



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

NEVADA EARLY CHILDHOOD ADVISORY COUNCIL (ECAC)

DATA & EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE

PUBLIC MEETING

THURSDAY 8/18/2022

1:00 PM - 3:00 PM

“Nevada’s children will be safe, healthy, and thriving during the first eight years of life, and the system will support children and families in achieving their full potential.”

Meeting Location:

This meeting will be held via Teams videoconference:

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

PUBLIC NOTICE

The public is hereby notified that the Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council reserves the right to take agenda items out of posted order (except that public hearings will not begin earlier than posted times); items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time; and items may be combined for consideration. A time for public comment is provided at the beginning and at the conclusion of the meeting. A time limit of three minutes may be imposed by the Subcommittee Co-Chairs, for public comments, in order to afford all members of the public who wish to comment, with an opportunity to do so within the timeframe available to the Council. The Subcommittee Co-Chairs reserve the right to call on individuals from the audience or to allow for testimony at any time.

The Subcommittee Co-Chairs reserve the right to call items of the agenda out of order as needed.

Reasonable efforts will be made for members of the public who have disabilities and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting. Please contact Denise Tanata at DTanata@childrenscabinet.org, at least five business days in advance so that arrangements can be made.

This public notice has been posted at the offices of the Department of Education in Carson City and Las Vegas; Department of Health and Human Service in Carson City; and at the Nevada State Library and Archive in Carson City. Notice of this meeting was posted on the Internet through the Nevada ECAC website at <http://nvecac.com>.

The support materials to this agenda are available, at no charge on the Nevada ECAC website at: <http://nvecac.com/> (under the meeting date referenced above) or by contacting Denise Tanata at The Children’s Cabinet, 1771 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 200B or 702.544.9629 or DTanata@childrenscabinet.org.

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Call to Order, and Roll Call

Marty Elquist Chair, called the meeting to order

Denise Tanata helped with roll call.

Marty Elquist noted that Cathleen Rexing is no longer in her position with the NV Department of Education and given that this is a required seat for the ECAC that is reserved for the Section 619 coordinator, she has resigned from the ECAC. Once Denise Tanata deems it necessary, she will appoint another Co-Chair. Marty Elquist noted this would be greatly appreciated. The bylaws dictate that the Chair & Co-Chair have to be members of the ECAC.

- The following subcommittee members were in attendance:
 - Marty Elquist
 - Anna Marie Binder
 - Denise Tanata
 - Amanda Haboush-Deloye



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

- Matthew Hoffman
- Jon-Thomas Champlin
- Karissa Loper
- Justin White
- The following members of the public were in attendance:
 - Rebecca Dunne
 - Rachel Stepina

2. Public Comment #1

- No public comment was provided

3. Review and Approve Minutes from January 24

(Discussion, For Possible Action)

Marty Elquist Chair

- The January Minutes were not posted on the ECAC website or emailed to subcommittee members.
- This agenda item will be tabled for the next meeting.

4. Review and Approve Minutes from July 7

(Discussion, For Possible Action)

Marty Elquist Chair

- Anna Maria Binder made a motion to approve the July minutes. Justin White seconded this motion.
- The July 7th minutes were approved.
- Karissa Loper abstained from approving the Minutes, as she was not present.

5. Discuss Early Childhood Research Questions

(Discussion, For Possible Action)

Marty Elquist Chair/Denise Tanata

- The Research Questions were posted on the Data & Evaluation Subcommittee page of the ECAC website.
- Marty Elquist handed the floor over to Amanda Haboush-Deloye.
- Amanda noted that the starter workplans for each subcommittee were used as the basis for creating questions that might be needed to address each of the potential outcomes for each workplan and where that data might come from.
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye asked those present what they thought the best way to tackle this part of the meeting would be.
- Marty Elquist stated that there needs to be better synthesis of questions due to the overwhelming amount of questions in the document. Marty Elquist observed that in the research questions document, there is both (1) the need to collect data to measure how the ECAC is moving forward with the strategic plan and (2) the need to address larger, systems-level questions regarding what outcomes we should expect to see in our children and families when we have a truly comprehensive early childhood system.
- To help determine how to tackle the research questions, Denise Tanata noted that there are the following two purposes of the Data & Evaluation Subcommittee: To help the other subcommittees identify tangible metrics for their workplans and to identify what the sources of that information might be; and to measure the progress of the early childhood system as a whole, in which the provider-family outcomes that we want to look at are determined. For each of the subcommittees, Denise Tanata stated that we look at the objective and what we anticipate the impact/outcome of that work to be. Denise Tanata suggested taking this piece-by-piece and looking at what it is that each subcommittee needs to know in order to measure what they are doing and what is the impact of what they are doing. For pure transparency, Denise Tanata noted



