some are listed on the slide. We want to find out how their use is influencing the early learning community. That's been one facet of our work in trying to answer this question.

On slide 19 you'll see some additional methods that we've used, interviews, document reviews and, of course, a survey that I've mentioned which I'll go back to in a few minutes. On slide 20 you'll see some additional purposes that we believe are important in addressing question 2 about how systems are changing in Washington State. This phase will really focus on documenting intentional use by local groups. Organizations and agencies. We think this is essential in really tracking systems level changes and also it will allow us to establish a baseline for measuring the systems change. Again, any local group or agency can implement the kids matter framework and our job is to document how the local work is linked to kids matter focusing on changed collaboration, policies, funding, changes in public norms and other resources. This would tie back to the influence and leverage outcomes I mentioned earlier. The next slide details the methodology for collecting this data and we're documenting the work of our key implementing partners.

On slide 22 it shows some actual examples of how Kids Matter outcomes have been adopted. We did work with the born learning campaign in Washington State to crosswalk their outcomes with Kids Matter outcomes and as you'll see, one of their outcomes is increased knowledge of the importance of nurturing. And this connects to the Kids Matter outcome of improved understanding and practice of nurturing behaviors. Another example as shown on 23 where an outcome is championing public support and influence regarding early learning messages and we see it linking up to the Kids Matter outcome of the public seeing early childhood education helps and school readiness is a major contributor in success and economic growth. Adopting and working toward those outcomes. On the next

slide you'll see an outcome map that we created for born learning and again this is a little hard to see printed on your screen but if you print it out it should come out in more detail. The point of this slide and the following slide is to help the key implementers. We highlighted the strategies and outcome areas on which the key implementing agencies or organizations are focused.

If you go to slide 26 it shows that in the first year of our evaluation we are really focusing on the awareness and utilization of Kids Matter. Then the second year we're moving into documentation of actual system changes. So as I mentioned, we've already started -- we've already gathered some data on this first year on the awareness and utilization to a recently completed stakeholder survey. On the next slide you'll see the purpose of the survey, which was to document baseline data about awareness and utilization among our early childhood stakeholders. The data that we collected will be used to inform the implementation -- to inform the future implementation of the Kids Matter framework and has already been for discussions around the data have been presented and already started.

On slide 28 you'll see details about the methodology. Basically we use denomination sample that was made up of 499 early childhood stakeholders at local, regional and statewide levels. These stakeholders represented almost 300 groups and organizations and the contract information with provided by partner groups that make up Kids Matter. We administered the survey online and comprised of 14 questions both closed and open ended and we had an almost 55% response. The respondents -- details about the

respondent background and affiliation is noted on slide 29. We found the respondents worked at all levels both statewide and local. They noted affiliation with a wide variety of agencies. I believe we ended up with a list of nearly -- it was a very significant list of agencies that they noted primary affiliation with. We also found that these respondents were fairly involved in a wide variety of early childhood groups and processes. So to jump into some of the results on slide 30, we found that there is widespread awareness of the Kids Matter framework in Washington State. 75% of respondents said they had heard of the program and learned about it from discussions, presentations or a colleague. This illustrates the strength of social networking theory in action in regard to how widespread awareness of this framework is.

On slide 31 you'll see some results regarding knowledge, specific knowledge around the kids matter framework. Almost 60% of respondents were able to identify a specific characteristic of the plan and the one that was shown to have the greatest importance to stakeholders was the integrated and overarching framework with a comprehensive systems focus. Slightly less important was the collaborative approach that the framework has taken. On slide 32 you'll see that new or different relationships, partnerships or collaborations are being developed that advance early childhood outcomes and the data also demonstrated that these collaborative changes are occurring. One respondent noted and you'll see a quote from them on slide 33, that they have completely refocused their grant writing strategy to align with Kids Matter goals and outcomes and also worked with collaboratives to ensure priority legislative items would be in alignment with the goals of

Kids Matter. Another example of collaborative efforts that are resulting in systems level change.

