

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Family Support - long term home visitation

**Agency:** Partners in Family Development

**Name of Program:** Parents as Teachers

**Completed By:** Jovanka R. Westbrook **Date:** 7/15/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$260,972.00	ECI grant award		
122	Families	114	Families
1000	Visits	884	Visits
12	Group Parent Ed	33	Group Parent Ed
2.375	FTE Educators	2.375	FTE Educators
0.375	FTE Supervisor	0.375	FTE Supervisor
0.75	FTE Director	0.75	FTE Director
1	Blockfest	1	Blockfest

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

In spite of the challenges noted below, the Program met it's benchmarks for staffing, exceed it's benchmark for group parent education offered; came within 88% of it's benchmark for visits completed and 93% of the benchmark for number of families served. Participating families maintained or improved on the Annual Outcome Measures required by the State in significant numbers. An important benchmark, the percent of new enrolled families meeting eligibility requirements, fell short by one and a half families. The Program has noted and identified the problem and has put into place the procedures that will make certain that this benchmark will be met going forward. The Program has a long history of overall excellence, a commitment to meeting and exceeding benchmarks and continuous quality improvement. We are confident that with the processes that have been put into place that we will continue to provide quality service to all Program stakeholders.

Number of Home Visits By County		Number of New Families Enrolled	
356	Dallas	15	Dallas
150	Madison	11	Madison
378	Warren	13	Warren
<b>884</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>Total</b>

ECI Funding Investments	
\$240,246.58	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>92.1%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other Funding Expended and Source:	
\$3,910.00	Madison County CBCAP Funds
\$9,545.00	Madison County ICAPP Funds
\$0.00	
<b>\$253,701.58</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>
<b>\$286.99</b>	<b>Average cost per visit</b>

## Demographics

Primary Care Givers Marital Status	
77	Married
20	Partnered

15	Single
0	Widowed
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>

1	Divorced
1	Separated

**Household Size**

12	2	21	5
32	3	9	6
38	4	2	greater than 6
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Primary Care Giver Education Level**

1	middle school or lower	4	trade or vocational training
9	some high school	12	2-year college degree
28	high school diploma	36	4-year college degree
2	GED	12	master's degree or higher
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>	10	some college

**Primary Care Giver Race/Ethnicity**

0	Native American or Alaskan Native	2	Asian
1	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	108	White
2	African American	1	Multiracial
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Primary Care Giver Hispanic/Latino**

14	# that are Hispanic/Latino
100	# that are not Hispanic/Latino
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Children with ISFP or IEP**

14	# of children with an ISFP or IEP
154	# of children that do not have an ISFP or IEP
<b>168</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Children with an established biological risk factor (i.e low birth weight, etc)**

6	# of children with a risk factor
162	# of children without a risk factor
<b>168</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Primary language spoken in the home**

97	English	14	Spanish
1	Arabic	0	Chinese
0	French	0	Italian
0	Japanese	0	Korean
0	Polish	0	Russian
0	Tagalog	0	Vietnamese
0	Tribal Language	2	Other
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**First Time Mother**

35	Yes
79	No
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Number of families where one or more of children 0-5 are not living with the parents due to out-of-home placement in the DHS foster care system**

5	Yes
109	No
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>

**One of more care givers are incarcerated**

8	Yes
106	No
<b>114</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Other Care Giver's Education Level**

3	middle school or lower	5	trade or vocational training
7	some high school	7	2-year college degree
15	high school diploma	20	4-year college degree
2	GED	9	master's degree or higher
<b>78</b>	<b>Total</b>	10	some college

**Other Outputs**

<b>39</b>	# of newly enrolled families
<b>28</b>	# of newly enrolled families that met enrollment criteria
<b>32</b>	# of exited families
<b>9</b>	# of children referred to Early Intervention Services
<b>33</b>	# of group-based parent education meetings conducted
<b>26</b>	# of participants that attended group-based parent education meetings
<b>141</b>	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project
<b>8</b>	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project that accepted service
	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project that were already enrolled in your family support program
<b>3</b>	

**Outcomes**

<b>86.0%</b>	home visit completion rate
<b>72.0%</b>	% of families that met enrollment criteria
	% of families that improve or maintain healthy family functioning, problem solving and communication
<b>93%</b>	
<b>89.0%</b>	% of families that increase or maintain social supports
<b>75.0%</b>	% of families that are connected to additional concrete supports
<b>66.0%</b>	% of families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting
<b>50.0%</b>	% of families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children

**Other Comments**

### **Successes**

1. Goal setting has worked well for my families. They are finding it easier to set goals and work toward them. They feel good when they see their goals have been accomplished and this encourages them to set new goals and work step by step to achieve them.
2. We have experienced an increase in referrals from a few agencies in Madison County. Also, a Madison County Mom's Facebook page has spread the word locally about the service that we are able to provide to all families.
3. Strong collaborations have been made with Madison County's Child Abuse Prevention Council and the Perry Child Development Center in Dallas County.

### **Challenges**

1. Making contact and meeting regularly with high needs families.
2. During this program year, a Program Supervisor was hired, two Parent Educators resigned and one Parent Educator was on an extended leave of absence during the second quarter. In spite of these challenges, two new Educators ( one bi-lingual) were hired, trained and began serving families before year-end.
3. Particularly in Madison County, the Program has received referrals and enrollments of families with complex needs and multiple service providers involved. This has required coordination, cooperation, creativity and flexibility. The challenge has been a good learning opportunity for the Educator, community partners and the Program.
4. The Program is required to use three data management systems which presents multiple challenges. Different data is tracked for the Parents as Teachers National Center, our funder and the State. Errors occur due to human error and a misunderstanding of what is being asked, program guidelines and how the data is to be inputted. The learning curve is extremely high for new staff and even seasoned staff stumbles. A great deal of time is spent reviewing data, correcting data and creating procedures to make the processes accurate, coordinated and simpler. This is an on-going challenge and requires diligence and understanding from all sides.

### **Success Story**

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Family Support - Intensive long term home visitation

**Agency:** Lutheran Services in Iowa

**Name of Program:** New Parent Program

**Completed By:** colleen theis **Date:** 7/15/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$125,000.00	ECI grant award		
36	Families	33	Families
648	Visits	352	Visits
4	Group Parent Ed	4	Group Parent Ed
1.8	FTE Family Support	1.8	FTE Family Support Workers
0.5	FTE Supervisor	0.5	FTE Supervisor

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

The New Parent Program was successful in meeting the benchmark for number of group parent Ed. provided. This was completed through the collaboration with the Young Parents program of warren county. The program increased the number of families enrolled into the program from 24 at the half year mark to 33 at year end.

