EARLY CHILDHOOD COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES

Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Prepared by Greg Bloom, Vesla Tonnessen, and Rachel Hall

washingtoncfc.org

2022

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Table of Contents

Live document replicated on 8/18/22

Introduction:

Washington Communities for Children (WCFC) is a network of coalitions dedicated to improving the wellbeing of children, families, and communities. There are 10 WCFC Regions across the state who bring together community resources, regional expertise, and robust cross-sector relationships to improve systems and achieve measurable results. Six state teams, called Learning Networks, meet regularly to build relationships, learn together, identify challenges, and test ideas. This framework is paralleled in all WCFC Regions, and in many counties, to ensure connectivity within and across early childhood systems.

WCFC received a sub-grant through the Washington State Department of Health's Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (ECCS) program to develop strategies to identify local and culturally appropriate services, and update resource and referral directories. Between January and July 2022, WCFC, in partnership with Open Referral, convened a Resource Directory Strategy Pilot, including a cohort of five WCFC Regions, serving small rural populations and families with children 0-3. The cohort explored and assessed options for the establishment of a supply of localized, sustainable resource directory information, for the purpose of building capacities for coordination of care across sectors and technologies, and to inform a more cohesive statewide system of resources for children, their families, and service organizations.

This report summarizes the findings of the initial process of discovery and deliberation within and among each of our cohort members' coalitions. It also presents a set of recommendations for future development. The appendices collect a set of strategic briefs from each cohort member, and a set of collateral materials that reflect policies and project charters from these emergent initiatives.

Problem summary

For any initiative to support children and families – and to improve the health and well-being of our communities at large – it is critical to have reliable access to comprehensive information about the availability of health, human, and social services. However, this information changes all the time, and is typically maintained *ad hoc* in redundant, fragmented, incompatible silos.

Among the Early Childhood Coalitions in Washington State, every community has experience developing and/or using community resource directories; whether through call centers, web platforms, or Word documents maintained on a desktop. However, these have all previously been developed in isolation, or even in competition with each other. With each new effort to collect this information, providers become more overwhelmed and less likely to spend time providing their own information to any given third party. We know that one system is unlikely to meet all needs – our communities are diverse, and many of the services that can help children and families also are a part of other networks that share our goals but have unique requirements. We need the capacities to cooperate among organizations, and to develop sustainable means of producing resource data that can be shared across systems.

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Our prompting questions:

What are the unmet needs in our community? Both with regards specifically to information about children and families, and the broader domain of relevant services?

What assets already exist in a community with regards to management of resource directory information? How can these assets be most effectively and equitably leveraged?

What lessons have community stakeholders learned from past and current efforts to maintain or procure resource directory information?

What are the values that nourish the culture of our community of stakeholders, and what are the principles that should guide our work?

Where should we start with any new initiatives to improve the local, regional, and state supply chains for resource data?

How might local resource directory information initiatives align with regional and statewide systems such as 2-1-1, WithinReach, prospective community information exchanges, and etc?

Methodology

Between January and July 2022, WCFC convened a Resource Directory Strategy Pilot, including a cohort of five WCFC Regions, serving small rural populations and families with children 0-3. These communities worked with Open Referral to explore and assess options for creating and maintaining localized resource directory information. The cohort was joined by a project mentor, Vesla Tonnessen of the Whatcom Early Learning Alliance, and steering committee member on the emerging Whatcom Resource Information Collaborative (WRIC).

As a collective, the cohort affirmed a project scope, set objectives, and reviewed progress; the project facilitator and mentor met one-on-one with each cohort member's leadership to support them through their own process of discovery and deliberation in dialogue with stakeholders in their local communities. Several cohort members concurrently conducted "asset mapping" exercises in partnership with WithinReach, assessing and improving the availability of information about local, culturally appropriate services in the statewide partner's website and Help Me Grow call center network. This process converged in the drafting of a strategic summary memo authored by each respective cohort leader. These memos (see appendix) will be circulated among stakeholders and may serve as a precursor to a project charter in the next iteration of the WCFC-ECCS initiative.

Findings:

Summary of cohort's findings, with a mix of general themes and specific callouts.

Assets

In most instances, cohort members found a range of already-existing sources of resource directory information. While none of these sources of information entirely meets the needs of their community, there is interest in building upon these assets rather than launching a new initiative that would compete with them.

In general, the Early Childhood Coalitions expressed interest in finding cooperative solutions that could align efforts that have been previously siloed, especially among an array of early childhood information management systems that are already in use within their communities. Holistic strategies will work with these systems to integrate and improve them.

A significant amount of expert knowledge is held informally by key stakeholders (public health nurses, community health navigators, etc.) in the Regional coalitions. Solutions should build upon this wealth of knowledge – rather than attempt to render local knowledge unnecessary.