On the next slide we'll see that almost 3/4 of our respondents believe the framework will help organizations receive positive outcomes for children and almost 70% can actually imagine how they or their organization would use the framework in their efforts to achieve these positive outcomes. Meaning this is a really strong indication of the direction of youth in the future for this framework. On slide 35 we've noted a few areas of contribution that respondents believe that the Kids Matter framework will have including increasing awareness about the importance of early childhood systems. It's also a comprehensive framework that includes research-based strategies that can be implemented locally and statewide. They also reported the framework encourage collaboration and coordination resulting in decreased fragmentation. And respondents also mentioned that the framework provides common outcomes and goals resulting in increased accountability. There were a few expected data that weren't quite as positive.

On the next slide you'll see that as we expected fewer respondents are implementing the plan than are actually aware of the plan. 28.6% of respondents reported they're currently using the plan and these respondents tended to have a statewide focus to their work. On slide 37 you'll notice a few of the current applications of kids matter. These include using grant proposals. They are allowing people to connect to processes and we're also seeing new partnerships develop as a result of Kids Matter. Moving forward on the next slide, stakeholders also reported that they do have a desire to further their understanding of the

framework. They want to learn more about the plan itself, what it is. And ways that they can connect to the plan. We also found a lot of interest in information -- additional information and training to support implementation within their own local areas. That concludes my summary of the survey results and I want to turn it back over to Lorrie to wrap up and also perhaps offer some additional comments on the effort itself.

LORRIE GREVSTAD: The next slide is labeled key challenges. One of the things that we wanted to share that we need to continually as partners have reminded ourselves about the difference between evaluating the grant itself and evaluating the strategic plan or Kids Matter. I think as other states are moving into this work it would be interesting because we really are doing -- there are two different pieces and two different levels of work in terms of evaluating some of the specifics and the process of the grant versus what states and stakeholders have identified as resulting in their early childhood strategic plan again recognizing and being clear in your state whether your needs assessment and environmental scan drives you to doing work at a program versus a systems level for your evaluation. Remembering the dynamic nature of the work. We laugh around and talk about chaos theory but it really is not linear work. It's very dynamic and moves around a lot and can't be looked at as when we do A it will automatically move to B and to C. The challenge of recognizing there is a lack of systems data. It's not only hard to collect data or look at data or decide on what data you want to review when you're working across all the different components of the early childhood systems grant work. And then ultimately trying to decide if there is data across all those system of systems, how you can pull that data together to be meaningful.

Challenges in terms of resources both people and funding. This work takes time. It's messy, it's part of the chaos theory and to recognize the messiness is OK. Again, because it isn't linear and doesn't always work logically at the time, it can be kind of frustrating and challenging to be looking at multiple things at the same time and trying to identify what parts of those might be moving us forward. Which moves us to the next slide in terms of lessons learned. The importance of clarifying language with your partners. I know we've talked about that in our national meetings when we were doing our planning effort and it certainly is true in implementation and I don't know if it's more true but equally as true in evaluation because we aren't always meaning the same thing when we talk about performance measures or indicators or outcomes in what we mean and at what level we're actually looking to do that work. Prioritizing is a challenge I mentioned earlier. There is so much emphasis and important ways to look at early childhood right now. And it is on a lot of different radar screens. But it's impossible to do it all and address all pieces of the system at the same time and although the grant has certainly and I think we've had significant results in giving states dollars that actually help build capacity for doing systems level work it's hard to do all this work at \$100,000 or \$140,000 without leveraging other dollars and work and needing a commitment from all the partners, not just the grant lead. We've been very fortunate in this state to have that commitment and buying from all our partners in what has been the merged work of Kids Matter. Maybe the good news or challenge in that is recognizing some people are less knowledgeable about what we called our ECCS grant and are becoming more knowledgeable. The last slide is a

reference for you for both Organizational Research Services, which is our evaluation consultant.

If there are any specific questions about how we've done our evaluation or the guidance for that and then our executive summary for the Kids Matter framework is on the website and that's available for you to refer to. The last comment I would make, I think, is recognizing for us, which has been very exciting recently in all of what we're learning from the awareness and utilization survey and data, collection on that is really how we've used in looking at this as a theory of change at a systems level for Washington so it's helping us identify what our consultants, our evaluation consultants have helped us understand as a level of contribution not necessarily attribution. And the important distinction between that. It is helping us ultimately answer the question about how we can show what changes are being made. Thank you very much.

JOSEPH ZOGBY: Thank you very much Lorrie and Hallie. We'll switch now to Indiana and Maureen Greer.