Number of Home Visits By County		Number of New Families Enrolled	
7	Adair	0	Adair
111	Dallas	7	Dallas
78	Madison	0	Madison
156	Warren	6	Warren
<b>352</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>Total</b>

ECI Funding Investments	
\$91,461.33	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>73.2%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other Funding Expended and Source:	
\$8,849.00	DCAT(Madison/warren counties)
\$385.36	Early Childhood Foundation
\$0.00	
<b>\$100,695.69</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>
<b>\$286.07</b>	<b>Average cost per visit</b>

## Demographics

Primary Care Givers Marital Status			
12	Married	14	Partnered
4	Single	1	Divorced
0	Widowed	2	Separated
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Household Size**

5	2	5	5
13	3	3	6
4	4	3	greater than 6
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Primary Care Giver Education Level**

0	middle school or lower	0	trade or vocational training
5	some high school	1	2-year college degree
19	high school diploma	0	4-year college degree
2	GED	0	master's degree or higher
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>	6	some college

**Primary Care Giver Race/Ethnicity**

0	Native American or Alaskan Native	1	Asian
0	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	28	White
4	African American	0	Multiracial
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Primary Care Giver Hispanic/Latino**

4	# that are Hispanic/Latino
29	# that are not Hispanic/Latino
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Children with ISFP or IEP**

1	# of children with an ISFP or IEP
30	# of children that do not have an ISFP or IEP
<b>31</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Children with an established biological risk factor (i.e low birth weight, etc)**

1	# of children with a risk factor
28	# of children without a risk factor
<b>29</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Primary language spoken in the home**

27	English	2	Spanish
3	Arabic	0	Chinese
0	French	0	Italian
0	Japanese	0	Korean
0	Polish	0	Russian
0	Tagalog	0	Vietnamese
0	Tribal Language	1	Other
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>		

### First Time Mother

15	Yes
18	No
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Families where one or more children 0-5 are not living with the parents due to out-of home placement in the DHS foster care system

2	Yes
31	No
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>

### One of more care givers are incarcerated

2	Yes
31	No
<b>33</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Other Care Giver's Education Level

0	middle school or lower	1	trade or vocational training
8	some high school	0	2-year college degree
17	high school diploma	0	4-year college degree
1	GED	0	master's degree or higher
<b>28</b>	<b>Total</b>	1	some college

### Other Outputs

<b>13</b>	# of newly enrolled families
<b>13</b>	# of newly enrolled families that met enrollment criteria
<b>10</b>	# of exited families
<b>9</b>	# of children referred to Early Intervention Services
<b>4</b>	# of group-based parent education meetings conducted
<b>0</b>	# of participants that attended group-based parent education meetings
<b>7</b>	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project
<b>0</b>	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project that accepted service
<b>0</b>	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project that were already enrolled in your family
<b>1</b>	support program

### Outcomes

<b>74.0%</b>	home visit completion rate
<b>100.0%</b>	% of families that met enrollment criteria
<b>86.0%</b>	% of families that improve or maintain healthy family functioning, problem solving and communication
<b>64.0%</b>	% of families that increase or maintain social supports
<b>68.0%</b>	% of families that are connected to additional concrete supports
<b>50.0%</b>	% of families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting
<b>36%</b>	% of families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children

### Other Comments

As of July 14th, the New Parent Program is fully staffed. The recent vacant position has been filled by Stevie Riesburg. She will be attending the week long HFA mandatory core training in Des Moines, in August.

### Successes

The New Parent Program successfully completed the rigorous process of accreditation with the Healthy Families America program. This Accreditation is good through December of 2018. The program has been successful in enrolling 13 new families in programming during the last FY. The program has also participated in collaborative meetings with other programs to increase program model awareness and clarify the referral process.

### Challenges

The program faced the challenge of obtaining qualified staff to fill vacant position. It was the programs original intent to hire Spanish-bilingual staff, to better serve the population in the Perry area. A candidate had been located, but prior to placing offer of employment, this candidates driving history and insurability was in question. The program must ensure that families receive services in their home, requiring valid driver's license and meet insurability requirements. The program adhered to HFA program model standard(s) when selecting staff. The education and past working experience of ensures staff possess characteristics necessary to build trusting, nurturing relationships and work with families with different cultural values and beliefs than their own.

### Success Story

The New Parent Program has been working with Mary, since 2013 when she moved to the area from Waterloo. Mary had been with the local LSI HFA program in the Waterloo area when she learned that there was a HFA program that could work with her when she moved; she asked to be transferred to a worker in Dallas County. Mary has been a very dedicated mother of two; her background includes a past history of abuse when she was a child. Mary is determined to do something different. With the support and encouragement of her family support worker, Mary has set goals to help her son successfully potty train, to have her son be able to identify his numbers and shapes, and for her to continue with her education. Mary has only two semesters left before she graduates from college with her AA degree and in August will be closing on the purchase of her first home. The name has been changed to protect the participant.



## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Family Support - long term home visitation

<b>Agency:</b>	Southerwestern Community College		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Parents as Teachers		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Kristie Nixon	<b>Date:</b>	July 15,2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$75,313.00	ECI grant award		
25	Families	26	Families
340	Visits	335	Visits
12	Group Parent Ed	17	Group Parent Ed
1	FTE Educators	1	FTE Educators
0.07	FTE Supervisor	0.07	FTE Supervisor
0.2	Administrator	0.2	FTE Administrator

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

We met benchmark for number of families served but missed visits benchmark by 5. So close! There were 94 non completed visits for the year.

Number of Home Visits By County	Number of New Families Enrolled
<b>335</b> Adair	<b>9</b> Adair

ECI Funding Investments	
\$72,068.09	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>95.7%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other Funding Expended and Source:	
\$3,320.00	CBCAP
\$7,017.00	ICCAP
\$0.00	
<b>\$82,405.09</b>	Total cost of program
<b>\$245.99</b>	Average cost per visit

## Demographics

Primary Care Givers Marital Status			
12	Married	5	Partnered
5	Single	1	Divorced
0	Widowed	3	Separated
<b>26</b>	Total		

Household Size			
5	2	4	5
7	3	3	6
4	4	3	greater than 6
<b>26</b>	Total		

**Primary Care Giver Education Level**

0	middle school or lower	0	trade or vocational training
4	some high school	7	2-year college degree
7	high school diploma	5	4-year college degree
2	GED	0	master's degree or higher
<b>26</b>	<b>Total</b>	1	some college

**Primary Care Giver Race/Ethnicity**

0	Native American or Alaskan Native	0	Asian
0	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	26	White
0	African American	0	Multiracial
<b>26</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Primary Care Giver Hispanic/Latino**

1	# that are Hispanic/Latino
25	# that are not Hispanic/Latino
<b>26</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Children with ISFP or IEP**

3	# of children with an ISFP or IEP
	# of children that do not have an ISFP or IEP
<b>3</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Children with an established biological risk factor (i.e low birth weight, etc)**

3	# of children with a risk factor
0	# of children without a risk factor
<b>3</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Primary language spoken in the home**

26	English	0	Spanish
0	Arabic	0	Chinese
0	French	0	Italian
0	Japanese	0	Korean
0	Polish	0	Russian
0	Tagalog	0	Vietnamese
0	Tribal Language	0	Other
<b>26</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**First Time Mother**

10	Yes
16	No
<b>26</b>	<b>Total</b>

**One or more of families 0-5 where one or more children 0-5 are not living with the parents due to out-of-home placement in the DHS foster care system**

0	Yes
26	No
<b>26</b>	<b>Total</b>

**One of more care givers are incarcerated**

1	Yes
25	No
<b>26</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Other Care Giver's Education Level**

0	middle school or lower	0	trade or vocational training
5	some high school	1	2-year college degree
2	high school diploma	0	4-year college degree
2	GED	0	master's degree or higher
<b>15</b>	<b>Total</b>	5	some college

**Other Outputs**

<b>9</b>	# of newly enrolled families
<b>9</b>	# of newly enrolled families that met enrollment criteria
<b>8</b>	# of exited families
<b>0</b>	# of children referred to Early Intervention Services
<b>17</b>	# of group-based parent education meetings conducted
<b>27</b>	# of participants that attended group-based parent education meetings
<b>41</b>	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project
<b>5</b>	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project that accepted service
	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project that were already enrolled in your family support program
<b>4</b>	

**Outcomes**

<b>78.0%</b>	home visit completion rate
<b>100.0%</b>	% of families that met enrollment criteria
<b>89.0%</b>	% of families that improve or maintain healthy family functioning, problem solving and
<b>89.0%</b>	% of families that increase or maintain social supports
<b>61.0%</b>	% of families that are connected to additional concrete supports
<b>44</b>	% of families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting
<b>17.0%</b>	% of families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children

**Other Comments**

The last two outcomes data only measures an increase in these areas. The families generally stayed the same. Some were at 5 so there was no increase possible.