For example, some Early Childhood Coalition leaders already maintain – or partner with government agencies that maintain – information about services for children and youth with special health care needs (CYSHCN). This subdomain of services may pose a strategic starting point for pilot projects to upgrade information infrastructure.

Statewide partners like WithinReach and 2-1-1 Washington have infrastructure for information management and referral, though stakeholders engaged in our process have the impression that these systems lack detailed information about many important local services, especially in rural areas. However, we also heard strong interest among stakeholders in the prospect of developing new partnership models that might prove mutually beneficial, such as exchange of information about local services maintained by local partners for statewide services maintained by statewide partners.

Overall, the WCFC initiative – including its learning networks and its support for local programming – is considered a valuable set of assets for the coalitions and their partners. Resource directory information initiatives should leverage these assets and in turn enhance their value.

Challenges

In most cohort Regions, stakeholders have experience with failed attempts to build "centralized" solutions, and this has caused distrust and skepticism for new efforts. Acknowledging this history, learning from it and accounting for it in our work is an important first step.

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Local stakeholders report feeling disconnected from statewide initiatives, from existing statewide resource referral programs to new/emergent "community information exchange" initiatives. Stakeholders express an interest in improving the quality of these partnerships and, in turn, the quality of statewide services.

Stakeholders express confusion and ambivalence about dialogue emerging about "resource referral platforms" and "community information exchanges." One cohort is actively seeking to procure such a platform for its network, but is concerned that their local choice might not be able to interact with other systems statewide. Others expressed concern about pressure to join such platforms, given the risk that they become new silos and create more fragmentation. Through our process, we reached a shared understanding of a critical difference between *applications* and *infrastructure*: any given *software application* (i.e. "a platform") might be valuable for *some* users, but no single software system can meet the needs of *all* users, so there is an unmet need for *information exchange infrastructure* (i.e. "CIE" capabilities) that can enable interoperability *among* software applications.

Stakeholders have limited capacity to invest in new systems or manage information themselves. Previous efforts to manage complex information services on a voluntary basis have proven to be unsustainable. Investment in stakeholders' capacity is needed to enable their participation and even leadership in the design and maintenance of resource information systems.

Stakeholders observe that existing resource directories have a diversity of categorical schemas, which don't overlap with each other or, in some cases no clear categorical schema at all, which may hinder cooperation among partners. Investment in curatorial capacities – for taxonomy management and translation, for instance – is an important factor for success.

Emerging opportunities

The emergence of resource data exchange standards – as developed by [the Open Referral initiative](#) and formally adopted by [the Alliance of Information and Referral Systems](#) – makes it possible for communities to approach this old problem with new strategies that leverage existing assets while escaping the historical patterns of competitive silo-ization. This cohort did not explore technical dimensions of resource directory information sharing, but local leaders affirmed that stakeholders in their communities are responding positively to a prospective shift toward *infrastructural strategies* – through which reliable resource data can be made available not just through *a* website, but as a "web service" in which the same data can be used many websites and other tools simultaneously.

Among the cohort of regional coalitions, we identified at least two emerging partnership models for the production of resource directory data as an infrastructural service. These models offer the plausible promise of sustainability, and could be replicated in other communities. As strategies, these

are not necessarily mutually exclusive – they can be considered complementary patterns that can be employed together in accordance with the needs and assets of localities and sectors.

Locally-stewarded resource data infrastructure: the data utility model

As demonstrated by the Whatcom Resource Information Collaborative (WRIC), communities can establish collectively-owned capacities for managing resource information as a freely-available public good. In Whatcom, the WRIC has designated responsibilities for data steward – the Whatcom Opportunity Council – which is accountable to a Collaborative on terms established by a charter. The WRIC has developed a standardized (replicable) resource database with a website prototype as well as an open API (Application Programming Interface) that can provide access to this data for use by 3rd-party websites and applications. The WRIC has also established policies that spell out how information is managed, what resources can be included, and how decisions are made (see the Whatcom Resource Data Utility Style Guide and Verification Process).

The WRIC is now exploring opportunities to partner with WithinReach, as well as 2-1-1, such that their local service information can be made available through the call center systems operated by statewide partners who have previously lacked capacity to manage it; in exchange, the WRIC can potentially access information about regional and statewide services maintained by these statewide partners, yielding more comprehensive information for all parties at lower costs.

Other Early Childhood Coalitions – such as San Juan and Visions for Early Learning – are interested in exploring this model in future phases.

Local<>statewide collaboration: the partnership model.