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

that “NVSAGA” next to the titles of each research question section refers to the HRSA Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems Grant, in which a system gap and asset analysis must be done. Thus, a lot of the systems-level questions for NV came from the guidance document from the system asset and gap analysis from the feds. This does not mean that every question needs to be included. Rather, we need to identify the questions important to the ECAC to address and determine how we will measure the questions. Questions from the P-20W group and QRIS are also included. As the Chair of the ECAC, Denise Tanata noted that the workplans for all of the subcommittees need to be finalized and be able to identify what metrics and sources we need. However, Denise also pointed out that looking at the systems-level questions may provide insight into how to address each set of subcommittee questions, metrics, etc.

- Marty Elquist noted that she sees the research questions that need to be addressed as falling into one of the 3 following buckets: subgroups; system as a whole – how do we evaluate our system moving forward; and the long-term child and family outcomes – how do we know we are improving the lives of family and children?
- Justin White noted that coming to consensus as to the audience and purpose of the data would be helpful.
- Anna Marie Binder stated that she understands the goal to be to centralize the data being collected – to get more providers and caregivers to start reporting into the systems so that we can get better outcome data regarding what our funding and programs are servicing. Anna Marie Binder sees comparable questions across each of the subcommittees and thus suggested pairing up similar questions across subcommittees.
- Karissa Loper asked if the job of the Data & Evaluation Subcommittee is to bring together all of the questions and to then try and pinpoint if anything is missing. Denise Tanata clarified that once the questions we want to answer/data we want to collect has been clarified, the role of the Data & Evaluation Subcommittee is to determine if that data exists, and, if not, to go back to the drawing board and reassess. Denise Tanata also noted that not all HRSA questions need to be addressed. Rather, this document serves as a space in which to determine what questions are out there that need to be answered, what do we have/not have data points for, and where do we want to prioritize and focus.
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye stated that the overlap and alignment part of this process that Anna Maria Binder referred to had not yet been done.
- Anna Maria Binder suggested looking at questions such as (1) What efforts currently support our EC system? (Subcommittee Systems Alignment) + (2) How do you measure what a coordinated system looks like? How many of those pieces are under coordinated leadership structure? (Subcommittee Leadership) + (3) How many decision makers are supportive of a revised structure? What are the key stakeholders that are needed to move this work forward? (Subcommittee Leadership) + (4) What is the process for building the capacity of ECS champions and leaders? (Systems Level Questions, NVSAGA)
- Anna Maria Binder asked Denise Tanata if she has the brainstorming document that was worked on at the July meeting. Amanda Haboush-Deloye clarified if Anna Maria Binder was referring to the Workplan. Anna Maria Binder suggested this may be a good place to look for ~5 minutes. Marty Elquist noted that in the Workplan, a task to identify the research questions, which is this agenda item, was assigned. Marty Elquist then reiterated the following three buckets that need to be looked at: (1) Questions the committees need to know to determine if they are advancing the sections of their workplan, which also feeds into the success of larger the ECAC Strategic Plan; (2) questions around HRSA/SAGA concerning the question of are we moving our system forward?; and (3) the creation of an Early Childhood Integrated Data System – what data fields do we need to ensure that our investments in early childhood are yielding positive advancements in the lives of families and children?
- Matthew Hoffman noted that he agrees with Marty Elquist’s “buckets,” but that her third bucket regarding the Early Childhood Integrated Data System is the ECAC vision and thus, in his opinion, the priority.
- Marty Elquist agreed with Matthew and noted that tasks completed in the other workgroups and the systems-level thinking is more akin to process evaluation or quality improvement of our work to ensure that the plan we put in place is moving forward. In a logic model, this should eventually relate to positive child and family outcomes.
- Matthew Hoffman noted he is trying to match the ECAC vision with his work position.