### **Successes**

Educator carried a full case load this spring. Educator completed the Iowa Family Support Worker training. Toddlerfest was a success with well over 109 people in attendance and numerous community partners sharing resources with families. Program continued to improve on helping families set goals and work towards achieving those goals set. This was an area we set for improvement this past year after our credentialing visit.

### **Challenges**

Program director retired at end of June. Continuing to schedule and meet with high needs families is a constant battle. There were 94 non-completed visits this past year.

### **Success Story**

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Family Support - long term home visitation

**Agency:** Dallas County Public Health

**Name of Program:** Maternal Child Health

**Completed By:** S. Horak, A. Cochran, S. Hegarty      **Date:** 7/24/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$80,997.00	ECI grant award		
105	Families	101	Families
760	Visits	650	Visits
1.41	FTE Nurse/Social Worker	1.02	FTE Nurse/Social Worker

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

DCPHNS indicated that 1.41 FTE's would be dedicated to this project. This figure included more than just the RN and the Social worker; however this report only allows us to capture their time. Our continuous time study is used to place the numbers in this report; a process that was in place in the past. The remaining FTE are involved in the program but the time spent is not captured in the time study. We will address this in FY16 to ensure all time is captured. All staff originally identified as having a role in the program currently fill their roles in the capacity indicated in our original application. If you have any questions, please let us know and we can discuss how we arrive at the numbers on this report. In FY15, due to changes in program leadership, increased reporting requirements which requires data entry in 3 separate databases, and more time devoted to professional development and interactions with community partners, the MCH nurse dedicated more time to coordinating service than in years past. This has impacted the number of visits she is able to conduct as a part-time employee. This is a permanent change in our program model, and highlights our commitment to on-going quality improvement, whereby our program is evaluated by the quality of our services, and not just the quantity of visits. Next year's visits will be calculated using the guidance from Tool FF, so we will monitor our progress monthly and quarterly to ensure we are meeting our targets. 650 home visits were reported to ECI, but only 576 are reported in REDCap, as until the middle of FY15, we were not reporting Baby Well Visits as part of the mother's record, and we were not reporting Baby Well Visits in REDCap at all. Beginning January 1, 2015, all Baby Well Visits are now reported in REDCap as part of the mother's record. A process is currently being developed to make sure that in future years, these numbers match in the way ECI & RedCap wish them to be reported. 102 Families were served, but only 101 entered into REDCap as 1 potential client was having all of her healthcare needs already met by her provider. This type of situation is reflected in the "Enrolled Families" and "Exited Families" number reported as well, as both numbers reported to ECI are more than what was entered into REDCap. REDCap does not allow us to track evaluation visits, but they are entered into our in house electronic health record.

Number of Home Visits By County	Number of New Families Enrolled
<b>576</b> Dallas	<b>58</b> Dallas

ECI Funding Investments	
\$78,379.20	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>96.8%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

**Other Funding Expended and Source:**

\$6,919.08	DCAT Nest Project
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$85,298.28</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>
<b>\$148.09</b>	<b>Average cost per visit</b>

**Demographics****Primary Care Givers Marital Status**

39	Married	34	Partnered
24	Single	1	Divorced
0	Widowed	3	Separated
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Household Size**

8	2	18	5
32	3	12	6
25	4	6	greater than 6
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Primary Care Giver Education Level**

15	middle school or lower	3	trade or vocational training
26	some high school	1	2-year college degree
26	high school diploma	5	4-year college degree
7	GED	0	master's degree or higher
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>	18	some college

**Primary Care Giver Race/Ethnicity**

1	Native American or Alaskan Native	8	Asian
0	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	86	White
6	African American	0	Multiracial
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Primary Care Giver Hispanic/Latino**

44	# that are Hispanic/Latino
57	# that are not Hispanic/Latino
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Children with ISFP or IEP**

0	# of children with an ISFP or IEP
56	# of children that do not have an ISFP or IEP
<b>56</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Children with an established biological risk factor (i.e low birth weight, etc)**

1	# of children with a risk factor
---	----------------------------------

53	# of children without a risk factor
<b>54</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Primary language spoken in the home

50	English	40	Spanish
6	Arabic	0	Chinese
0	French	0	Italian
0	Japanese	0	Korean
0	Polish	0	Russian
0	Tagalog	1	Vietnamese
0	Tribal Language	4	Other
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>		

### First Time Mother

36	Yes
65	No
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Families with one or more children 0-5 are not living with the parents due to out-of home placement in the DHS foster care system

3	Yes
98	No
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>

### One of more care givers are incarcerated

3	Yes
98	No
<b>101</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Other Care Giver's Education Level

13	middle school or lower	3	trade or vocational training
18	some high school	1	2-year college degree
28	high school diploma	4	4-year college degree
1	GED	0	master's degree or higher
<b>71</b>	<b>Total</b>	3	some college

### Other Outputs

<b>58</b>	# of newly enrolled families
<b>56</b>	# of newly enrolled families that met enrollment criteria
<b>66</b>	# of exited families
<b>1</b>	# of children referred to Early Intervention Services
<b>0</b>	# of group-based parent education meetings
<b>0</b>	# of participants that attended group-based parent education meetings

0	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project
0	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project that accepted service
	# of referrals from Coordinated Intake project that were already enrolled in your family support program
0	

**Outcomes**

91.0%	home visit completion rate
97.0%	% of families that met enrollment criteria
79.0%	% of families that improve or maintain healthy family functioning, problem solving and
89.0%	% of families that increase or maintain social supports
57.0%	% of families that are connected to additional concrete supports
57.0%	% of families that increase knowledge about child development and parenting
38.0%	% of families that improve nurturing and attachment between parents and children

**Other Comments**

The number of children with Risk Factors and IEP/ISFP was off by 2. These records have been found and corrected in REDCap. DCPHNS reported 63 new enrollments to ECI for FY15. This number includes babies born into our program as the Electronic Health Record we use counts new babies as new admissions. The number of families enrolled is 58, which matches what was reported in REDCap. In FY16 we will be counting only new mothers admitted to the program, not their babies. This has been a year full of changes in documentation for our agency. We will continue to collect data in both ways throughout FY16, as stated in our application to ensure that the 4RKids Board understands that the lower numbers do not reflect less work by our agency. We will continue to search for new and meaningful ways to evaluate and represent the success of our program outside of the RedCap database and numerical data. Our short-term home visitation program is important in improving birth outcomes and producing healthy moms and healthy babies; our plan will be to demonstrate this through client and community engagement.

**Successes**

The Dallas County MCH Nest program received funding this year to encourage clients to complete our entire program. We have had success in keeping clients on service for a longer period of time due to this, however, because the program is still in its initial stages, we look forward to reporting the full success of the incentives next year. We have had positive feedback from our clients about information given to them on events and programming in collaboration with our partners, including: Toddler Fest, New Opportunities Family Planning Clinic, and PAT Pre-natal classes. Our Registered Nurse and Licensed Social Worker were able to attend the Association of Maternal and Child Health Professionals National Conference thanks to funding provided over and above our requested budget. The initiation of the Dallas County Nest Program is supported by research that was learned at this conference, especially that young parents are motivated by incentives for a short term program. MCH initiated a three-way collaborative call with our partners, resulting in better communication about referrals to all programs.