Local organizations and networks can establish local staff capacity to support maintenance of local service information directly in a statewide referral partner's information system. This strategy has already been demonstrated by the North Central resource data partnership between Greater Columbia 2-1-1 and Action Health Partners – with support from the North Central Accountable Communities of Health (ACH). In this model, the regional ACH and a local care navigation program have hired and trained a resource specialist who conducts personalized outreach to local service providers, and adds information about their services directly into the 2-1-1 system. In addition to improving the quality of local information in the 2-1-1 system, this partnership can also build capacity for local organizations to access resource data from 2-1-1 as a service – for integration with and usage through in their own websites, screening and referral tools, etc.

As Olympic Community of Health develops their plans for deploying a regional resource referral platform, they have expressed interest in learning from this model to establish accountable stewardship of resource information within their vendor partner's platform – including potential establishment of contractual clauses that ensure access to local service data outside of the platform.

Learnings about our process:

Overall members of this cohort provided positive feedback about the design and implementation of our participatory research initiative. Early Childhood Coalition leaders expressed appreciation for the opportunity to engage both 1:1 with subject matter expertise and peer mentorship in the process of developing their local strategic assessment. The cohort also expressed appreciation for the capacity to develop these strategic assessments through peer group dialogues occurring concurrently across the state network and within their local communities.

By establishing a limited scope – focused upon discovery, preliminary deliberation, and recommendations for future iteration – through an iterative process, stakeholders reported confidence and satisfaction with their ability to focus and get things done in the face of a complex and at times overwhelming challenge.

Local leaders also appreciated the example set by pilot projects that modeled prospective strategies as proofs of concept.

Project leads encourage further investment in capacities for local representation in this process.

Open questions moving forward

How should we structure the next iteration of this ECCS work? Should this cohort be expanded? If we were to launch a pilot project (or support an existing one), what should be the selection criteria and prioritized use cases?

How might we design equitable and effective partnerships between local, regional, and statewide systems? What should be the terms through which a local organization assumes local stewardship responsibilities in a statewide partners' database? If a local coalition wants to maintain its own resource directory information system, how can we ensure that the contents of this system can be effectively shared with statewide partners' systems and vice versa? How might these models inform the evolution of systems like Help Me Grow and/or 2-1-1?

What potential funding models can ensure resource data is reliably maintained and equitably shared?

What role might funders and network institutions play in establishing accountable commitments from providers to provide updates about their own services?

How can these local needs and capacities best align with emerging social resource referral platforms?

Recommendations for future development

1) **Design and fund at least one pilot project** among this cohort. At least two kinds of prospective pilot scenarios have already been identified:
   a) **Data exchange among multiple local, regional, and/or statewide resource directory maintainers,** delivering -
      i) synthesized and improved data
      ii) replicable tools and processes for collaborative data management / exchange
      iii) evaluative analysis to inform future development.
   b) **Local capacity established to supply local service information to a statewide resource infrastructure**, demonstrating –
      i) Improvements in coverage and data quality in WithinReach via Help Me Grow network, and/or similar partnership with another statewide entity like 211.
      ii) Resource data shared back from statewide system for use in local third-party websites and/or care coordination systems
      iii) Replicable partnership model (including job description and contract terms).
      iv) Evaluative analysis to inform future development.

2) **Build additional capacity and awareness within the WCFC network.**
   a) Share this report with findings and recommendations with the following:
      i) WCFC Regional Leads
      ii) WCFC Beyond Connection Conference
      iii) WCFC Resource Navigation and Access Learning Network
   b) Re-form cohort, adding at least one new cohort member (no more than 7 total)
   c) Offer Office hours for the benefit of Regional Coalition network members.
   d) Host a workshop and/or design a replicable training process.
      i) Develop a toolkit offering templates, guiding questions, and other resources to support communities in self-guided work.

3) **Advocate for alignment across sectors among funding streams, projects, and info systems:**
   a) Share findings in related networks, exploring potential for partnerships –
      i) Other relevant early childhood partnerships
         (1) Help Me Grow Washington
         (2) Child Care Aware of Washington
         (3) Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment
         (4) Early Learning Coordination Plan Steering Committee
         (5) Essentials for Childhood Steering Committee
      ii) Health and social care coordination initiatives
         (1) Accountable Communities of Health network
         (2) Regional / statewide CIE initiatives
         (3) Sea Mar FQHC network

       iii)   Share findings and recommendations with relevant government stakeholders:
- (1) Department of Health and Care Connect leadership
- (2) Health Care Authority's Medicaid policy office
- (3) DCYF
- (4) DSHS
- (5) Governor's office
- (6) Poverty Reduction Task Force

   b) Engage with Washington 2-1-1 leadership in dialogue about findings and prospective partnership opportunities.
- i)   Learn about existing partnerships between 2-1-1 and WithinReach.

4) **Diversify funding sources** in order to expand the capacity for this work among more cohort members / pilot projects.

Conclusion

In this report, we have summarized the findings of the initial round of participatory research into a range of needs and opportunities for resource directory information management as conducted among Early Childhood Coalitions across the state of Washington. This information about the resources available to children and families is a critical input to many different kinds of initiatives that are currently in progress or envisioned across the landscape of early childhood service providers.