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

- Anna Marie Binder noted that a lot of these questions are very important on a community-level right now. She brought up the notion of trust and the question of how can we do any of this without families trusting other people with their children?
- Marty Elquist brought Anna Maria Binder's point back to the Community & Engagement subcommittee's question of, "Are families utilizing supports and services?" Marty Elquist connected this to the bigger picture need of having integrated data and that data we need to have integrated depends on the research questions we want to have answered.
- Marty Elquist reiterated that we need to examine what data questions we want to have answered so that we know what fields need to go into that data store or what data stores need to even talk to each other. Marty emphasized that this is the third bucket of process measure – measuring the progress in developing a plan, measuring the progress in developing an early childhood comprehensive system, and then looking at the results (child outcomes) to clarify the question of "Why do we even have an ECAC or Strategic Plan?"
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye suggested that we pick one bucket and start working through the questions. Then, we can connect each bucket of questions together.
- Marty Elquist agreed with Amanda Haboush-Deloye and asked the group if it is okay to move forward with working through each of the previously mentioned buckets.
- Marty Elquist clarified, "Is this workgroup tasked with helping to identify data sources to do the process evaluations for the workgroups?" Denise Tanata responded yes. Amanda Haboush-Deloye asked Denise Tanata to clarify that the questions from each subcommittee are indeed drafts and subject to change. Denise Tanata stated this is correct and suggested that this group start with the vision and long-term outcomes because that is what needs to drive the work of the subcommittees. This may change the questions, data we look at, or work of the subcommittees, but Denise Tanata suggested that we go back to the bucket looking at long-term outcomes of what we want all of this systems-level work to accomplish in the end in an effort to define how we measure progress toward that vision.
- Matthew Hoffman put the following into the chat: "Nevada ECAC vision: 'Nevada's children will be safe, healthy, and thriving during the first eight years of life, and the system will support children and families in achieving their full potential.' In cooperation with the State Board of Education, the Council is responsible for establishing guidelines to measure the school readiness of children."
- Marty Elquist noted that Vitals & DHHS or DFS Data is the first point of contact that struggling families will have with the system. Marty Elquist suggested beginning by talking about the data stores that will need to be incorporated to evaluate this. Amanda Haboush-Deloye recommended going back to Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to look at and to pick the key indicators that will allow us to say we are meeting our vision.
- Marty Elquist noted that first, we need to know how many people are living in the state of NV. Vitals can be used for this.
- Denise Tanata brought the group back to the DGIS Report that HRSA is requesting that asks questions such as "percentage of mothers receiving adequate prenatal care." In keeping with looking at the vision, Denise Tanata noted that we are looking at healthy birth, school readiness, child death rates, cases of abuse and neglect, etc. – pieces of data we can get baseline data on, measure over time, and that aligns. Denise Tanata stated that we need to ask the following: What are the long-term changes, benefits, outcomes, etc., that we want to accomplish for our children and families?
- Marty Elquist agreed with Denise Tanata and noted that she now sees two sub-buckets within her previously mentioned "vision" bucket. Marty Elquist went on to note that we can pull together Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as poverty statistics, maternal health, and access to high-quality care and track these KPIs to determine if Nevada's children are thriving. Plus, we can assess how all of these systems talk to one another and link into a longitudinal key data system to determine what investments are needed to have successful families and children.
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye agreed with Marty Elquist and suggested that we pick one metric or measure to work with to avoid going down a rabbit hole.



