

2018-2019 Coordinated Enrollment Self-Assessment

The 2018-2019 Coordinated Enrollment Self-Assessment is designed to support community networks' continuous improvement efforts of community networks as they consider the successes and challenges of the 2018-2019 coordinated enrollment process and plan for the 2019-2020 coordinated enrollment process. Each section of the self-assessment is intended to help community networks reflect on how effectively they accomplished each component of the coordinated enrollment process, with an emphasis on indicators in four categories: planning, implementing, unifying, and evaluating.

Each lead agency should work in partnership with the community network program partners and other key community stakeholders to complete the self-assessment. To the extent possible, lead agencies should engage all publicly-funded early childhood partners (child care, Head Start, NSECD, and school-based pre-K providers) in completing the self-assessment. Input and feedback from every program type should be represented in the completion of the self-assessment.

Lead agencies must submit the self-assessment responses electronically at this [LINK](#). It is strongly encouraged that prior to electronic submission, lead agencies first complete the self-assessment in paper format and then transfer the responses into the google form. Electronic submissions of the self-assessment are due by **September 3, 2019**.

AT-A-GLANCE

- Key Terms, page 1
- Instructions, page 2
- Example Item, page 2
- Section 1. Maximize Capacity, page 3
- Section 2. Coordinated Information Campaign, page 7
- Section 3. Coordinated Eligibility Determination, page 11
- Section 4. Coordinated Application, Matching, and Registration, page 15
- Assurances, page 19

KEY TERMS

Performance Statement: A statement describing an expectation of the coordinated enrollment process

Indicator: Behaviors or action steps that serve as indicators for the successful completion of the expectations of coordinated enrollment

Overall Rating: Overall level of performance that reflects the behaviors or action steps taken by the community network for each section of the coordinated enrollment process

Family Demand: A measure of the number of families who have applied for early childhood programs in the network. This number should include the number currently in seats plus the number on waitlists

Access Gap: The number of eligible economically disadvantaged families who were not able to access a publicly-funded program

Enrollment Data: Any data or records collected during the enrollment process, which may include the number of applications submitted, the number of eligible families, family eligibility records, etc.

INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THE COORDINATED ENROLLMENT SELF-ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Read the performance statement and the indicators for each item. The network will select all of the indicators that reflect the action steps taken by the community network to accomplish each statement during the 2018-2019 coordinated enrollment process. Note: community networks can choose more than one indicator and out of order as it applies for each statement.

At the end of each section, tally the total number of indicators selected, which will be used to calculate the overall rating, which represents their performance for that section.

Example Item	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p><i>Statement about what should have been true for a highly effective coordinated enrollment process.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Designed a data management system to track application and eligibility data</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Used the data management system to monitor applications and eligibility determination results, which resulted in timely placement decisions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Used the same data management system across <u>all</u> program types and with <u>all</u> program partners</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated the effectiveness of the data management system to remove inefficiencies and to make improvements for future years</p>	<p>3</p>

SECTION 1: Maximize Capacity

1.1 PERFORMANCE STATEMENTS AND INDICATORS

Networks should utilize strategies that maximize available funding sources and increase access to publicly-funded early childhood programs each year.

Section 1, Item 1	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p>Implemented a process to accurately capture the met and unmet family demand for seats in the community.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Identified the relevant data sources needed to accurately measure the met and unmet family demand in the community</p> <p><i>Improvement needed for this indicator. While we can measure the met and unmet family demand for the population who has submitted / initiated an application, we cannot currently measure the met vs. unmet family demand for the total eligible population.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implemented a process to manage and analyze enrollment data that resulted in the accurate, unduplicated, and complete measurement of met and unmet family demand</p> <p><i>Improvement needed for this indicator. While the descriptors above can be applied to the enrollment data available to us (i.e.: families who submitted / initiated an application), we cannot say our data portrait is “complete” or “unduplicated” in reference to the total possible eligible population.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The process to measure family demand was used across <u>all</u> program partners and program types</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All publicly-funded EC providers, across all program types, used the EnrollNOLA demand, target-setting, and matching framework. EX: OneApp family application data, OneApp match data, EnrollNOLA Demand Reports, EnrollNOLA target-setting and projections processes, waitlist data.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated the effectiveness of the process used to measure family demand to identify opportunities for continuous improvement</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. We have worked to identify our gaps in data collection, analysis, and sophistication. In our current strategic planning, our team has placed a strong emphasis on improving data, research, and analytical capacity by way of existing and expanded funding, partnerships, and governance structures. EX: work to identify city-wide population of target age and income demographics vs. total applications; identify ways in which current application data reflects 1) met/unmet demand for specific programming and/or funding types; 2) met/unmet demand for higher income brackets; 3) met/unmet demand for additional access supports such as expanded hours or transportation; 4) satisfaction with available programs / quality</i></p>	4