**Challenges**

An ongoing challenge we experience is fragmentation across ECI grantees, rather than functioning as a coordinated system. Our Agency hopes to assist in facilitating this coordination across programs through



coordinated system. Our Agency hoped to assist in facilitating this coordination across programs through engaging partners in reviewing aggregate PFS data and doing thoughtful planning on improving outcomes across the service area. However, after convening a call with partners, we learned that other programs do not utilize the PFS survey in the capacity that our program does; thus, we cannot look at data across the region to identify gaps and prioritize strategies for improvement. Nonetheless, our MCH program has examined the factors included in the tool, and will be focusing our program's efforts on improving scores related to concrete supports through connections to community resources and integration with our internal Health Navigation Program. Additionally, our agency continues to build cooperative relationships with New Opportunities with the goal of piloting a billing system as a subcontractor for Title V and ASQ screenings. This pilot is a priority for DCPH; however, obstacles at the state-level, including challenges with documenting in separate electronic databases must first be resolved.

A related challenge is the necessity for our professional staff to document client contacts multiple times in separate databases required by funders. This increased time used to chart equals less time spent in direct client service, which is reflected in the decreased number of client visits made during fiscal year 2015 compared to previous years.

### Success Story

with the ability to speak limited English, was referred through the WIC list. The client was served by DCPH Maternal Child Health during pregnancy, beginning March 2014, with home visits from our nurse and social worker; she was also referred to the LSI New Parent home visitor. Client delivered a baby July 17, and was screened for postpartum depression, with results showing no signs of depression. Client visited the Dallas County Hospital Emergency Department Aug. 16 with what was later identified as postpartum depression, but that evening she was only able to describe her symptoms as “dizzy” due to the fact that she lacked the English vocabulary to describe depression. She was sent home with a script for Meclizine, which is a remedy for vertigo. On Aug. 20, our client’s husband phoned MCH nurse again to report she was feeling “very bad.” Nurse phoned client’s OB, who recommended a visit to Mercy Franklin for psychiatric evaluation, where she was evaluated and discharged the following day.

After numerous visits to the DCH ED and to Mercy Franklin, and continued phone calls and visits from MCH nurse and social worker over a period of 8 weeks, client was found to also have kidney stones, which were then treated. During this time, DCH and MCH social workers together assisted client in getting enrolled in health insurance because the Medicaid she’d had during pregnancy had expired. With client’s husband’s permission, social worker spoke to the chaplain at husband’s employer to explain husband’s high absentee rate during these weeks, and to pastor of their church. Through the connection made by the MCH social worker to the church, an emergency food package was delivered to the client’s home, and volunteers spent time at the client’s home to provide child care for her 2-year-old and infant, and to assist with housework and meals. LSI was alerted to the situation as well. Social workers in DCH and with MCH collaboratively provided support for depression and referred to Genesis for counseling. This has resulted in a number of sessions that have finally begun to treat her post-partum depression appropriately.

Client continued to be monitored by MCH nurse for 2 months after she began therapy for depression and was then client was discharged from MCH services. She has since maintained good mental health. Family is aware

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Child Care Nurse Consultant - Indirect

<b>Agency:</b>	New Opportunities Inc		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Child Care Nurse Consultant serving Dallas County		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Paula Klocke	<b>Date:</b>	7/8/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$34,983.00	ECI grant award		
30	providers served	35	providers served
4	health and safety trainings	7	health and safety trainings
115	onsite visits	95	onsite visits
0.5	FTE qualified CCNC	0.5	FTE qualified CCNC

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

We have made great progress in achieving benchmarks. We served double the number of providers, completed additional trainings, and came very close to achieving the onsite visits benchmark.

ECI Funding Investements	
\$33,461.69	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>95.7%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other funding expended and source:	
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$33,461.69</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>

### Outputs

<b>96</b>	# of visits by a nurse consultant
<b>35</b>	# of programs participating with nurse consultant (unduplicated)

Number of programs participating with		Number of programs by regulation	
7	QRS Level 1	3	Non-registered
9	QRS Level 2	32	DHS Registered
3	QRS Level 3	0	DHS Licensed
9	QRS Level 4	0	DE Regulated/license exempt
4	QRS Level 5	<b>35</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>32</b>	<b>Total</b>		

7	# of health and safety trainings provided
9	# of children with special health care needs
156	# of technical assistance contacts
16	# of early learning programs participating in quality initiative
<b>45.7%</b>	% of programs participating in quality initiative (unduplicated)
<b>\$956.05</b>	Average cost of service

## Outcomes

	# of children with a special health care need who have a care plan at the facility
9	
<b>100%</b>	% of children with special health care needs with a special needs care plan in place at the child care facility (program)
	# of programs that received onsite assessment and consultation that improve health safety conditions in their early learning environments
32	
<b>91%</b>	% of programs receiving onsite assessment and consultation that improve health and safety conditions in their early learning environments
	# of early learning programs that received child care nurse consultation that achieved a level 3, 4, or 5 in the QRS system
16	
<b>46%</b>	% of programs rating a 3 or higher in the QRS system

## Other comments

### Successes

Watching the programs work towards achieving a higher QRS rating is very rewarding. I enjoy providing the trainings and touching base with the providers.

### Challenges

Nothing to report.

### Success Story

Chris has attended CACFP Sign Up Clinic so she can meet and greet providers who are participating in the Food Program. She has worked with CCR&R to get new registered providers and make contact with them. She has also started just making stops at providers houses so she can get her foot in the door. Many times if they can see a face it puts them at ease and are more willing to at least listen to what is offered.

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Child Care Nurse Consultant - Indirect

<b>Agency:</b>	Warren County Health Services		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Child Care Nurse Consultant serving Madison & Warren County		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Shelly Jensen RN BSN	<b>Date:</b>	7/6/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$33,700.00	ECI grant award		
35	providers served	45	providers served
3	health and safety trainings	10	health and safety trainings
100	onsite visits	133	onsite visits
0.4	FTE qualified CCNC	0.4	FTE qualified CCNC

### Comments meeting benchmark targets

All benchmarks met and exceeded.

ECI Funding Investments	
\$33,700.00	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>100.0%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other Funding Expended and Source:	
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$33,700.00</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>

### Outputs

<b>133</b>	# of visits by a nurse consultant
<b>45</b>	# of programs participating with nurse consultant (unduplicated)

Number of programs participating with nurse consultant by QRS category	Number of programs by regulation (should add to be the same as B29)
0 QRS Level 1	1 Non-Registered
9 QRS Level 2	28 DHS Registered
1 QRS Level 3	16 DHS Licensed
12 QRS Level 4	0 DE Regulated/license exempt
3 QRS Level 5	<b>45</b> Total
<b>25</b> Total	

10	# of health and safety trainings provided
4	# of children with special health care needs
140	# of technical assistance contacts
16	# of early learning programs participating in quality initiative (i.e. QRS 3-5, QPPS, National Accreditation, Head Start Standards)
<b>35.6%</b>	% of programs participating in quality initiative (unduplicated)
<b>\$748.89</b>	Average cost of service

## Outcomes

	2	# of children with a special health care need who have a care plan at the facility
<b>50%</b>		% of children with special health care needs with a special needs care plan in place at the child care facility (program)

	35	# of programs that received onsite assessment and consultation that improve health safety conditions in their early learning environments
<b>78%</b>		% of programs receiving onsite assessment and consultation that improve health and safety conditions in their early learning environments

	16	# of early learning programs that received child care nurse consultation that achieved a level 3, 4, or 5 in the QRS system
<b>36%</b>		% of programs rating a 3 or higher in the QRS system

## Other comments

### Successes

A success this year was working with more providers in Madison County-homes and 1 center. It has been challenging in the past to recruit and serve providers in this community.

### Challenges

A challenge this year was not being able to serve core programs that were interested in CCNC services. While some of these programs do have access to a nurse for health consultation; many do not. The nurses that serve these programs also do not have the specialized training of the CCNC and are not able to complete the QRS health and safety tools with the programs.