The lack of reliability and sustainability of this information is an old and well-known problem; we now observe new strategies that can avoid the pitfalls of previous attempts. These new strategies emphasize alignment among diverse stakeholders in a community, and seek to establish interoperability of this public information such that many different tools and programs can access the same reliable data. This emphasis on local engagement, accountable governance, and interoperable systems can help communities the failures that have resulted from competitive databasing efforts in the past.

The early childhood network – and broader health, human and social service sectors in Washington state – have an emerging opportunity to build open access solutions that ensure reliable information is accessible to all, across boundaries of sectors, organizations, and technologies. We welcome feedback on this report and expressions of interest in partnership. For more information, please contact: info@washingtoncfc.org and visit the Washington Communities for Children website: https://www.washingtoncfc.org/

Appendices:

Glossary

API: application programming interface. An API makes data available as a service to third party systems.

Community Information Exchange: "An ecosystem comprised of multidisciplinary network partners that use a shared language, a resource database, and an integrated technology platform to deliver enhanced community care planning." (2-1-1 San Diego) "A 'Community Information Exchange' should encompass the three elements of primary infrastructure that comprise a holistic ecosystem of health and social care: Resource Data Exchange, Client Data Exchange, and Community Data Governance" (Sorenson & Bloom, 2021)

Data standard: agreed-upon method of structuring data to enable interoperable use among different technologies.

Data services: third-party services that help to manage data for clients.

Infrastructure: systems that enable diverse, simultaneous activities among a multiplicity of "downstream" systems.

Resource directory data: information about the accessibility of health, human, and social services that are available to people in need.

Referral platforms: software systems that enable users (often service providers) to find social services to which people in need might be referred, with varying capacities for coordination thereof.

Strategy Memos

The following documents are replicas of strategy memos made for each community in the cohort. There are links to the live documents on each page.

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Whatcom Resource Information Collaborative Project Summary

Background context:
Whatcom County is the upper northwestern county of Washington State, largely rural with a primary population center in Bellingham. There are two tribal communities, including the Nooksack Tribe and the Lummi Nation. The County has seven independent school districts that serve as primary catchment areas for data collection and service delivery.

Purpose of the Collaborative:
Cultivate a healthy information ecosystem that enables people to efficiently and effectively navigate among systems of support on their journey to health and empowerment.

Vision of the Collaborative:
A future in which all Whatcom residents can readily access and benefit from the resources that they need to live with dignity and respect.

Assets in our community:
The Whatcom County government has prioritized investments in early childhood development, with emphasis on improving access to information about services for children and families.

The Whatcom Resource Information Collaborative is a broad network that has formed to build capacities to coordinate care and improve health outcomes. The WRIC includes libraries, school's family resource centers, and the referral line for the early support for infants and toddlers program.

The Opportunity Council is a CBO that offers a range of services to residents in need, including a resource directory that they have historically maintained and made available on their website. SEAS is children and family service referral program housed within the Opportunity Council that operates a hotline which provides resource navigation for Children and Families.

The Whatcom Early Learning Alliance is the county lead for the local expansion of the Help Me Grow framework and works to collaborate and create partnerships with relevant organizations. This coalition has representation on the Northwest Early Learning coalition and the broader state networks of Washington Communities for Children.

Our priority objectives:

Build a sustainable and reliable resource directory data utility – including technologies, processes, and human resources – through which comprehensive information about health, human, and social services can be reliably managed, efficiently distributed, and effectively used across an ecosystem of tools and organizations. This infrastructure should enable integration among relevant local, regional and statewide systems – so that many different information systems can share the same resource data – in order to reduce redundancy and improve efficiency. It should also be accountable to, and shaped by, local stakeholders — especially

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Whatcom residents in need. [We have established a governance model in this charter.](#)

In our pilot phase, we have prototyped this system – including a [database with an API](#), and [a public-facing website](#) – with a primary initial focus on the needs of pre-natal families and young children, as well as service providers who help them. In future phases, we hope to scale this infrastructure to serve more stakeholders, and also to support more complex operations such as care coordination that involves sharing of client data.

Key questions:
- As we consider options for sustaining the labor of maintenance, to what extent should the steward (the Opportunity Council) be primarily responsible for information management?
    - To what extent, if any, can directory record maintenance be shared among partners in the collaborative in accordance with their domains of expertise?
- How can we develop a sustainable model?
    - To what extent can we get funding from which funders (state and local government, local philanthropy)?
    - To what extent might the WRIC generate revenue from data-related services?
- Should there be a specialized role for "Community Access Points" who directly provide navigation services?
    - How might they take on additional responsibilities, and receive additional benefits, above basic membership?
- How can we best align this work with the priorities and activities of Help Me Grow, to leverage our work and sustain it?