Section 1, Item 2	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p>Conducted a landscape analysis that used multiple sources of data for a comprehensive assessment of community network needs to inform strategic planning.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coordinated with program partners and other stakeholders to identify all relevant data to analyze the access gaps</p> <p><i>Improvement needed for this indicator. We do not currently have an agreed upon catalog of all relevant data impacting student access/demand for free/affordable child-care city-wide, nor do we have the data infrastructure needed to analyze and address city-wide access gaps.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analyzed data from multiple sources to strategically plan for the needs of local families, such as by pinpointing areas of the parish with a greater need or by predicting future demand</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator, with room for improvement. Using past enrollment and demand data, we were able to identify which areas in the parish would see greater applicant numbers and/or seat demand, and to identify where additional capacity was needed. EX: OneApp family application data, OneApp match data, EnrollNOLA Demand Reports, EnrollNOLA target-setting and projections processes, waitlist data.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included <u>all</u> program partners, funding sources, areas of the community, and subgroups of children in the analysis</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All publicly-funded EC providers, across all program types, areas, funding sources, and applicant groups were included in access analysis and strategic planning. EX: Coordinated Funding Request, EnrollNOLA Demand Reports, OneApp match data.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated the effectiveness and completeness of the data used and of the analysis to identify opportunities for future analysis</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. We have worked to identify our gaps in data collection, analysis, and sophistication. In our current strategic planning, our team has placed a strong emphasis on improving data, research, and analytical capacity by way of existing and expanded funding, partnerships, and governance structures. Ex: identify city-wide population of target age and income demographics vs. total applications; identify ways in which current application data reflects 1) met/unmet demand for specific programming and/or funding types; 2) met/unmet demand for higher income brackets; 3) met/unmet demand for additional access supports such as expanded hours or transportation; 4) satisfaction with available programs / quality</i></p>	<p>4</p>

Section 1, Item 3	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)					Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating		
<p><i>Collaboratively developed a unified strategic plan to address gaps in access.</i></p>	<p>✓ Identified the network’s current capacity to serve children at each age level across the community, and collaboratively set goals to address gaps</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Using unified processes such as the Coordinated Funding Request (CFR) and historical enrollment data, as well as fundraising efforts to fill current service gaps, we worked collaboratively to meet expected community need at each age level. EX: CFR, EnrollNOLA projections, OneApp historical match data, City Seats.</i></p>	<p>✓ Developed or updated a formal strategic plan to address gaps in service</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. NOEEN’s updated strategic plan, developed and approved with the NOEEN Steering Committee, includes long- and short-term goals and tactics for addressing existing gaps in service.</i></p>	<p>✓ Incorporated <u>all</u> funding sources and program types into the strategic plan to address gaps in service</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All publicly-funded EC funding sources/program types were represented and included in Steering Committee processes related to strategic planning and the CFR.</i></p>	<p>✓ Monitored progress toward implementing the strategic plan and achieving the goals, and made changes accordingly</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. We have continued to track our progress towards the goals of our strategic planning activities, as well as the success/growth areas of this year’s CFR requests vs. allocations vs. enrollment. As we enter the 2019-2020 school year, we anticipate incorporating lessons learned into our upcoming cycle of Committee and CFR decision-making.</i></p>	<p>4</p>	