### Success Story

A center based program removed unnecessary equipment from the playground area that if not removed, could have potentially resulted in child injury. Another program added multiple locks and safety gates that reduced the risk of serious child injury in their indoor child care environment.

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Quality Improvement for Early Learning - Indirect

<b>Agency:</b>	Orchard Place/Child Care Resource and Referral		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Cash incentives for child care providers - serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren County		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Leslie Stonehocker	<b>Date:</b>	7/14/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$6,551.00	ECI grant award		
15 to 20	provider mini grants	9	Provider mini grants

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

Several providers were not able to complete requirements within this current fiscal year. We hope that we'll see them follow through during FY16.

#### ECI Funding Investments

\$4,948.48	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>75.5%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

#### Other Funding Expended and Source:

\$148.84	DHS funds to support professional development opportunity
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$5,097.32</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>
<b>\$566.37</b>	<b>Average cost per participant</b>

**9** # of programs participating in the funded quality improvement activity

#### Number of programs participating in quality initiative by QRS category

0	QRS Level 1
2	QRS Level 2
0	QRS Level 3
0	QRS Level 4
0	QRS Level 5
<b>2</b>	<b>Total</b>

#### Number of programs participating in the quality initiative by category

0	QRS 3, 4, 5
0	IQPPS Verified
0	NAEYC Accredited
0	NAFCC Accredited
0	Head Start Standards
<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Outcomes

<b>0</b>	# of programs participating in the quality improvement activity that improve their rating in one or more of the quality initiatives (as defined by ECI) or that maintain their rating at the highest level in the rating
----------	--

<b>0.0%</b>	% of programs that improve or maintain at the highest level their rating in a quality initiative
0	# of early learning programs that have achieved a level 3, 4, 5 in the QRS system
<b>0.0%</b>	% of programs rating 3 or higher in the QRS system

**Other Comments**

\$1862.84 in professional development funds awarded to support the CCR&R Child Care Consultant Coordinator to attend Child Care Aware of America's Annual Meeting and the National Headstart Association's Annual Conference in Washington, DC.

**Successes**

A total of eleven providers in Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren counties completed a ChildNet series in FY15. Six providers completed the series in Adel last fall, and four of the providers became ChildNet Certified by June 30. One additional provider is currently working on becoming certified while the other provider closed her child care business last fall. For the Indianola session this spring, a total of five providers completed the series and two of the providers have already become ChildNet Certified. Additionally, two more providers just became certified the first week of July, and the child care consultant is currently working with the other provider to become certified by the end of July. This is a huge success rate since completing the ChildNet series requires attending a 10-week training, being 100% compliant on the DHS registration checklist, and being 100% compliant on the ChildNet checklist which includes having liability insurance, being an active participant of the Child and Adult Care Food Program, and having enhanced health and safety policies.

**Challenges**

One of the main challenges we faced this year was time. Since the second ChildNet series didn't end until April 20th (a few classes were cancelled due to weather), that really put a time crunch on the providers and child care consultant to ensure everything was completed by June 30. Becoming ChildNet Certified can be a lengthy process due to completing the ten week series as well as the provider completing action plans in order to be 100% compliant on both the DHS checklist and ChildNet checklist. Also, the motivational level of each provider can vary drastically because some providers are ready to be certified immediately while others take a minimum of 2-3 months upon completion of the series. Moving forward, we have learned to end the series earlier in the spring so we can ensure providers have some time to get everything completed by the end of the fiscal year.

**Success Story**

A success story for this year includes a child care provider who has done non registered care for over twenty years. Just last summer, the provider had a major life change and began to have a different outlook on her child care business. She decided to get registered with DHS, began working with a child care consultant as well as a child care nurse consultant, and enrolled for the Child and Adult Care Food Program. She decided she no longer wanted to be a "babysitter"; instead, she wanted the families and the community to look at her as a professional so that's why she took the necessary steps towards quality improvement. Today this provider is now ChildNet Certified, rated a Level 2 on the QRS, and has a waiting list, which has never happened. One of the provider's goal is to continue to implement quality initiatives in her program which include applying for QRS Level 3 next spring!

**Other Information**

Number of mini grants by County		Amount Expended by County	
1	Adair	\$350.00	Adair
3	Dallas	\$750.00	Dallas
1	Madison	\$350.00	Madison
4	Warren	\$1,400.00	Warren
<b>9</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,850.00</b>	<b>Total</b>

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Professional Development Training - Indirect

**Agency:** Dallas County ISU Extension

**Name of Program:** Quality Improvement Program - Serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren County

**Completed By:** Myra Willms **Date:** 7/8/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$95,848.00	ECI grant award		
45	Trainings	54	Trainings
160	Provider visits	139	Provider visits
425	Parent contacts	655	Parent contacts
1.25	FTE	1.25	FTE

### Comments regarding benchmark targets

Provider visits was lower than anticipated due to the fact that we gave out less mini grants this year and therefore did not make as many visits to providers. The amount of mini grants was lower because we had stricter guidelines and the commitment part of the providers was greater and less providers chose to participate. We were not able to complete all of the follow-up grant visits due to the late in the year distribution of funds which delayed the providers spending funds, collecting receipts and doing the follow-up paperwork needed for finalizing the grant with staff. We will continue to do the visits throughout the remainder of the summer.

### ECI Funding Investments

\$89,525.12	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>93.4%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

### Other Funding Expended and Source:

\$2,485.00	ISU Extension and Outreach
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$92,010.12</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>

**54** # of trainings

### Number of trainings that best fit each of the following categories

22	early learning programs
8	family support
5	special needs
19	health, mental health, nutrition
<b>54</b>	<b>Total</b>

## Outcomes

### % of traings that best fit following categories

<b>41%</b>	% early programs
<b>15%</b>	% family support
<b>9%</b>	% special needs
<b>35%</b>	% health, mental health, nutrition
<b>\$1,703.89</b>	Cost per training



**Other Comments**

We were able to provide 156 contact hours of training through classes this fiscal year. This is more than in years past. The length of classes and also the availability of online training contributed to this. I started a director's support group this year in Dallas County. This provided administrative and leadership training to center and preschool directors. Meetings were held once a month. They were publicized and open to all directors from all four counties and held in Waukee. The groups were sometimes small, but successful and beneficial for those who attended. The evaluation and consensus at the end of the year was that we will continue the group and have discussions using the Director's Toolbox which is a Management Series for Early Childhood Administration.

**Successes**

Training classes for the year went very well. Especially in the Spring, as we had full attendance at most of our classes with a waiting list. Our attendance ratio vs enrollment was at 89%. This is our all time high. We had 374 unduplicated participants with 263 coming from the 4Rkids ECI area and 111 from other counties. That is 70% from 4Rkids. 253 of those participants work in child care centers or preschools and 121 in child development homes. We were also able to provide scholarships to providers for 14 online classes, using the additional funding dollars granted this year. I was able to attend a National Leadership Conference in Illinois with extra granted professional development funds which gave me valuable insight to what is needed in our state to continue to move providers to higher quality and participation in the Quality Rating Improvement System. We had 29 providers in our four counties take the Environmental Rating Scale class this last year in order to participate in the mini grants. This helped several programs move into participating in a quality initiative. Some programs had more than one staff member attend which speaks well for their program, that they are investing their time and efforts to increase the understanding and use of the scale when evaluating their program to set goals.

**Challenges**

The attendance at classes in Madison County was low this year, with us having to cancell one class in the fall due to lack of participation. One of the classes held had 5 in attendance with none of the participants residing in Madison County. For other classes, we made an effort to recruit local providers. I have made contact with a center director in the county to find out the training needs of the staff and will make efforts to match those needs. I will also work on other ways to increase interest in classes held within the county.