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

- Matthew Hoffman agreed with Amanda Haboush-Deloye in further indicating that there needs to be something concrete to work with and/or tangible steps to take, or he will forget everything. Matthew Hoffman noted that there are definitely steps that the Office of Early Learning & Development (OELD) can take. Matthew Hoffman inquired whether or not it would be useful for him and the OELD team to take one of the six questions on page 2 of the research questions document and model steps to take to achieve these goals.
- Rachel Stepina suggested being mindful about how to partner with other partners, especially regarding unique identifiers for students. Rachel Stepina also mentioned that the ECIDS framework needs to be kept in mind in determining which little steps to focus in on, where to act, etc. Rachel Stepina would be happy to share the ECIDS grant project narrative containing questions if that may be helpful to reference as the conversation evolves. Lastly, Rachel wished to emphasize the coordination of our many agencies and departments in attendance here so as to avoid creating more silos while looking for integration.
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye clarified that the idea of having research questions pulled from many different organizations is to make sure we have a comprehensive list in one place – the idea is not necessarily to tackle all of the research questions at once, but to have a plan in which we work together on the same thing.
- Rachel Stepina clarified that she was referring to the previous ECIDS proposal. Amanda Haboush-Deloye emphasized that her goal was to pull research questions from all sorts of places to have this information in one location for easy reference and accessibility.
- Marty Elquist echoed that she hears Matthew Hoffman loud and clear in his request for the group to have clear, actionable items. Marty Elquist suggested identifying a phased approach to this work and then prioritizing what we need to do. Marty Elquist stated that ECIDS is a separate conversation on KPI's regarding how we meet the needs of Nevada's children. Marty noted that, though important, how we are doing in Nevada with our children is different than ECIDS. Another area to prioritize is the evaluation of moving our early childhood system forward (SAGA questions) and the need for evaluating and helping with our subcommittee work going forward. Marty Elquist now sees four buckets that need to be clearly identified so as to be tackled and put in a phased-approach and prioritized. Marty Elquist also noted that there is overlap between the buckets. Marty Elquist further questioned, "What are we tracking with KPIs and what do we need to see on a data dashboard to know that our children are thriving?" Marty Elquist then pointed out that Karissa Loper and her team are working on the data dashboard and suggested this as a starting point.
- Karissa Loper talked about data. Karissa Loper emphasized the importance of the following question: How are we communicating the value of this data that we are asking for from families to the families themselves? Karissa Loper noted that the "Childcare Dashboard," as it is currently referred to by the Office of Analytics, is looking at various factors such as the following: how NV compares nationally; the subsidy program and uptake and use of that; supply and demand of child care itself; access to child care; and facilities childcare cost burden.
- Marty Elquist commended and thanked Karissa Loper for sharing this information.
- Marty Elquist asked if Karissa Loper could provide a list of bullet points to start working with in the KPI bucket (if the committee agrees to tackle the KPI bucket first). Then, the subcommittee could further look and see what other data points are needed to answer/measure the question, "Are our children thriving?"
- Karissa Loper stated that she is indeed able to provide a list of bullet points that are currently being worked on for the Childcare Dashboard.
- Marty Elquist told Karissa Loper that this would be amazing.
- Karissa Loper agreed to get this bullet point list information to Marty Elquist to then get to the entire subcommittee in the next week.
- Denise Tanata noted that as part of what is being done with the HRSA grant, there is a list of indicators that the NV Maternal & Child Health program is working towards. Denise suggested these may be items/data points to look at as well in regard to KPIs.



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

- Before moving on, Marty Elquist asked if everyone in the subcommittee is okay with moving forward with tackling KPIs for Phase 1.
- Denise Tanata will be responsible for adding the indicators from the HRSA Maternal & Child Health Program to the bullet point list that Karissa Loper will send over regarding the Childcare Dashboard. Then, Marty Elquist will send this compiled list to the subcommittee group and members can respond to the question of “What other KPIs do we need to answer the question, ‘Are our children thriving?’” Denise Tanata elaborated that for the Systems Subcommittee, one goal is to figure out what is included with the phrase, “early childhood system” – what are the different agencies and buckets of that system? Thus, it might be helpful to bring that question back within each of those. Denise Tanata further elaborated with the example of DWSS, under the Early Childhood Program that is obviously part of the Early Childhood System, by asking the question, “What are their KPIs? What is it that they are trying to accomplish?” She stated that as we identify the different parts of the system, it is important to identify existing outcomes/KPIs and what they are trying to achieve. Denise Tanata will try to bring the “systems” pieces together to create alignment with different agencies and programs.
- Marty Elquist agreed with Denise Tanata and noted that as the subcommittee goes through the KPIs and puts together that list, it is going to naturally lead into the question of, “What systems need to talk to one another to ensure it feeds into longitudinal data?” Marty Elquist continued by noting the following questions: What do we need to know? What do we need to track? What needs to go into a long-term system so we can evaluate it 20 years down the road and see long-term results? What needs to go into the state longitudinal data system to evaluate results?
- Marty Elquist continued by stating that the subcommittee has next steps for the KPIs. Marty Elquist asked if the subcommittee has any thoughts regarding next steps for the priority in our buckets.
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye suggested that follow-up with the workplans come next to ensure the workgroups are moving in the correct direction. Amanda Haboush-Deloye asked Denise Tanata for her thoughts on this suggestion.
- For the purposes of clarity, Denise Tanata asked the group to define the four buckets.
- Marty Elquist clarified the following buckets:
 - Workgroups – process evaluation on their action plans; how do they know they are being successful in moving their workplans forward?
 - SAGA + The Whole System – process evaluation for the question of “Is our early childhood system coordinated and functioning properly?”
 - Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) – real-time utilization, needs, supply, the bullet points that Karissa Loper discussed; Are families disaggregated by race, ethnicity? Are they accessing the services they need?
 - State Longitudinal Data System (data lives elsewhere) & Integrated Data System (hosts the information) → These two data systems can be two buckets or viewed together.
 - Do systems talk to each other and share data for real-time processing today?
 - Certain fields from our data system go up to a state longitudinal data system so we can see that the investments we make in children are paying off
 - What data fields do we need to go into a state longitudinal data system to measure those long-term outcomes for our children and families?
- Marty Elquist elaborated by providing the following timeline for tackling each bucket:
 - Phase 1: Go through the KPIs & bullet point list. The subcommittee can do this once the bullet points list is received.
 - Phase 2: Answer some of the questions such as “What will we see if we have a comprehensive early childhood system?”
 - Denise Tanata clarified that SAGA is due at the end of October. However, she noted that there are data gaps and questions we cannot answer. Denise Tanata requested that everyone please look at this document and if you have insight as to where the answers for where some of these questions might be,