MAUREEN GREER: Good afternoon and good morning on the west coast. We're delighted to be able to join you to talk a little bit about the different -- a little bit different approach that Indiana took to evaluation of their ECCS initiative. As we did some of the calls in preparation for this, it was really clear that the state contacts and the story behind that would be critical to understand why Washington took the direction it did and Indiana took the direction it did. On slide 2 you'll see that Indiana very fortunately has had a long

history of early childhood systems initiative and it's really put us in a different place than many other states in that a lot of the system building work that Lorrie in Washington have talked about had already taken place to some extent. We've had governor's initiatives, then governor Bahy had make a hallmark of his administration called step ahead, the childcare funding grant and really used it as a mechanism to bring together a variety of stakeholders to organize at the local level and help to create a system for young children.

We also in the next governor had an initiative called building bright beginnings. It was an extension of step ahead but really focused on the first five years and what does the research tell us about the importance of early childhood. He organized cabinet activities across all agencies and brought together agencies that we don't typically see together on early childhood issues. Workforce development. The Department of corrections. The Department of environmental management including the social service and health agencies which looked at what do we need to do across communities and state agencies to promote the importance of early childhood. Indiana also had been the recipient of a grant with similar components to ECCS back in the late 1990s. And really began, again, building on already existing initiatives looking at childcare issues, medical home issues, infant mental health issues. All the variety of -- Healthy childcare initiatives. Childcare health consultant projects and a variety of other initiatives both funded at the state level as well as the organizational and institutional levels within the community.

The commitment when ECCS came to be was that we weren't going to start a new program or a new system building initiative but, in fact, it would build on already existing

initiatives. And because there were so many of those initiatives, Indiana made an intentional decision to focus on child and family outcomes. We have had a long series of -- as I just said, our system building kinds of initiatives. Those initiatives had been evaluated by Lynn and some of the other national studies and we really felt that including all of the participants that system building itself we will move a little beyond that and really look at. As a result of system building what difference can we make in outcomes for children and families. So we were really intentional and you'll see that difference between the work that Washington and Indiana is doing primarily because of where we are in terms of context.

The next slide. When we were beginning the work with the core partners we really began to lay out the very specific pieces that we wanted to operate on that again cut across all of those initiatives and built on the work that has gone before us. And so the goal was to really look at the development of service standards, outcomes, priority adjustments and strategies. I would say what ECCS has really evolved to is a facilitator/convener of process because of the collaboration that exists ECCS didn't want to come in and replace or challenge any of those already very positive existing initiatives but to really serve as that facilitator of process, a convener. The great activities that are happening that it was coordinated, comprehensive and that the work of every group was acknowledged and recognized. Like a puzzle you looked at each piece to see how they fit together to create that whole system of support for young children. The process that we used to get to service standards outcomes and objectives the core partners, which represented a variety of agencies, organizations and families, would draft documents. They would then be sent to subcommittees for each of the ECCS components for their review and feedback and

revision and then the results of that work would come back to the core partners for a final review from -- all of these documents remain draft documents through community dialogue process that I'll talk about a little later.

On the next slide these are the principles by which we are operating. The ECCS initiative are being incorporated into the other early childhood initiatives. In Indiana, many of you would find that these really represent the values that we have for it. Values can be a little politically laden so the decision was made to look at service standards as opposed to service values. So right from the beginning outcome focus that was the clear direction of the core partners that everything that happened with ECCS needed to be outcome focused but it needed to be culturally competent and responsive. That all of our activities need to be family centered. We need them to be proactive and responsive. That everything that we did was universally accessible and most importantly that it be evidence-based. That we not use look at what we think we know or how we feel or how we've always acted but that, in fact, we use the research, the multitude of research that's out there. The values and service standards guide all activities and have consensus definitions to ensure that they're being defined consistently across all entities. As we began the process of developing the new standards and defining them as each individual would look at a definition, everyone was coming up with a little different so we worked through a fairly lengthy process to get to consensus definitions and so we're operating under that basis. The other commitment that we made was that we were not going to develop a set of outcomes for each component but that, in fact, we would develop three or four outcomes across all components. That regardless of which particular subcommittee