Recommendations for future development:
- ➔ Develop data exchange partnership with 211, so local information can be shared with regional/statewide call centers in exchange for regional/statewide information.
- ➔ Test an instance of use of the WRIC data via API through integration with a priority partner who has their own information system – such as WithinReach.
- ➔ Test systems of user feedback and quality assurance.
- ➔ Develop a sustainable funding plan with both commitments from local government/ philanthropic partners AND a prospective business model with potential revenue streams from value-adding premium services that can be offered to third-parties like Unite Us or healthcare systems etc.
- ➔ Test a Community Access Point partnership to assess prospective responsibilities and benefits of an elevated membership role.

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Collateral Materials:

Whatcom Resource Information Collaborative Charter

Whatcom Data Utility Style guide

Whatcom Data Utility Verification Workflow

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Early Learning Resource Navigation in North Central WA

The Problem

Our partners and families rely on family resource navigators to have accurate information about the resources available in our community. But available sources of resource directory information are fragmented and unreliable. Many have tried to solve this problem by developing new directories – only to result in new silos that unintentionally make the problem worse.

The Goal

NCELC seeks to ensure that all children and families have equitable access to quality childcare and early learning options that meet their unique needs. Toward this end, we partner and collaborate to expand program options and access, invest in early learning educators and care providers, and engage local communities.

We envision a future in which our partners have access to reliable and comprehensive information about other organizations that can meet the needs of children and families in our community. Toward that end, we want to explore opportunities to enable partners like WA 211, Parent Help 123, and Child Care Aware to share data with one another and with other systems.

Current North Central WA Initiatives

General Resource Directory Initiatives

- **Greater Columbia 2-1-1 Partnership:** With funding and support from the North Central ACH, Action Health Partners (AHP) and People for People / Greater Columbia 211 (GC211) are piloting a unique shared staffing model. AHP, a local community-based organization, hired a full-time bilingual *Community Resource Specialist* who was trained and onboarded as an external extension of the GC211 team, and works closely with GC211's *Database Resource Specialist* as a local representative in Chelan and Douglas Counties. This *Community Resource Specialist* engages in community outreach, engagement, and trainings in promotion of the regional 2-1-1 resource database and referral system. The *Community Resource Specialist* also gathers and provides resource updates to the 2-1-1 *Database Resource Specialist*, filling in gaps in the local landscape that 2-1-1 previously lacked the capacity to cover.
- **Regional Resource Directory Working Group:** NCACH has established a workgroup of regional partners to explore cross-sector solutions to this problem. North Central Early Learning Coalition is a member of this workgroup bringing an early learning perspective. Other NCELC members are part of this workgroup as well such as NCESD.

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Early Learning Initiatives

- **Child Care Aware (Catholic Charities)** operates a hotline and online list of childcare centers. The Child Care Referral Specialists focus on connecting families throughout the state with licensed child care. In our region Child Care Aware is operated out of Catholic Charities who operate various services such as home visiting, coaching for child care workers, infant support programs, and play and learn groups. Catholic Charities and the Child Care Aware hotline are almost seen has hubs for resources for young children but their systems do not connect with 211 or ParentHelp123

- **Children and Youth with Special Health Care Needs (CYSHCN)** is a statewide program hosted by health districts in each of our 4 counties. They are required to keep an updated list of resources in their county. This is usually a spreadsheet that they share with the Dept of Health and WithinReach. Program managers refer children with special healthcare needs enrolled in the program to various organizations using the resource list.

- **ParentHelp123** operates their statewide call center for families and young children. The directory for our region is sparse including mostly statewide resources like AppleHealth and WIC. Many of the local resources and services available to families in our region are not included such as food programs, housing, mental and behavioral health supports, or crisis intervention for victims of violent crimes. While ParentHelp123 lists the Child Care Aware childcare referral hotline as a resource, they do not have a list of childcare providers in our region sending families to the Child Care Aware hotline, a separate program for childcare referrals.

- **Unite Us** is being adopted by some regional partners in the education sector. Still in the early stages of exploration and adoption. This service would primarily be used by school districts and partner community agencies

- **NCESD Early Intervention program** employs Family Resource Coordinators (currently the program has 6 FRCs) that connect families with young children with disabilities to community resources and services.   FRCs have a large amount of knowledge of community resources which is beneficial when building relationships with families and understanding their needs. This poses a problem when there is turnover in staff.

- **Social media** - The first stop for parents and caregivers of young children looking for support is often social media. There are several active community and mom's groups in the area. These are private groups where individuals share resources and information. Some individuals who work for social service or state organizations (moms or community leaders themselves) share information about resources in these groups but not reliably or consistently. Since these are private groups, the information is not shared publicly. Since these pages are structured as timelines they are not a directory of information, just a chronological list of posts.