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

to reach out to her directly. Although some primary data collection may need to be conducted, most data already exists and needs to be found. Denise Tanata suggested that we wait to tackle this until the SAGA piece is done at the end of October

- Marty Elquist inquired as to are these measures something that we come back to, are they functioning?
- Denise Tanata clarified that this phase is more about the following questions: What systems exist? What systems don't exist? To what level? How are we integrated and coordinated with our system? How is this used to inform the work across systems?
- Marty Elquist sees this portion that Denise mentioned as a charge for this committee because it gets into Data Integration and the question of what data is shared with State Longitudinal Data. Marty Elquist also noted that it seems like many of the SAGA questions belong in the systems-group and that we are not capturing a data store.
- Denise Tanata clarified that the intent in putting this together was to identify all of the questions out there that we could potentially answer – these are systems, procedural questions that may not be specific to data.
- Marty Elquist sees the charge for the Data & Evaluation subcommittee as the following: What are our data points to evaluate and monitor if we truly have a comprehensive & high-functioning early childhood system? How do we evaluate a high-functioning early childhood system?
- Denise Tanata noted that the network analysis and policy analysis will help answer these questions previously mentioned by Marty Elquist plus identify if the people are connected to services.
- Phase 3: Tackle the workgroups. The KPIs can tell us what data stores need to talk to each other.
 - Denise Tanata noted that these are not 100% flushed out by the other subcommittees yet. Denise Tanata noted that some of the work of the Data & Evaluation Subcommittee is dependent on the work of the other subcommittees first getting their base foundations together. Year 1 is focused on process – have we aligned? Does everybody have a solid understanding of what we do as an ECAC? With the metric pieces, this focus on process will likely extend into Year 2. Denise Tanata would like to go into year 2 with all of the workplans having very well-defined metrics regarding progress on workplan activities – this is more important than trying to come up with metrics right now.
 - Workplans are important but will not be tackled until the other subcommittees have finalized workplans. Denise Tanata stated that by November, all of the workplans with metrics/what each subcommittee wants to accomplish will be in place.
 - Marty Elquist inquired as to who is responsible for pulling the workplans' metrics and tracking it to say whether or not we are on track. Denise Tanata stated that this will be her role and that she will enlist the help of others.
- Phase 4: Determine what gets fed up to the state longitudinal data system
- Marty Elquist added that the research questions will help inform these steps.
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye suggested that we start with this timeline as a plan and then once we get the notes and have had the chance to sit on the information, maybe something will have come up and adjustments can be made as necessary.

6. Discuss Workplan for Group

(Discussion, For Possible Action)

Marty Elquist Chair

- Marty Elquist pointed out that she has not seen the most updated workplan on the ECAC website.