you sat on, which particular area of interest you had, that the outcomes that we would develop for this specific project would cut across all and therefore we developed this slide to really show how they would cut across. The vision that we developed for ECCS that in Indiana children are safeing healthy and reach their full potential. We wanted a vision statement that could be endorsed by everyone and not challenged by anyone. The three outcomes are on the slide, young children, policy program and resource priorities. Every family with young children birth through 5 is a quality comprehensive resources and support and support for young children birth through 5 are coordinated, cost effective. Linguistically competent and community based. As Lorrie said you can't do it all. As we were working through this process I think we had a list of 15 or so things that people came up with. Consensus was not an easy process as everyone has a passion for their own particular area. We were able, through a consensus building process and through prioritizing to get down to three that everyone agreed to and accepted.

The next slide, please. The next three slides really look at the priority objectives and again across all outcomes. We wanted to make sure we maintained the consistency, we weren't just focusing on childcare or mental health but the objectives crossed all those subcomponents. So in terms of there were seven priority objectives. All children will have a medical home. They'll be covered for services. That the medical home will facilitate developmental behavior and mental health screening. With each outcome trying to assess how it cuts across the three outcomes. The fourth -- next slide, the fourth priority objective was that a central clearinghouse is established for information regarding resources and supports at the state and local level both for families and for providers. We clearly

identified through the work of the subcommittees it isn't just family that have the necessary information, that often providers in a variety of different arenas work in a vacuum without the ability to connect across or access appropriate resources. Quality and unduplicated resources and supports are integrated to have an early childhood system. It spoke to our commitment not to duplicate the efforts already ongoing but to bring them together and to coordinate across.

On slide 8 the final two priority objectives were that parents have information support and knowledge about child development and are able to assess their child's progress. Finally, families have timely access to resources and support to address a child's health, safety and developmental needs. Because those priority objectives were really clearly stated and became consensus objectives it really became a platform for which we were able to base the evaluation components. In terms of stakeholder engagement, in the core partners level there are 37 members of those core partners. They represent 28 different state agencies, professional and community organizations. In the subcommittee components you can see in access to insurance in medical home we had 19 active members mental health. Family support 20 and parenting education 23. Those really are those who are most active involved and we had a much larger list of participants that either received email participation or received mailings.

We also wanted to make sure that this wasn't just a state level activity and so we conducted -- once we achieved draft outcomes and priority objectives, we conducted 12 dialogues in six different communities across the state going to each corner of the state to

make sure that at the very local level, what we call the whitewater level, those who are right in there trying to make differences for children and families have the opportunity to say those of you who are sitting in Indianapolis, you're off base and this isn't really what we need but what we ended up finding was that there was very little refinement. The work of the subcommittees which did, in fact, have participants from all over the state did to the greatest extent represent their local communities and incorporated the work of the community participants and their activities. We conducted three focus planning meetings of the key three participants representing 35 different entities and really developed the strategies that would be implemented based on those outcomes and objectives. And those objectives and strategies really formed the basis of the strategic plan that we submitted.

In terms of the evaluation plan, on slide 11 we really looked at it again, as I said, being outcome focused. We wanted to make sure we were looking both at qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. The numbers will tell us one thing but we wanted to hear the stories behind the numbers as well so we built in both of those to the evaluation plan. There are really three levels of the evaluation plan. The first level is really focusing on the discrete activities for completion of the strategic plan. So did Indiana do what the plan said? How much was done and who was the target audiences? Were the project activities completed on time? Were there unforeseen influences that caused modifications to the plan? What were the positive and negative implications of the modifications? Was there a concerted effort on the part of all stakeholders to work together and integrate resources and support to families? How could the implementation

be improved? We're focused on a formative evaluation to take the information and make changes along the way.

In the second level to really look at what difference did it make? Is there -- are children and families better off now than they were before the ECCS plan was initiated? And we really want to look at did the activities make it possible for more families to access quality comprehensive services? Are Indiana children healthy, safe and ready to learn? Do more families have an identified medical home covered by a public or private source of payment for their care? Using the theories of data elements that will really begin to help us identify what are the outcomes that we see? So part of what we'll be doing in the third level is to look at how well did we implement the plan? Not did the discrete activities occur and are we seeing changes to children and families but again what are the system changes that we're seeing and the implementation process itself in terms of evaluating not just what we did but how well we did it. So we're real excited about that process there and to really begin to look at the actual changes that occur as a child, family and system level.