Section 1, Item 4	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)					Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating		
<p>Actively pursued strategies to expand access for economically disadvantaged families.</p>	<p>✓ Identified possible new funding sources or innovative strategies to increase access to early childhood programs</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. In the past year, we have exhaustively pursued additional funding possibilities needed to maintain successful initiatives, launch new programs, bring additional resources to service providers, and expand leadership capacity. Our fundraising efforts have included visionary strategies for improvement. EX: hiring of Deputy Director, Director of Policy, and Managing Director of Programs; BCM grant application; ECHO fund launch (w/Kellogg grant dollars); City Seats initiative, Ready Start Network status, National League of Cities grant application.</i></p>	<p>✓ Secured new funding sources and/or implemented new strategies, which resulted in more families accessing early childhood programs than the previous year</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. In the past year, we have aggressively expanded necessary funding to meet strategic and tactical goals. EX: expansion of capacity for children ages 6 weeks to 2 years through City Seats initiative, made possible through New Orleans City Council grant dollars, securing Ready Start Network grant and status, acting as one of seven trailblazing districts state-wide; launch of Echo Fund, agency-managed investment dollars to provide direct resource support to local EC providers, made possible through Kellogg grant dollars; expansion of Agenda/NOEEN leadership team focused on implementing long-term strategy to secure funding stability, local investment, and stakeholder buy-in.</i></p>	<p>✓ Considered <u>all</u> funding sources and program types when pursuing strategies to expand access</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program types and funding sources were considered as we worked to expand funding and, accordingly, resources for our network and community. Steering Committee members (representative of all funding sources) were kept apprised of and included in related fundraising initiatives, strategy execution, and network developments.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of efforts to increase access, which informed plans for future improvements</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Our team is actively planning for a future of funding sustainability that will allow us to pursue our long-term goals for improving access, quality, and communications. Additionally, our team is working collaboratively with local, state, and Steering Committee leadership to consider how current funding constraints impact access and what to do about it for the immediate future.</i></p>	<p>4</p>	

1.2 OPPORTUNITIES FOR PLANNING

How will the network’s responses inform decisions for the next year? This is an opportunity to reflect on your past performance and plan for the future. This item is optional.

While we can measure the met and unmet family demand for the population who has submitted / initiated an application, we cannot currently measure the met vs. unmet family demand for the total eligible population. As a network, we would like to continue to collaborate with providers and other partners to better understand our data gaps, leverage existing resources, and ensure we are meeting the total need of our city. In addition, we would like to better understand non-traditional and non-participating childcare availability and demand, such as in-home and family childcare options, and CCAP.

1.3 OVERALL RATING

Determine network’s overall ratings that represent the performance level for the section of the coordinated enrollment process.

- Step 1: Sum the total number of indicators that you tallied in questions 1-4 in this section below.

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Total
Tally of Indicators	___ 4 ___ (4 points max)	+ ___ 4 ___ (4 points max)	+ ___ 4 ___ (4 points max)	+ ___ 4 ___ (4 points max)	= ___ 16 ___ (16 points max)

- Step 2: Check the level that accurately reflects the number of indicators achieved

Overall Rating for Section 1. Maximize Capacity

Total Number of Indicators	Description	Overall Rating
0-4	Some evidence of basic data analysis and planning to address gaps in access.	<input type="checkbox"/> Starting Point
5-8	Some evidence of analysis, planning, and attempts at implementation to address gaps in access.	<input type="checkbox"/> Progressing
9-12	Evidence of analysis, planning, and attempts at implementation to address gaps in access.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standard
13-16	Strong evidence of analysis, planning, implementation, and evaluation of the effectiveness of implementation to address gaps in access.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Above Standard

SECTION 2: Coordinated Information Campaign

2.1 PERFORMANCE STATEMENTS AND INDICATORS

Networks should implement a coordinated information campaign through which the community network informs families about the availability of publicly-funded programs serving children birth to five years old.

Section 2, Item 1	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p>Created informational materials with the goal of increasing public awareness of early childhood education options and the value of high-quality interactions.</p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with program partners to create or update informational materials in easy-to-read language(s) and media formats to increase public awareness of early childhood options</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. In the past year, Agenda for Children/NOEEN worked collaboratively with partners and providers to ensure families had access to strong choice resources, in multiple formats and languages. EX: ULGNO ECE guide, EnrollNOLA website, EnrollNOLA EC program guide, OneApp online application, provider SchoolForce profiles, fliers and other paper materials, EnrollNOLA diversified application ad campaigns.</i></p>	<p>✓ Created informational materials in a variety of locations, languages, and/or formats to meet the needs of all families in the community</p> <p><i>Improvement needed for this indicator. While all available resources, including those listed above, are presented in multiple formats, languages, and across multiple locations, we are still not meeting the needs of all families in the community, as demonstrated by lack of engagement, low verification rates, and focus group / anecdotal reports of difficulty understanding program options, eligibility, and requirements.</i></p>	<p>✓ Included <u>all</u> program types and program partners in all of the informational materials (i.e., all materials include references to all programs)</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program types and funding sources are included in all enrollment materials.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the informational materials to identify opportunities to reach more families</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Working with NOLA-PS, providers, and Education Research Alliance (ERA), we have hard and soft data to indicate which formats are accessible, where we are losing families, and what improvements / additions would allow us to meet more members of our community.</i></p>	<p>3</p>