**Success Story**

We have a child care center in Madison County who did not readily participate in our programming until this last year. They are now attending some of our trainings, received a rating in the states' QRS, participating in our quality improvement grants, asking questions and checking our resources through technical assistance, have evluated their program and have set some goals to move forward in quality. The director seems to respond favorably to taking suggestions and implementing best practice to make her program better.

**Other Information**

# of Face to Face Contacts by County		# of Parent Contacts by County	
7	Adair	8	Adair
40	Dallas	220	Dallas
30	Madison	82	Madison
62	Warren	345	Warren
<b>139</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>Total</b>

**# of Trainings Conducted by County**

9	Adair
21	Dallas

4	Madison
20	Warren
<b>54</b>	<b>Total</b>

**# of Participants Served Through Training by County**

47	Adair
261	Dallas
29	Madison
242	Warren
93	Polk
93	Other
<b>765</b>	<b>Total</b>

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Quality Improvement for Early Learning - Indirect

<b>Agency:</b>	Dallas County ISU Extension		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Incentives for child care providers - serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Myra Willms	<b>Date:</b>	7/8/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed
\$24,951.20	ECI grant award	
10 to 15	provider mini grants	13 Provider mini grants

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

We were able to meet our specified benchmark this year. The total mini grants were down this year due to a new set of guidelines for providers. We asked providers to complete a self assessment using the Environmental Rating Scale. This was more time consuming and investive on the part of the provider. Several providers who participated in the past, choose not to participate this year. Providers were asked to complete an ERS class if they had not in the past and till designate thier need of items as recommended in the ERS to increase the rating of the quality of thier program. They were required to set goals to move towards a higher standard of quality. Grant dollars were distributed more on need and less on giving everyone the same.

ECI Funding Investments	
\$25,611.18	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>102.6%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other Funding Expended and Source:	
\$118,373.81	United Way of Central Iowa
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$143,984.99</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>

56 # of programs participating in the funded quality improvement activity

#### Number of programs participating in quality initiative by QRS category

0	QRS Level 1
12	QRS Level 2
4	QRS Level 3
17	QRS Level 4
6	QRS Level 5
<b>39</b>	<b>Total</b>

#### Number of programs participating in the quality initiative by category

27	QRS 3, 4, 5
6	IQPPS Verified
1	NAEYC Accredited
0	NAFCC Accredited
0	Head Start Standards
<b>34</b>	<b>Total</b>

## Outcomes

	# of programs participating in the quality improvement activity that improve their rating in one or more of the quality initiatives (as defined by ECI) or that maintain their rating at the highest level in the rating
<b>34</b>	
<b>60.7%</b>	% of programs that improve or maintain at the highest level their rating in a quality initiative
27	# of early learning programs that have achieved a level 3, 4, 5 in the QRS system
<b>48.2%</b>	% of programs rating 3 or higher in the QRS system

## Other Comments

We did overspend in the ECI mini grants by 625.58 due to a miscalculation on our part of the administrative fee. After speaking with the ECI Executive Director, we agreed to use funds from our training budget to cover the difference. We did this because some providers had already been notified of their award amounts before I found the error.

## Successes

We saw a greater amount of commitment on the part of providers participating in the grants when they had to take a look at their program and self assess their level of quality and see where they were lacking in the scale of environmental quality. Using a research based tool, and previous training in that tool, emphasized what is important to provide for best practice in the care of children. When providers could see where they were at and what they needed to attain higher levels of the scale, they could set achievable goals and gain confidence in their practice. This process gave some providers the confidence that they could reach the goal of 5 in the QRS.

## Challenges

Grant funds were distributed to providers in round 2 of the process later this year due to cash flow restraints. This slowed down our timeline for providers to get purchases made, receipts together, paperwork completed and ready for their second visit. Two preschool programs closed down for the summer before we could complete the process. We will complete all visits, but they will be after fiscal year end. We know that the process is ongoing and we want providers to continue working on improvements all year, so we will continue working as needed.

## Success Story

This year's grants were based on environments. One large center in Dallas County was able to reach their level 5 in the QRS after filing out an assessment on each of their classrooms and able to get items for each class. They were so very thankful for the guidance and assistance to reach their goal. They celebrated with all the staff using the stipend from DHS for their level 5 for teacher rewards and investment.

## Other Information

Number of mini grants by County		Amount Expended by County	
4	Adair	\$6,900.00	Adair
18	Dallas	\$48,100.00	Dallas
9	Madison	\$17,376.00	Madison
28	Warren	\$65,100.00	Warren
<b>59</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$137,476.00</b>	<b>Total</b>

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Coordinated Intake - Indirect

<b>Agency:</b>	Dallas County ISU Extension		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Coordinated intake for family support programs serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren County		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Val Cameron	<b>Date:</b>	7/21/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$10,923.00	ECI grant award		
40 to 60	families that enroll in a family support program	24	families that enroll in a family support program

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

The benchmarks were not met due to the lower number of scholarships for the 2014-2015 school year.

ECI Funding Investments	
\$10,157.66	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>93.0%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other Funding Expended and Source:	
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$10,157.66</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>

<b>198</b>	# of intakes processed
<b>198</b>	# of families served
<b>24</b>	# of families that received a referral and enrolled in a local program
<b>174</b>	# of families that received a referral and did not enroll in a local program

### Outcomes

<b>\$51.30</b>	Cost per intake
<b>12.1%</b>	% of families that received a referral that enrolled in a local program
<b>87.9%</b>	% of families that received a referral that did not enroll in a local program

### Other Comments

It is a new program that will continue to get better. Families are already so overscheduled that adding another thing to their busy schedules can prove challenging.

### Successes

Adair County reached several families that likely would not have known about the service.

### Challenges

Programs having waiting lists and unable to provide services to families. The time it takes to follow-up with families.

## Success Story

This family was referred to SWCC PAT from Coordinated Intake. A single dad w/ one 4 year old child. The parent was somewhat hesitant and would only agree to once a month visits and was just going to "try the program out" for a little while and see if he wanted to continue. The parent has kept all but one of his scheduled visits since enrolling in October 2014. This parent has a full time job-overnights, is trying to buy his home, recently went through DHS/legal issues w/ the child's biological mother and is just trying to be the best dad that he can for his son. The parent has several things he wants to do to improve himself, in an effort to be a better role model and parent for his son. He recently decided he wants to quit smoking, and find better ways to deal with his personal stress and frustration so that it doesn't surface when trying to manage his son. The dad has been through some rough things in the last few years and he is truly trying to do his best and finding ways to improve for both of them!

## Other Information

# of Families Referred by County		# of Families Accepting Service by County	
45	SWCC - PAT	8	Adair
141	PFD - PAT	8	Dallas
7	LSI - New Parent Program	1	Madison
5	DCPH - MCH	7	Warren
0	Other	0	Other
<b>198</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>Total</b>

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Preschool Coordination - Indirect

<b>Agency:</b>	Dallas County ISU Extension		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Preschool Enrichment Program - Serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Val Cameron	<b>Date:</b>	July 13,2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$44,790.00	ECI grant award		
85	Visits	97	Visits
35	Preschools	25	Preschools
1	Complete Preschool Map	1	Complete Preschool Map
1.25	FTE	1.25	FTE

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

Visits exceeded benchmarks because of requirement of mini grants grants and new director needs. Participating preschools were down which coincided with the number of scholarships.