Slide 12 and 13 we're really looking and wanted to show you a priority objective of strategy and the measurements that we're using for that. So if you look on slide 12 the priority is that all children in Indiana will have a medical home. One of the strategies we're using is that the childcare voucher applications will be revised to have a request for information for each child who receives care. We begin to look at data measurement. The rate of early enrollment in part B and children's special healthcare services. The number and percentage of parents able to identify primary caregivers for their children and the

rates of preventable morbidity. Slide 13. All children will be covered by a source of payment whether public or private for medical and developmental services identified by the medical home.

The strategy is the childcare voucher application will support access to Hoosier health and support recertification process. One of the things we discovered through the community dialogues is that while you need -- it's important to be able to access initially who is your Medicaid and chip program but the recertification issue is a major problem for us. We're working with the childcare system to look at how can we assist that through the voucher application and recertification process? You'll see a series of data measurements that will help us keep track of that. On slide 14 a central clearinghouse will be established that includes information about resources and support at both state and local levels of families of young children.

The strategy is that the early childhood meeting place website will be expanded to include families. The early childhood meeting place has been a website used by childcare, by the Department of education, by the early intervention system to really look and serve as a resource for -- a major training calendar, it provides resources and ongoing training activities for early childhood providers. What the communities asked was that that be expanded to be not just for providers but for families. We're in the middle of that process right now. Then you'll see that the measurements will be the number of hits, the number of hits -- links listed to the early childhood meeting place. The rate of consumer satisfaction with the use of clearinghouse information and the number of resources listed in the

clearinghouse. While those are all examples of quantitative data, we'll also be looking at going back out to really talk to people, to do surveys, to really begin to look at what does this mean to you on an individual basis? We know what the numbers say but tell us what that means. Again, picking up a qualitative information that we believe will form the whole picture of what is occurring with it.

The current status of the project I talked a little bit about the early childhood meeting place. We're in the middle of one of our strategies was to adopt the Utah clicks program so we would have a universal application system. We have the major state agency in terms of social services already having piloted that process and now we're in the midst of trying to incorporate that and bring it out of pilot status and into an actual web-based place. We have a social, emotional training initiative. An example of where we didn't want to replace anything but to convene and facilitate. We're in the process of bringing everyone who is doing social/emotional training. It's wonderful that everyone has adopted this and moved toward with great excitement but everyone is doing training independently and so our goal next month is to bring everybody together for facilitated meeting with Georgetown to really begin to look at what kinds of training standards are in place. Can we develop core competencies regardless of who you're training or what training you're doing that are consistent so all the messages are being sent the same.

And that out of that would come a consensus statement around training activities for social, emotional well-being. Again, trying to make sure we limit -- that we aren't doing everything but, in fact, are taking a very discrete piece of that social/emotional initiative

and encouraging everyone to do it. Serving in a facilitator role. We made a very intentional decision to use an external evaluator. So we currently have an evaluation request for proposal out. All proposals are due back next Friday and we'll be excitedly awaiting who the successful bidder of that is. The initial work scope for them is to develop evaluations, they're embedded into the strategic plan as you saw with the strategies and measurements. What we've asked them to do is to develop a series of protocols and to develop or identify the collection tools that will be used. And that will create action time lines that goes for the next three years and established an evaluation committee that will guide the activities of the successful evaluator contractor.

We were asked to talk about the challenges we faced as we began the evaluations and right before we submitted our strategic plan, our governor died unexpectedly and as a result we had the lieutenant governor took over, continued the commitment to early childhood but when he stood for reelection a year later he wasn't the successful candidate so we've had an entire change in administration. For Indiana this was the first time in 17 years that the changes went to the level that it did. And so every agency had just about every program had -- almost the entire core partners were gone and we had all new people taking over those agencies and programs and so as we were developing the strategic plan we were very considerably bringing those people on board, helping them understand the work that had gone before, and that in almost uniformly we had commitment to continue that work and commitment from the governor's office that early childhood was important. The basis of success in school and therefore he has continued to be a strong supporter of the initiative. We're one of those states that has a major budget

deficit. So one of the premises of the ECCS initiative was we had to absolutely leverage already-existing money and activities and the concept of giving some major kind of new funding wasn't going to be reality. How do we use the existing resources to the greatest extent we could?