- **Head start and other childcare organizations** often maintain their own spreadsheet of community resource information. These lists are used to point families in need in the right

direction. They are often outdated and since they are created through internal processes are usually not shared publicly.

Priorities and criteria for success:

- Shared trust between community partners within healthcare, education, and social services
- Bilingual resource navigators and information
- Up-to-date contact information (who to call specifically; not just the main line)
- Should contain information about play and learn groups, mom groups, parenting classes, behavioral and mental health supports birth-3yo
- Many points of entry (online, phone, in-person through Family Resource Navigators/Centers)

Open questions:

Is our need really for a new system that serves everyone, or do we need the capacities to collaborate among systems?

Our ESD and other partners have expressed interest in developing capacities to make "warm referrals" and "close the loop" – and talk to one another to address a families' needs efficiently and privately. But any new system would have to integrate with other systems – such as Child Care Aware, or our region's coordinated entry system (Hope Source? HMIS?). How can we establish these capacities for integration among multiple systems?

Community partners want to use one system as the single source of truth in which they will update their resource and contact information. But given the existence of 2-1-1, WithinReach, and local systems, how can we enable our partners to update their information in one place, to which all other sources of resource information can refer?

How can the data maintained in 211 by our local Resource Specialist be accessed for use outside of 211?

What would a mutually beneficial partnership with different statewide referral systems look like? Can WA211 and ParenHelp123 work alongside one another to serve families in North Central WA? How could we ensure that our communities' needs are met by such a partnership over time?

Recommendations:

- Continue to participate in the NCACH resource directory workgroup
- Work to build collective trust among regional and community partners
- Gather data about available resources and resource directories on the county and community levels
- Gain a better understanding of where families go when they are seeking resources

- Explore potential partnership models with WithinReach, WA 2-1-1, and local/regional organizations

Collateral Materials:

- Since March 2021, North Central Accountable Communities of Health has convened discussions with partners who are involved in regional community-based care coordination programs serving residents in our North Central Washington region.
  - The project brief can be found here along side a landscape document

San Juan Resource Directory Summary Report

Live document replicated on 8/18/22

Mission:
Our mission is to promote, protect and preserve, with dignity, the
health and well-being of the people and communities of San Juan County. Our goal is to provide population-based services and assure access to preventive health services in the community. We provide extensive referral and coordination with other health and social service providers.

Vision:
A future in which all residents in our community can readily access and benefit from the resources that they need to live with dignity and respect.

Assets in our community:
- There are three Resource Centers (Joyce L. Sobel Family Resource Center on San Juan Island, Lopez Island Family Resource Center, and Orcas Community Resource Center) that provide community referrals and connection to services and supports.
- San Juan County Health and Community Services has a previously participated in a Community Network Resource Directory and has a historical record of this document that was updated one year ago and was formerly housed online by the Orcas Island Library, however this resource directory website is no longer being maintained.
- San Juan has a partnership with WithinReach for conducting an 'asset mapping' project including extracting information from their system to analyze and update and has additional funds hire a facilitator to convene with local and regional stakeholders to conduct a more formal assessment.
- San Juan County HCS maintains a Children and Youth with Special Health Care Needs (CYSHCN) Resource list as a PDF document, with program name, phone, and website info that is updated annually.
- Key community leaders with extensive knowledge of services and supports that are willing to partner to support this project.

What we've done:
Working on an Asset mapping project with WithinReach that found a majority of local resources are not identified in their database system.

Have a funding source to hire a facilitator for a Community Asset Mapping project to be completed by the end of September 2023.

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Identified a community health worker who can help support the Resource Directory work and time starting in October has been allocated to help build an Open-Source Resource Directory or facilitate updates to the statewide resource directory.

Submitted a DNP project request for a potential nursing student to help support the Community Asset mapping work.

Applied for grant funding with the San Juan Island Community Foundation to support a very part time Resource Navigator role.

Potential objectives:
● Upgrade our current system for managing community and CYSHCN resource information:
- Consider upgrading existing word documents into Airtable (for example Whatcom's Opportunity Council) or another web-based system to structure data.
- Work with WithinReach's to test their (in-development) online form for eliciting updates from providers.

● Develop plan to expand Resource directory contents to include more service providers and supports (for example early intervention and other behavioral health providers).
   ● Research and develop proposals for potential to partner with WithinReach, North Sound ACH, or other entities to establish sufficient local/ regional capacity to maintain this resource directory (funding and staffing).
   ● Near-term possibility: recruit and train nursing student for short-term data management through the DNP request for proposals, unclear if our project has been selected.
● Long-term: seek funding for a Resource Navigator with potential for partnership with Island County.