Section 2, Item 1	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p><i>Disseminated informational materials strategically throughout the community by leveraging strong community partnerships to increase families' exposure to materials.</i></p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with program partners and other community stakeholders to locate campaign materials strategically throughout the community</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Enrollment materials and resources are available online, with internet access available from trained team members at NOLA-PS Family Resource Centers as well as at Public Libraries. Hard-copy resources are also available at Family Resource Centers, which are strategically located throughout the city, as well as at Agenda for Children, partner orgs such as the Urban League, and at providers' program sites.</i></p>	<p>✓ Distributed informational materials in a variety of locations, languages, and/or formats to meet the needs of all families in the community</p> <p><i>Improvement needed for this indicator. While all available resources, including those listed above, are presented in multiple formats, languages, and across multiple locations, we are still not meeting the needs of all families in the community, as demonstrated by lack of engagement, low verification rates, and focus group / anecdotal reports of difficulty understanding program options, eligibility, and requirements.</i></p>	<p>✓ Engaged <u>all</u> program types, program partners and other relevant stakeholders to distribute informational materials strategically throughout the community</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All programs and partners are able to access and distribute existing materials. In addition, providers are able to drop of additional promotional material at NOLA-PS Family Resource Centers, or vice-versa (to pick up hard-copy materials from Family Resource Centers) for distribution from their program site or organization.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the location of informational materials and of the process used to distribute materials to identify opportunities to reach more families</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Working with NOLA-PS, providers, and Education Research Alliance (ERA), we have hard and soft data to indicate which formats are accessible, where we are losing families, and what improvements / additions would allow us to meet more members of our community.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

Section 2, Item 2	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p><i>Increased family awareness about special programs by creating meaningful materials, locating them strategically, and training program partners to ensure consistent communication.</i></p> <p><i>Example special programs: children with disabilities, English learners, gifted and talented, children experiencing homelessness, and children in foster care</i></p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with program partners and other stakeholders to create or update informational materials and training(s) about all special programs in easy-to-read language(s) and media formats</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Informational materials are available for all specialized programs alongside other program options, in the same variety of formats, languages, and modes of distribution. See Section 2, Item 2.</i></p>	<p>✓ Distributed informational materials to families that included step-by-step instructions regarding special programs, trained program partners, and provided written guidance on policies and procedures for each special program</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Instructions for enrollment into, and eligibility for, specialized programs are available in written and online materials, alongside other program options. Additionally, parents applying for specialized programs that require additional steps after application (i.e.: Gifted & Talented programs, language immersion / unique environment programs) received personalized communications from the EnrollNOLA team, including detailed instructions. Programs are trained at least once annually on entering eligibility determinations in the student information system, SchoolForce.</i></p>	<p>✓ Ensured that <u>all</u> program partners were offered the same trainings and used the same guidance when communicating with families about special programs, and that families were offered information about special programs in a variety of settings</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program types and funding sources are included in all trainings regarding use of the student information system, internal and external communication standards/methods, and, if applicable (i.e.: specialized programs), what unique enrollment policies and procedures are applicable.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the informational materials and process for training staff on special programs to identify opportunities to reach more families</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. In collaboration with EnrollNOLA, our team has areas where both program training and parent information campaigns can be improved to be clearer, more accessible, and more adaptive to the needs of families and providers.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

Section 2, Item 4	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p>Analyzed data to develop a plan for effectively engaging under-served groups in the information campaign.</p>	<p>✓ Identified the relevant data sources needed to effectively plan for improving engagement with currently under-served groups</p> <p><i>Improvement needed for this indicator. While our organization and partners recognize that we were not seeing adequate engagement from under-served groups, we do not have a strong consensus on why or what data points would be most helpful to collect in order to address low engagement, nor did we prioritize identifying data points as a stakeholder group.</i></p>	<p>✓ Used targeted strategies to engage under-served groups in the informational campaign</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. For the 2019-2020 enrollment period, the enrollment information campaign performed its second year of a pilot text message campaign. This year, the campaign differentiated between Head Start and LA4/NSECD applicants, in order to provide more 1:1 support for Head Start applicants. This decision was made to measure whether or not higher-touch outreach could impact enrollment for an applicant sub-group that is economically needier, with more eligibility steps required in order to enroll.</i></p>	<p>✓ Coordinated with <u>all</u> program types and relevant stakeholders to implement the targeted strategies to engage under-served groups</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All resources for parents and community members included all program types and funding sources. The enrollment team also engaged with partners such as the Urban League of Greater New Orleans, Head Start, the Department of Education, Public Libraries, and others, to distribute resources and check for accurate, approachable language and guidance.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of outreach by measuring any changes in enrollment for under-served groups</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. The Education Research Alliance (ERA) and NOLA-PS Office of Student Enrollment are evaluating the results of the text message study, measuring whether text support moves the needle on enrollment, and whether or not high-touch vs. low-touch outreach impacts results.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