[Inaudible]>> One of the things we continued to do is try to work with the challenges or the priorities that have been established by the variety of federal and state funding sources and to really show how it can help maximize those and collaborate across those and convene with people who need to work together more efficiently. That's the current status. The last slide is our contact information. Andrea Wilkes with the Indiana State Department of Health is the project manager for sunny start and I'm with Emerald Consulting and we have a contract to help facilitate the implementation.

JOSEPH ZOGBY: Thank you very much, Maureen. We will now entertain questions and Dena will coordinate them.

DENA GREEN: We only have one question from Judy from Texas. And her question is, what methods are these states using to sustain the efforts of the ECC initiative in its role as the overarching facilitator and convener of coordinated services and thus building in longitudinal measures of effectiveness? That's a long question but I think she's asking what kinds of approaches and thoughts you're using to help sustain your program and it also reminds me our next session on June 7th will be talking about sustainability. Either grantee can respond if you'd like.

LORRIE GREVSTAD: This is Lorrie in Washington I would say that some of the ways that we're moving toward that sustainability is part -- Maureen can answer for Indiana, is part of what I hear from both of us in terms of the level of engagement of partner ships that created the frame works and moved us into implementation. An example is in Washington state last year we were able to have legislation that was put forward -- actually a year and a half ago. It was implemented last year, to create an early learning -- cabinet level early learning council appointed by the governor. In the language of that bill it identified that it should build on existing efforts such as the early childhood comprehensive systems grant work. So that helped us get at the table to help inform what this new early learning council work would be and they found the framework very helpful. That early learning council has a lot of early childhood -- it's only 17 individuals appointed but it has early childhood representation as well as business and philanthropy. They were part of the survey that helped us understand in their feedback the use of being able to use Kids Matter as an overarching framework and some of their quotes were they said it helped identify convergence of thinking and the one place to show the landscape of all the things that make up quality early childhood. That it isn't use childcare or early care in education but all the different components that were in ECCS. As a result of that we had legislation presented this year in that work a lot of different things of which Kids Matter was a partner that has created a new cabinet level agency in the Department of early learning and that bill was just signed in the last 30 days and a new large private/public partner shipped called thrive by five that the governor is co-chairing with Bill gates Sr. to create a private partnership to see how business and philanthropy should help with early childhood. Our

sustainability has really been the result of doing this work for us at a systems level since that's what our stakeholders asked for. And so timing for us was right in how that became useful politically and strategically to show the frame of what should happen for early childhood and it helped us. We don't know yet in the long run how that might be specific but I think what it is going to do, because of the new department and the partnership, it will bring resources both people and dollars to all the different pieces of early childhood.

MAUREEN GREER: This is Maureen. I agree with what Lorrie said and I think building even more on that is we really viewed ECCS as not a new initiative. It wasn't established to compete with our already-existing initiatives or replace them and we've been really careful to make sure as much as possible all the different entities focusing on early childhood are at the table and it has helped to see us as that facilitator. I think the sustainability of the initiative is with the numbers. It's with the collaboration. If we had set out to be something on our own or to establish a new process or a new program, we would have much more difficulty because as Lorrie said earlier, there is not enough money in this to do more than help support some of the infrastructure but to do any type of programming or impact it has to occur through partnership and collaboration. The more we are integrated into the work that is already ongoing and is already funded, the better our chance for long term success.

LORRIE GREVSTAD: This is Lorrie again. I just want to re-emphasize the huge point Maureen made about building on existing efforts. We have the same issue in Washington when ECCS came out the response was sort of who put you driving the bus? And how are

we going to work? We already have all these efforts going on. It was very important for us strategically and politically to identify that we would do -- we would help play a role, as Maureen said, to facilitate and convene bringing people together. Our primary interest was keeping the bus moving forward. We were not implying we needed to drive the bus.

DENA GREEN:: Another question for Washington You mentioned the lack of system or systems data which I think is a common challenge in many states and relates to the evaluation of the ECCS project that is being done by the grantee. What are your system or systems measures that you will be using?