● Facilitate discussion among community.
   ● Testing ability to use resource data in Within Reach's / ParentHelp123.org – quality improvement on search results? Especially tailoring results to be local-only.
   ● Explore other (complementary or alternative) methods of delivering resource information through our community, especially via Resource Centers and HCS Dept and the client interfaces they would utilize that readily identifies and aggregates information into an accessible format.

Key questions:

● Can we start with a low- or no-cost system upgrade that improves our ability to do this work more effectively than in a Word/ PDF document, such as through an Airtable template?

● How would a stronger partnership with WithinReach work?

- If we were to agree that their system should be the place where this information is managed, how would we ensure that we have access to and ability to assure quality of that data? Could we utilize the WithinReach resource directory in a way that would

interface with a local website and could be branded with Help Me Grow WA San Juan? How do we ensure their data is pulling relevant local resources?

- If we were to manage this information on our own, how can we ensure that the data is shared with WithinReach so the CAP and 123 website have the same info that we have locally?

● How can we build local capacity to manage reliable information? Who might fund what kind of capacity? What might be the roles of the Resource Center staff be in such a partnership?

● How can we ensure that our communities' needs are met by this arrangement over time?

● How can we access 211 and do a data pull to compare their data system contents to our local directory? Based on a detail report from the past year there were no requests for San Juan County for childcare/ parenting resource information – is that because the information is scarce and so families are not connecting to that site or does more outreach need to be done to ensure families know how and when to utilize this potential information resource?

Resources:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dT5uKl9shCQXJHyqHtrSduXDcpENHbG9xoJCU_4cyys/edit
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1c5wX5tNGgKJSdX6A3l1hYKkb2J2cbDVHz_mFd_2B1p0/edit
https://whatcom.sarapis.org/

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Member Counties:

Grays Harbor | Lewis | Mason | N. Pacific | Thurston

Visions for Early Learning Collaborative Project Summary

Coordinated Access / Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Resource Directory Initiative
Live document **replicated on 8/18/22**

Visions for Early Learning (VEL) – a regional early learning coalition which encompasses Grays Harbor, Lewis, Mason, North Pacific and Thurston Counties – *promotes partnerships and community connections that support early learning through coordinated services, family events, educational opportunities, and advocacy.*

Coordinated Access Workgroup Purpose: Ensure that information about resources available to children and families is trustworthy and accessible wherever it might help families. Families should be able to readily access the resources they need.

Vision Statement: A future in which families with young children in our community can readily access and benefit from the resources that they need to thrive and feel more connected to their community.

Summary of assets in our community: A variety of local resource directories are available – with a variety of capacities for maintenance and accessibilities – such as the Grays Harbor College resource directory guide, Together! Thurston County guide, and Lewis County Family Resource Network resource guide.

In general, the Early Childhood Coalitions (ELC) expressed interest in finding cooperative solutions that could align efforts that have been previously siloed. A significant amount of expert knowledge is held informally by key stakeholders (public health nurses, community health navigators, etc) in the local coalitions.

The infrastructure support from Washington Communities for Children (WCFC)/First Five Fundamentals has increased the capacity to progress toward the priority objectives by providing paid staff to ELC's at the regional and local levels to advance the initiatives already in process by local coalition members.

For each of the three counties involved in this project serve in some capacity as their respective SMART (School Medical Autism Review Team) Team, thus in collaboration with the University of Washington's SMART Team network and resource sharing pertaining to services for families seeking an Autism diagnosis and those with the diagnosis.

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Goal: Evolve from a landscape of siloed resource guides into a reliable, accessible, and scalable ecosystem – making it easier for people to find services, and possible to assess unmet needs to support advocacy for community health and well-being.

Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Program Phase 1: Summary Report

Priority Objectives:
- Further assess the landscape of regional and local resource directories, Family Resource Centers (FRCs), and Coordinated Access Points, to identify other prospective partners and to inform the design of supply chain strategies.
- Identify key partners at the regional level whose organizational capacity, infrastructure and/or financial resources can be leveraged to establish reliable resource directory data stewardship.
- Develop a partnership with **Help Me Grow Washington** through their affiliate **WithinReach** so they use our data about local services for children and families, and we can access and use their data about regional and statewide services for children and families.
- Create network spaces for informal connections to the extent to which early learning coalition members can share resources with colleagues, establish and maintain relationships to extend their knowledge of community resources.
- Continue stakeholder engagement at the regional and local levels to be better equipped to move forward with at least some, if not all, of the future recommendations stated below.

Long-term Objective: Analyze existing data that illustrates patterns of requests to better understand gaps in services. This data will inform next steps on who else should be included in this process.