### ECI Funding Investments

\$44,790.01	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>100.0%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

### Other Funding Expended and Source:

\$0.00	
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$44,790.01</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>

**206** # of tuition assistance applications completed

**24** # of programs in which children received direct tuition assistance

### Number of programs in which children received direct tuition assistance at each of the following levels

<b>2</b>	QRS Level 3
<b>8</b>	QRS Level 4
<b>6</b>	QRS Level 5
<b>16</b>	<b>Total</b>

**172** # of children that received tuition assistance to an early learning enviroment

**34** # of tuition assistance applications that were turned down

## Outcomes

<b>\$217.43</b>	Cost per application
<b>83.5%</b>	% of children applying for preschool scholarship who actually receive the scholarship
<b>66.7%</b>	% of programs rating a 3 or higher in the QRS system
<b>16.5%</b>	% of children applying for the scholarship that did not receive it because of:(list reasons below) (16) over-income (13)eligible for other (1)preschool didn't meet criteria (4) other reason

## Other Comments

2 programs increased their rating in the QRS. We have a level 5 now in the Waukee area which is also a first.

## Successes

School districts are adding 4 R Kids tuition information to their websites. Families are returning that have participated in the past with now another child.

## Challenges

We lost a number of families in Earlham due to Voluntary Preschool funding which also affected a childcare center's enrollment. The number of families attending an out of area preschool that is unaware of funding.

## Success Story

2 out of 4 programs received Shared Vision funding that applied. 1 program will now be able to utilize ECI funding.



## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: **Preschool Dental Screenings - Direct**

<b>Agency:</b>	Dallas County ISU Extension (with subcontracts)		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Preschool Enrichment Program - Serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren County		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Val Cameron	<b>Date:</b>	7/15/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$11,000.00	ECI grant award		
450	Dental Screenings	494	Dental Screenings

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

# of screenings exceeded benchmarks. # of children who went to dentist after screenings is done.

ECI Funding Investments	
\$9,611.70	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>87.4%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other Funding Expended and Source:	
\$6,598.89	T19
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$16,210.59</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>
<b>\$32.81</b>	<b>Average cost per dental screening</b>
Age of Children Served	
<b>0</b>	Age Prenatal
<b>0</b>	Ages 0-1
<b>0</b>	Ages 1-2
<b>0</b>	Ages 2-3
<b>274</b>	Ages 3-4
<b>220</b>	Ages 4-5
<b>494</b>	<b>Total children served</b>

<b>494</b>	# of children who were screened
<b>22</b>	# of children screened that were referred for follow up services
<b>8</b>	# of children who went to a dentist after a dental screening identified the need for additional treatment
<b>472</b>	# of children who did not have any untreated cavities

### Outcomes

<b>\$32.81</b>	Cost per child
<b>100%</b>	% of children screened for dental decay
<b>4.5%</b>	% screened that were referred for the service/treatment
<b>36.4%</b>	% of children who need dental treatment that went to a dentist
<b>95.5%</b>	% of children that are cavity free

### Other Comments

### Successes

There was a higher percentage of consent forms returned this year compared to last year.

### Challenges

This year went really well. Our only challenge was getting a late start making it difficult to return 6 months later. It was coming down to field trip days and end of the year events which made it difficult to find open days. The children that needed follow-up dental care into a dentist to get treatment completed.

### Success Story

"Amy- Seriously though, thank you so much for all your efforts to get these wonderful services provided to our school. I know there is a lot of leg work behind all of this and I truly appreciate it. So I am proud when the district families feel comfortable accepting and utilizing this wonderful service. It show great support of what you try to do. I will always be a cheerleader for you services, if ever I am asked." -School Nurse

A success story that-we had was a preschooler from I-35 presented for our Fall screening with severe decay. She had never been to the dentist. Before I even looked in her mouth, you could tell she did not feel well as she looked tired, dark areas under her eyes, and a look in her eyes I cannot even explain. As I looked in her mouth, nearly every tooth appeared to have some type of suspected decay and many with black and dark holes. My eyes welted up as i finished the screening, I asked if her teeth ever hurt and she said "sometimes." I told her I would call her mom and we would ger her to the dentist right away. I reviewed her consent form as i was about to call mom. I ask if there are any barriers to getting your child to the dentist, and mom states they have not had a vehicle for nearly a year and they find it hard to get to the dentist. Mom states that child started with one small cavity and she tried to find a dentist that would see her with Medicaid insurance but no one would take her. She stated "she felt bad for her but I don't know what to do and I have not had a car for a year." I called mom as soon as I was done with all my screenings and spoke to mom. I was able to get her an appointment scheduled for the next day. She was able to get a ride from her uncle to get to the appointment. Treatment was completed with extractions and crowns and fillings to remove the decay. I am happy to say when I came back this Spring she was a totally different little girl. Her face was bright and you could tell she felt better. Even her teachers said they noticed a difference after her decay was treated! Without the help of ECI, this child may still be suffering!

### Other Information

# Children Served by County		Funds Expended by County	
74	Adair	\$1,680.00	Adair
135	Dallas	\$3,606.37	Dallas
159	Madison	\$2,016.44	Madison
126	Warren	\$1,807.89	Warren
<b>494</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,110.70</b>	<b>Total</b>

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Preschool Scholarship - Direct

<b>Agency:</b>	Dallas County ISU Extension (with subcontracts to preschools)		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Preschool Tuition Scholarships - Serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren County		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Val Cameron	<b>Date:</b>	7/15/2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$160,000.00	ECI grant award		
185	Preschool scholarships	172	Preschool scholarships
35	Preschools served	24	Preschools served

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

The number of recipients and programs were down this year for the first time since the merger.

### ECI Funding Investments

\$130,624.07	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>81.6%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

### Other Funding Expended and Source:

\$0.00	
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$130,624.07</b>	Total cost of program
<b>\$759.44</b>	Average cost per child served with a scholarship

## Demographics

### Age of children served (as of September 15th)

0	Age 0-1 year	100	Age 3-4 years
0	Age 1-2 years	70	Age 4-5 years
0	Age 2-3 years	2	Age 5-6 years
<b>172</b>	<b>Total Children Served</b>		

### Marital Status of Head of Household

108	Married	4	Partnered
33	Single	13	Divorced
0	Widowed	14	Separated
<b>172</b>	<b>Total</b>		

### Household Size

20	2	25	5
50	3	0	6
72	4	5	greater than 6
<b>172</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Federal Poverty Level**

94	100% or below	26	201-299%
27	101-150%	0	300% or greater
25	151-200%		
<b>172</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Education Level of Head of Household**

	middle school or lower	17	trade or vocational training
2	some high school	25	2-year college degree
79	high school diploma	33	4-year college degree
8	GED	8	master's degree or higher
<b>172</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Race/Ethnicity Head of Household**

0	Native American or Alaskan Native	2	Asian
0	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	156	White
3	African American		
<b>161</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Hispanic/Latino**

11	# that are Hispanic/Latino
161	# that are not Hispanic/Latino
<b>172</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Meeting Quality Initiative**

3	NAEYC Accredited	2	QRS Level 3
0	NAFCC Accredited	8	QRS Level 4
0	Head Start	6	QRS Level 5
5	IQPPS Verified		
<b>24</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**Education Level of Lead Teacher(s)**

0	GED
2	high school diploma
1	CDA
3	AA in early childhood or child development
0	AA in related field
16	BA/BS in early childhood or child development
1	holds teaching license with Early Childhood endorsement
1	post graduate degree
<b>24</b>	<b>Total</b>

**Outputs**

<b>172</b>	# of total children served (# from demographics)
<b>24</b>	# of preschool programs in which children received a scholarship

<b>172</b>	# of children screened for developmental delays
<b>11</b>	# of children screened that were referred for follow up services
<b>161</b>	# of children demonstrating age appropriate skills
<b>16</b>	# of early learning programs that have achieved a QRS Level, 3, 4, or 5 (from demographics)

### Outcomes

<b>100.0%</b>	% of children screened for developmental delays
<b>6.4%</b>	% screened that were referred for additional services/treatment
<b>\$183.75</b>	Cost Per child
<b>93.6%</b>	% of children demonstrating age appropriate skills as measured by: indicate the tool(s) utilized GOLD
<b>66.7%</b>	% of programs rating a 3 or higher in the QRS system

### Other Information

# of Children By County	# of Families by County
-------------------------	-------------------------

28	Adair	27	Adair
68	Dallas	65	Dallas
28	Madison	26	Madison
48	Warren	45	Warren
<b>172</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>Total</b>

# of Preschool Programs by County	Funds Expended by County
-----------------------------------	--------------------------

4	Adair	\$17,142.00	Adair
9	Dallas	\$47,326.95	Dallas
4	Madison	\$18,195.00	Madison
7	Warren	\$41,150.33	Warren
<b>24</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$123,814.28</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Other Comments

It was interesting to look at the different demographics that were required this year. Families with education are struggling. The majority receiving assistance are from 2-parent homes.