HALLIE GOERTZ: This is Hallie. I'll say something and Lorrie will add to that. Our focus with this work has really been to develop and to evaluate the development of an infrastructure that will allow local agencies to implement, improve different or new services or procedures that will allow those systems outcomes to occur. We're really leaving it up to -- my understanding we are leaving it up to the agencies to choose which outcomes to collect in that arena.

LORRIE GREVSTAD: Yes, particularly at the local level. There is a lot of conversation going on in Washington now about building connections between our state and local work, which is really exciting to hear in Indiana because they've been able to move forward at the next level in some of that from the systems work. I think what's critical for us at sort of

two levels is using the framework in our outcome so people at a local level and a program can go to it and say this is where my work is and these are the measures and indicators that I would use. So that the plan is not prescriptive in some way telling people what they can or can't do or what they can or can't count. The challenge for us that we're addressing at a state level is how we can bring back either through a website or some other abilities to allow communities using it at a program or local level to share information back about what they are learning and what they're doing and then at a state level what we're doing across our state agencies and we're trying to begin to have this conversation because of the opportunity that has now presented itself through a new Department of early learning and a large public/private partnership is to be more intentional and it's happening through the early learning council, which broadens it and makes it even more powerful than some of the conversations through Kids Matter.

More conversations are now occurring asking the governor and the heads of state agencies about how we can better share data, what kind of shared data agreements we might be able to develop. What kind of data do we want to collect and who has what kinds of data across those state agencies and some of that was done with a needs assessment but not at the level we would like to move now in terms of what kind of indicators over time do we all want to track for this system of systems rather than what we just track individually? And that was a question that the public/private partnership has been asking that they might be able to help with and put some pressure to bear. At this point the only agencies that have actually -- programs that are moving into the new Department of early learning are the traditional early care and education programs. Not any programs

necessarily that represent the specific health or social, emotional or parenting aspect of that. The next phase that the department has then created the private partnership and early learning council over the next year are to answer the questions about what other things should move. And separate from what moves, what will be done to better improve coordination across those entities which includes data.

DENA GREEN:: Other question for Indiana. Do you currently have ways of collecting data for all of your established outcomes or is this something you're still developing? If you do, we would love to see them. That's from Colorado.

MAUREEN GREER: We tried to choose data elements that we knew already existed. There are some that we'll be working with the successful contractor to help us refine how that might be collected and even to identify if it exists. To the greatest extent we tried to use already-existing data sources that other systems were using to report to federal level funders or the state.

DENA GREEN:: The questioner is Kate from Massachusetts. She is saying her audio cut out during your presentation and she would like you to talk a little about influence and leveraging as major components of your approach both to your work and to evaluation of systems change.

LORRIE GREVSTAD: Hallie, why don't you start.

HALLIE GOERTZ: Sure. Those are things we've more recently adopted. We did some work with a foundation a couple years ago looking at their making connections programs and how to document change at the community level. And so the idea of influence is really getting at what are agencies or organizations doing? What change is happening when those groups are coming together and working to -- working within the community to make change that will then result in change at the individual level? So basically influences just looking at community or system-level change. Any type of change. It could be changes in policies and procedures. Additional collaborations, those sorts of things. And then leverage would get at the same sort of changes but in regard to funding sources or resources. So maybe pooled funding or additional resources being put to some effort. If you wanted additional information on our methodology and the framework that we used I would encourage you to go to our website. There is a manual that we have up there on PDF that you would download for a little more information on that area. We really see it as sort of an essential piece of this type of 30,000 foot work that Lorrie had been referencing. The idea of aim high and frame high needs tools that will allow us to see what changes are being enacted within the systems, early childhood systems in Washington state that will result in those individual level changes that Maureen in Indiana have been focusing on.

DENA GREEN:: Did you answer, both of you?

LORRIE GREVSTAD: This is Lorrie. I think that covers it. The other thing I would say about it is just because of doing things at the 30,000 foot level our stakeholders

understood the concepts of influence and leverage and recognizing where there would be benefit to that. I think that's one of the significant things we couldn't share a lot of detail about the awareness and utilization survey itself but some of the significant messages in that again when I reviewed it prior to this presentation, really focus on people's commenting about their using it because they see it can influence others and partners and how that has allowed them to influence whether at their more local program level or state level how they work with other partners, how they're dealing with public awareness pieces or policy or political will or then moving that conversation, that influence has then helped them leverage and literally it's how we've managed to move things in Washington that we wouldn't have been able to do with just the ECCS money. But literally leveraging partnerships for work and participation, as well as dollars to now try and build what will we hope eventually be a Kids Matter budget. The leverage is important but it isn't just dollars, it also has collaboration in the coordination that occurs where people coming together can go, I don't have money, but I need the same thing that you do so I can do this part. And I can't say enough about how much that has helped us move the work.