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

- Amanda Haboush-Deloye noted that the menu has been updated on the ECAC website and suggested that in addition to having a section for the meeting minutes and agenda items, a section for working documents be added for reference.
- Marty Elquist agreed with this change suggested by Amanda Haboush-Deloye.
- Denise Tanata shared the most recent version of the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee Workplan. This needs to be added to the ECAC website.
- Denise Tanata asked if the focus for the rest of the year should be on Objective 5.2 (Increase availability of, access to, and use of data that can be disaggregated to drive informed decision making) because of the time commitment it entails.
- Anna Maria Binder concurred with Denise Tanata that Objective 5.2 be prioritized over other deadlines that were initially identified. Karissa Loper also supported this approach in the spirit of moving forward. Marty Elquist agreed. Denise Tanata asked if there is anyone in disagreement or inquired as to whether anyone had a different perspective they would like to offer.
- Marty Elquist indicated that Objective 5.3 (Implement an Early Childhood Integrated Data System [ECIDS] to improve service delivery) aligns with Phase 4 of the previously discussed timeline for tackling each bucket.
- Denise Tanata asked if the group was okay with adjusting the timeline to move Objective 5.1 to Year 2. Marty Elquist noted this was fine and that the key messages need to be identified after the ECIDS work.
- Denise Tanata asked if any updates were needed elsewhere.
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye noted that her team started an existing data list of both state and federal-level data sources to have as a starter to say where the data is and what types of data exist (can you disaggregate by age, race, county, zip code, etc.). Amanda Haboush-Deloye noted she can share this data list at the next meeting, as there are about 30 sources coming together already.
- Marty Elquist thinks this great and aligns with the KPI list. Marty Elquist asked for this list from Amanda Haboush-Deloye to be summarized with Denise's list + bullet points that Karissa will send to say (1) here are all of the potential KPIs, (2) here is where it is/is not available.
- Denise Tanata noted that, yes, we can cross-reference these different lists. Denise elaborated that even if this list is not complete by the next meeting, we can still share the data list with the group at the next meeting and then cross-reference it with both the list from Karissa Loper and the KPIs.
- Karissa Loper drew the group's attention to the fact that regarding Objective 5.2 and the Data Dictionary (Measures, Who Collects It, Can It Be Shared), the quality of the data entered is very important. She brought up the importance of looking at the barriers to getting quality data & how to tackle these barriers.
- Marty Elquist agrees that we need to add this question regarding barriers to the Data Dictionary.
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye can make a Notes field on the Data Dictionary as information is collected.
- Marty Elquist asked Amanda Haboush-Deloye to add her list of data sources to Karissa Loper's bulleted list and Denise Tanata's list and to add to columns in the Excel file. Amanda Haboush-Deloye noted that she would do this.
- Denise Tanata suggested that this group brainstorm different agencies and programs to reach out to when looking for KPIs. Denise Tanata further suggested going through each agency and bullet pointing the different subgroups within each organization.
 - Nevada Department of Education:
 - Office of Early Learning and Development (OELD) – includes Pre-K, Head Start, Early Head Start, Early Childhood Special Ed, Kindergarten
 - State of Nevada Health and Human Services
 - Nevada Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS)
 - Child welfare and “safety”
 - Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH)
 - Anything health-related, Nevadans experiencing homelessness
 - Nevada Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS)



Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

- Social services support info (TANF, SNAP, Medicaid eligibility, Child Care subsidy eligibility, energy/water assistance), Nevadans experiencing homelessness
- Nevada Division of Health Care Financing and Policy (DHCFP)
 - Medicaid and CHIP (But then DPBH can have some of that info too, like the intersection of CHIP kids getting vaccinated, getting a well-visit, etc.)
- Nevada Aging and Disability Services (ADSD) + Nevada Early Intervention Programs (NEIS)
 - Some intersections for services to children and youth with special health needs (physical and behavioral health)
- Example of data point we may not have:
 - Infant/early childhood mental health
- Amanda Haboush-Deloye can send out NICRP's Data Dictionary next week (will BCC everyone).
- If there are other KPIs from other orgs, send Denise Tanata an email.

7. Discuss Agenda Items for Next Meeting October 20, 2022 1-3pm (Correction: Next Meeting Date is September 15, 2022 1-3 pm)

(Discussion, For Possible Action)

Marty Elquist Chair

- The next scheduled meeting is October 20, 2022, at 1 pm (Correction: the next scheduled meeting is September 15, 2022, at 1 pm)
- What will the focus be at the October meeting?
 - Go through the long list of KPIs.
 - Do not need to touch based on the workplan. Denise Tanata can make updates on the back end as necessary. Denise Tanata suggested leaving it on the agenda in case and we can always table it.
 - For logistics, Amanda Haboush-Deloye clarified if documents to which updates were made today can be sent to her and posted to the ECAC website. Denise Tanata noted she would edit the document and then send it to Amanda Haboush-Deloye.
 - Marty Elquist requested that Denise Tanata provide an update on the workgroups and their workplans, as Phase 2/Bucket 2 entails tackling the workplans. Denise Tanata agreed to this.

8. Public comment #2

- No public comment was provided

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:54 pm