### Successes

A better recordkeeping system was established to track the additional demographic reporting requirements.

### Challenges

Families struggle with transportation and wrap-around care. Dallas County continues to grow which makes it a challenge to find all the programs that are eligible for services.

### Success Story

A family with high medical bills because of a special needs child was able to receive funding that allowed the sibling to attend a high quality early childhood program.

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

Program service type as defined by ECI: Quality Improvement for Early Learning - Indirect

<b>Agency:</b>	Dallas County ISU Extension		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Quality Improvement Mini Grants for preschools - serving Adair, Dallas, Madison, and Warren County		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Val Cameron	<b>Date:</b>	July 15,2015

Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award		Year To Date Completed	
\$20,000.00	ECI grant award		
13	preschool mini grants	15	Preschool mini grants

### Comments regarding meeting benchmark targets

The amount expended exceeded the amount funded. The flexibility of the project allowed tuition dollars to be moved to accommodate the requests that were made.

ECI funding Investments	
\$26,375.00	4 R Kids ECI funds expended
<b>131.9%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

Other Funding Expended and Source:	
\$7,200.00	UNITED WAY
\$0.00	
\$0.00	
<b>\$33,575.00</b>	<b>Total cost of program</b>
<b>\$2,238.33</b>	<b>Average cost per mini grant</b>

**15** # of programs participating in the funded quality improvement activity

### Number of programs participating in quality initiative by QRS category

0	QRS Level 1
0	QRS Level 2
2	QRS Level 3
5	QRS Level 4
5	QRS Level 5
<b>12</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Number of programs participating in the quality initiative by category

12	QRS 3, 4, 5
2	IQPPS Verified
1	NAEYC Accredited
0	NAFCC Accredited
0	Head Start Standards
<b>15</b>	<b>Total</b>

## Outcomes

	15	# of programs participating in the quality improvement activity that improve their rating in one or more of the quality initiatives (as defined by ECI) or that maintain their rating at the highest level in the rating
	<b>100.0%</b>	% of programs that improve or maintain at the highest level their rating in a quality initiative
	12	# of early learning programs that have achieved a level 3, 4, 5 in the QRS system
	<b>80.0%</b>	% of programs rating 3 or higher in the QRS system

## Other Comments

Programs were very grateful for the opportunity to purchase new items for their classrooms. By using the ECERS tool, they were able to look closer at their improvement needs.

## Successes

A Waukee program was able to achieve a QRS 5 rating due to the grant. Items purchased were science items, sensory, and multicultural things for dramatic play areas. Blocks, bins, and accesories such as animals, people and road signs. Handwashing timers were another popular item that programs purchased.

## Challenges

Core programs were unable to participate with the improvement grants.

## Success Story

A program was able to improve in the technology area for their 3 year olds. Ipads were purchased to enrich their curriculum , as well as, improve their eye-hand coordination.

## Other Information

### Number of Preschools Served By County

5	Adair
10	Dallas
4	Madison
8	Warren
<b>27</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Number of Mini Grants by County

2	Adair
7	Dallas
1	Madison
5	Warren
<b>15</b>	<b>Total</b>

### Funding Expended By County

\$2,500.00	Adair
\$11,300.00	Dallas
\$1,200.00	Madison
\$10,000.00	Warren
<b>\$25,000.00</b>	<b>Total</b>

## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

### ECI Director

<b>Agency:</b>	Central Iowa Juvenile Detention Center/Debra Schrader		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	ECI Executive Director		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Debra Schrader	<b>Date:</b>	7/1/2015

### Benchmark Targets and ECI Grant Award

\$76,165.00	ECI allocation for Salary and Benefits
\$12,600.00	ECI allocation for director expenses

### ECI funding Investments

\$76,162.80	4 R Kids ECI funds expended for Salary and Benefits
<b>100.0%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended
\$10,799.86	4 R Kids ECI Funds expended for expenses
<b>85.7%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended

### Outputs

200	# of payment vouchers processed
10	# of contracts monitored
2	# of state wide ECI Director meetings attended
73	# of community collaboration meeting convened
91	# of community collaboration meeting attended not hosted by ECI
71.5	# of professional development hours
274	# of community partners that receive regular communication
4	# of newsletters completed
187.7	# of vacation hours accumulated
362	# of sick leave hours accumulated
13513	# of miles driven

### Other Comments

During the fiscal year I assisted Adair and Dallas County prevent child abuse councils with submittal of their grants. While I did not help write grants for all 4 Councils, all four councils recieved funding for the next 3 years.

I also assisted the Boone/Dallas DCAT and CPPC project with submittal of the CBCAP grant.

### Successes

Securing increases in Child Abuse Prevention funding for all four county's.

### Challenges

Balancing my time and trying to provide as much TA as possible to those in need, even though sometimes its not an ECI question.



## FY2015 4 R Kids ECI Area Report

### Board Administrative Expenses

<b>Agency:</b>	Central Iowa Juvenile Detention Center		
<b>Name of Program:</b>	Board administrative expenses		
<b>Completed By:</b>	Debra Schrader	<b>Date:</b>	7/6/2015

### Allocation for Administrative Expenses

\$19,785.00	ECI allocation for administrative board expenses
-------------	--

### ECI funding Investments

\$16,565.32	4 R Kids ECI funds expended for board amin
-------------	--

<b>83.7%</b>	% of 4 R Kids ECI funds expended
--------------	----------------------------------

### Expended by category

\$10,000.00	expended on fiscal agent fees
\$1,533.00	expended on board liability insurance
\$846.46	expended on fiscal audit fees
\$1,399.80	expended on copies
\$1,786.73	expended on event sponsorship
\$572.43	expended on marketing
\$426.90	expended on misc

<b>\$16,565.32</b>	<b>Total expended</b>
--------------------	-----------------------

### Outputs

<b>90</b>	# of volunteer hours provided by board members
<b>6</b>	# of board meetings that meet quorum
<b>6293</b>	# of website hits
<b>101</b>	# of Facebook likes
<b>7</b>	# of presentations provided by programs for professional development
<b>5</b>	# of community events participated in
<b>4</b>	# of community outreach activities (presentations, etc)

### Other Comments

5 Community events consisted of a Toddlerfest in each county and supporting the Fontanelle Parade which impacted 953 participants.

4 Community outreach activities consisted of the 4th Annual Appreciation Reception, Back to School Health Fair in Winterset, Presentation at the Dallas County Human Services Coalition, and Resource Fair at the Boone/Dallas Mental Health Conference which impacted a total of 231 participants.

### Successes

Secured a meeting with the Lt. Governor to review the challenges of ECI.

The Facebook page met the goal of 100 likes for the first year.

Quorum was met 100% of all board meetings held (6 of 6).

### Challenges

Obtaining gender balance on the board.

Affecting policy change at the state level.

Engaging policy makers.