2.2 OPPORTUNITIES FOR PLANNING

How will the network’s responses inform decisions for the next year? This is an opportunity to reflect on your past performance and plan for the future. This item is optional.

While all available resources are presented in multiple formats, languages, and across multiple locations, we fear we are still not meeting the needs of all families in the community, as demonstrated by continued lack of engagement, low verification rates, and focus group / anecdotal reports of difficulty understanding program options, eligibility, and requirements. In the next year, we would like to continue to problem-solve access and information gaps, ensuring the application is easy to use for all families of all technological and written literacy levels. In addition, we would like to do more focused campaigning for hard-to-reach communities, such as Latino and Vietnamese communities, where language and paperwork barriers contribute to low engagement. Lastly, we would like to redouble efforts to utilize existing campaigns and resources to reach families, such as NORD summer programming, public libraries, and others.

2.3 OVERALL RATING

Determine network’s overall ratings that represent the performance level for the section of the coordinated enrollment process.

- Step 1: Sum the total number of indicators that you tallied in questions 1-4 in this section below.

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Total
Tally of Indicators	____4____ (4 points max)	+ ____4____ (4 points max)	+ ____4____ (4 points max)	+ ____4____ (4 points max)	= ____16____ (16 points max)

- Step 2: Check the level that accurately reflects the number of indicators achieved

Overall Rating for Section 2. Information Campaign		
Total Number of Indicators	Description	Overall Rating
0-4	Some evidence of a basic information campaign to increase public awareness of the importance of early childhood education and the available options.	<input type="checkbox"/> Starting Point
5-8	Evidence of a basic information campaign that includes attempts to reach under-served groups and families whose children may be eligible for special programs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Progressing
9-12	Evidence of a strong information campaign that includes attempts to reach under-served groups and families whose children may be eligible for special programs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standard
13-16	Evidence of a strong and data-driven information campaign that makes successfully attempts to reach under-served groups and families whose children may be eligible for special programs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Above Standard

Section 3: Coordinated Eligibility Determination

3.1 PERFORMANCE STATEMENTS AND INDICATORS

Networks should develop a plan for the ideal implementation of a consistent and unified eligibility determination process that informs families of the programs they are eligible to apply for.

Section 3, Item 1	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p><i>Implemented a unified, systematic, and consistent process to determine eligibility by verifying income for families applying for publicly-funding programs.</i></p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with representatives from all program types to develop a unified process to determine eligibility</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. As a network, we continued our existing unified process for determining eligibility and incorporating final eligibility in the match.</i></p>	<p>✓ Implemented the unified income eligibility determination process in an accurate and consistent manner, and in a manner that limits undue burden for families</p> <p><i>Improvement needed.</i> <i>While eligibility processes were executed consistently, the process for determining eligibility needs continued improvement in order to address barriers to access for families. The current process is onerous and confusing for families, with residual negative impact for providers.</i></p>	<p>✓ Used the unified income eligibility process with <u>all</u> program partners and funding types</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Eligibility processes were unified across all program types and funding sources.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the unified eligibility determination process in order to address inefficiencies, inaccuracies, or unnecessary burdens for families</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. NOLA-PS and NOEEN are aware that the current process is inefficient and creates unnecessary burdens for families. These issues will continue to be workshopped and addressed in the 2019 Steering Committee and Sub-Committee governance structures.</i></p>	<p style="color: red; font-size: 24pt;">4</p>