Key Questions:
- Shared Philosophy: How to implement a "no wrong door" approach and create psychological safety for families seeking support e.g., the extent to which families are offered "warm hand-offs", rather than simply providing information to the family?
- Equity: What assumptions are unintentionally being made? How to design a culturally responsive and appropriate resource directory that is easily accessible to all families; especially those who are furthest from opportunities as marginalized and underserved populations?
- Governance and Sustainability: Who should be responsible for the maintenance? How will it be funded?
- Accessibility: How can we ensure that the directory is easily accessible in real time and responsive to all family's needs?
- Quality Assurance: How can we ensure that our communities' needs are being met by this arrangement over time?
  - How do we measure success and what metrics/evaluation tools are needed to do so?
- Statewide Initiatives/Collaboration: What would a mutually beneficial partnership with our statewide referral system look like?

Future Recommendations:
- Create a set of criteria to assist in the categorizing of what boundaries will be initially established to shape what "types" of a resource ecosystem that can be maintained sufficiently and efficiently by the collaborative.
- Develop a draft project charter that will formalize this collaboration among our local partners.
- Designate a local resource directory data steward, establish a style-guide for the resource directory information, and designate a database platform with an API, example: Airtable.
- Obtain continued funding to pursue the above.

Grays Harbor Early Learning Coalition (GHEL) Assets:
- Comprehensive resource directories:
  - Grays Harbor College: for Grays Harbor County (updated 2021)
  - The Arc of Grays Harbor (ongoing)

GHEL's Coordinated Access Workgroup Key Partners:
- Grays Harbor County Public Health
- Timberland Regional Library
- The Arc of Grays Harbor

- Aberdeen School District/Early Childhood Education Assistance Program (ECEAP)

Lewis County Early Learning Coalition (LCELC) Assets:
- Key Partner previously involved in "Healthy Children Ready to Learn" Cowlitz County example of utility model from neighboring county (example: Youth and Family Links and HealthBridge)
- Comprehensive resource directories:
  - Lewis County Family Resource Network
  - LCELC Framework resource list

LCELC's Coordinated Access Workgroup Key Partners:
- Cowlitz Indian Tribe
- Reliable Enterprises
- Family Education and Support Services

- Happy Kids Dentistry
- Centralia College/Early Childhood Education Assistance Program (ECEAP)

Thurston Early Childhood Coalition (TECC) Assets:
- Potential funding sources/community investment aligning with need for improved resource information exchange.
- Comprehensive resource directories:
  - Together! Thurston County
  - Thurston County Children with Special Health Care Needs

TECC's Coordinated Access Workgroup Key Partners:
- Thurston County Department of Health
- Child Care Action Council
- Family Education and Support Services
- ABCD Dental/CHOICE Regional Health Network

- Sound to Harbor/Educational Service District #113
- Cascade Pacific Action Alliance/Community CarePort

Olympic Community of Health Strategic Brief

Introduction: About Olympic Community of Health

Olympic Community of Health is working to improve individual and population health and advance equity by addressing the determinants of health. We envision a future of equitable systems, policies, and practices to support whole person care and to ensure that individual needs are met timely, easily, and compassionately.

Regional Context

The Olympic region spans Clallam, Jefferson, and Kitsap Counties and includes the seven sovereign tribal nations. Public transportation is severely limited throughout most of the Olympic Peninsula. The region houses four hospitals; for severe acute health care services, travel out of the region is often necessary.

Mission

To improve health and social outcomes by building our partners' capacities to connect residents to services and coordinate care across sectors throughout our region.

Objectives

- Deploy a 'closed loop' referral system for use among our partners throughout the region.
- Establish roles of OCH and regional partners in system governance processes, including policy-making, prioritization, evaluation, and conflict resolution.
- Develop recommendations and guidance regarding operational standards/protocols for collection, exchange, use, and stewardship of client data.
- Work with partners to design, deploy and maintain inter-organizational coordination capacities.
- Establish process and protocols for on-going evaluation of platform use.

Key questions:

1. How might OCH governance model evolve to best support this more complex phase of cooperation? What rights, responsibilities, and processes should be associated with partnership? (Should there be different 'classes' of partnership, represented in different capacities?) How can we ensure that decisions about this platform are made equitably and accountably?
2. How can we ensure that our regional platform infrastructure can interoperate with other platform infrastructures at a regional and state level? What assurances, capacities, and standards might need to be established through contracting, design, and deployment to ensure that this system can build bridges with other systems, rather than becoming another silo?
3. How can we ensure that our system's resource directory information is reliable and accessible as a public good? What role should our partners among service providers, and service funders, in the maintenance and curation of resource data? What terms of stewardship over this public information will be both equitable and sustainable for our community?

Recommendations for next phase:

- Compile a summary of this work for our partners.

- Create an outline of concrete next steps for our partners, including a recommendation to form a subcommittee.
- Develop a draft project charter that will formalize this collaboration among our local partners.
- Continue to check-in with Cohort group members with the goal of problem-solving issues as they arise.
- Continue to share resources among other cohort group members to support this work.