HALLIE GOERTZ: Just to add on a little bit to what Lorrie said, I think that piece is essential. Not only are you getting documentation around what can be conceptionally a difficult concept, what is systems change and how do you measure it. So to come up with tools and strategies that allow that to be documented for funders and for accountability purposes. It is also extremely energizing and invigorating to the issue itself and to the people involved to be able for -- for them to see themselves in the data and to say wow, individually I might not think that those conversations or those presentations at the

meetings or the work that I'm doing with another agency is that significant. But when they can see it all together, it really allows them to see how the incremental steps have a larger effect on the larger system and it can be very energizing for the stakeholder groups.

DENA GREEN:: Thank you. I'll remind everyone also that this webcast will be archived and you will be able to access it within five days after today. So next Wednesday at this time you can do it. The information is posted if you see it now or we'll have it in some of the announcements. You can get the information you may have missed, Kate and others. Our next presentation on sustainability will be on June 7th and it will be around the same time.

JOSEPH ZOGBY: Do we have any more questions?

DENA GREEN: That's the end of our questions.

JOSEPH ZOGBY: OK. If we don't have anymore questions, at this time is Kaye Johnson -- Johnson on the line? Well, we have about five minutes, I think, to wait for Kaye to come back. Does somebody have anymore questions?

KAYE JOHNSON: Hello, this is Kaye.

JOSEPH ZOGBY: Very good, Kaye. You're on.

KAYE JOHNSON: Sorry, I was on mute and I was having trouble getting off. I just wanted to put a future direction on the end of this conversation just to say those are two very excellent presentations and we all know that Lorrie and Maureen have made huge commitments and the other people in their states and everything that represents. I think what they also represent is clear thinking to a logic model. Clear and strategic planning, brilliant strategy at the policy and leadership level and macro level systems thinking. I think those things are the take-home lessons of what we heard today and a lot of similarity that mark Friedman trains the work. As part of our work plan in project strive we have included a piece of our focus on that macro level policy level, outcomes level thinking and it was a part of our 50 state assessment and review of each of the ECCS plans over the past year. The plans as well as the Maternal and Child Health Bureau proposals. We did a catalog of indicators and we've done it for every ECCS project. We will be, in the next 60 days, distilling those indicators to catalog them, organize them, share them back with the ECCS coordinators. We will make outcome indicators for ECCS the subject of a call with title V directors in the coming quarter. We also will be trying, really, to help ECCS project leaders think about a way to try to reach something like the consensus that you heard both Lorrie and Maureen describe.

If we were to pick as a group three to five indicators for which there was real consensus, and that really were in alignment about what would be the outcome objectives, not the formative measures and so on but the real outcome objectives of ECCS we hope we can get some consensus across state. With that consensus we think that those measures would gain greater value in the state Title V process. In particular we know that two states

have explicit -- Washington and Georgia have explicit state Title V. Their selected performance measures focus on ECCS and states have a number of others and we've cataloged those as well. Down the road -- we could even have perhaps eventually a national Title V measure building on state experience over the next whatever five years by 2010 or whatever. So we really want to help you think about this. We'll be doing it incrementally and asking for input and trying to see if we can't get some ideas out that help us build the kind of consensus that they have built in these individual states to what really are the most three to five important outcome measures that Title V and their partners can be measuring and monitoring over the coming years.

DENA GREEN: Thank you so much. Kaye. Anyone have any questions for Kaye?

JOSEPH ZOGBY: OK. I would like to thank our presenters again for their hard work and the richness of their presentation. I would also be repeating what DENA GREEN: had said and reminding you on June 7 at 1:00 p.m. eastern time we'll talk about sustainability. The final presenters have not yet been determined so if anyone has anything they would like to share on this topic, or suggestions for issues that should be covered, please let either your project Office for Children -- project officer know. That's all we've got. Thank you very much, everyone.