Section 3, Item 2	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p><i>Provided comprehensive training for all program partners and relevant staff on the income verification and eligibility determination process.</i></p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with representatives from all program types to develop or update materials and schedule for annual training on the unified eligibility determination process</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Enrollment trainings updated alongside LDE, NOLA-PS, and partner representatives, to ensure relevant system and process updates were included.</i></p>	<p>✓ Provided training for staff and program partners on the eligibility determination policies and procedures to ensure consistency in communication and implementation for families</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Enrollment trainings were held with all partners, and included any relevant system and process updates.</i></p>	<p>✓ Ensured that <u>all</u> program partners and relevant staff were trained and that all program partners used the same process for determining eligibility and verifying income</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Training opportunities were provided for all staff, including ad-hoc 1:1 sessions for any staff who missed group trainings, needed additional support, or joined after formal training sessions.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the eligibility determination training provided in order to identify opportunities for continuous improvement</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Trainings are updated annually for clarity and comprehensiveness. Any common points of confusion will be considered at the time of annual updates.</i></p>	<p style="color: red; font-size: 2em; text-align: center;">4</p>

Section 3, Item 3	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p><i>Provided comprehensive training on eligibility process for special programs, including the identification, referral, and eligibility determination process.</i></p> <p><i>Example special programs: children with disabilities, English learners, gifted and talented, children experiencing homelessness, and children in foster care</i></p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with representatives from all program types to develop or update materials and schedule for annual training on special programs</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program types were included in annual trainings. Where necessary, ad-hoc trainings were conducted.</i></p>	<p>✓ Provided training for staff and program partners on the enrollment and eligibility policies and procedures for special programs to ensure consistency in communication and implementation for families</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program types were included in annual trainings, including program types with additional eligibility requirements.</i></p>	<p>✓ Ensured that <u>all</u> program partners and relevant staff were trained and that all program partners used the policies and procedures for enrolling children in special programs</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program partners were trained. Adherence to enrollment policies is monitored and adjudicated by NOLA-PS.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the training provided in order to identify opportunities for continuous improvement</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Trainings are updated annually for clarity and comprehensiveness. Any common points of confusion will be considered at the time of annual updates.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

Section 3, Item 4	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p>Implemented a data management system to monitor and revise the eligibility determination process to ensure accurate placement decisions.</p>	<p>✓ Collaboratively developed or updated a system to track and manage income verification and eligibility data collection that allowed for the ongoing monitoring of these data for consistency and accuracy</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. System updates were made in direct response to partner, parent, and provider concerns regarding the application portal and back-end data management interfaces. Ex: updates to waitlist management interface and criteria; geographic priority updates; EPC calculations.</i></p>	<p>✓ Used the data management system to monitor eligibility determination results to make timely placement decisions and site-to-site referrals</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All placements are made using the data management system, SchoolForce, which incorporates final eligibility determinations and displays accurate seat availability information in real-time.</i></p>	<p>✓ Used the data management system to track and manage income verification and eligibility data for <u>all</u> program types and funding streams</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All verification data, including final eligibility determinations, are collected and stored in the data management system. Students may be assigned to any program type / funding stream for which they are confirmed eligible; students also see a full list of eligible options, across all program types, during the choice process. These functions are managed via SchoolForce, where eligibility requirements are hard-coded and calculated consistently and objectively.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the data management system to remove inefficiencies and make improvements</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Annual enhancements to the data management system are made in direct response to inefficiencies identified by parents and partners. A full list of enhancements is evaluated each fall and spring, and critical updates are workshopped with stakeholders before implementation.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

3.2 OPPORTUNITIES FOR PLANNING

How will the network’s responses inform decisions for the next year? This is an opportunity to reflect on your past performance and plan for the future. This item is optional.

While eligibility processes were executed consistently, transparently, and efficiently, the process for determining eligibility needs continued improvement in order to address barriers to access for families. The current process can be onerous and confusing for families, with residual negative impact for providers. In the future we will continue to try to streamline verification procedures and information campaigns to better serve families and meet community need. Some efforts to this effect include pursuing direct certification, electronic / remote submission of documents, and working with other public assistance entities to inquire into best practices / lessons learned.

3.3 OVERALL RATING

Determine network’s overall ratings that represent the performance level for the section of the coordinated enrollment process.

- Step 1: Sum the total number of indicators that you tallied in questions 1-4 in this section below.

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Total
Tally of Indicators	$\underline{\quad 4 \quad}$ (4 points max)	$+$ $\underline{\quad 4 \quad}$ (4 points max)	$+$ $\underline{\quad 4 \quad}$ (4 points max)	$+$ $\underline{\quad 4 \quad}$ (4 points max)	$=$ $\underline{\quad 16 \quad}$ (16 points max)

- Step 2: Check the level that accurately reflects the number of indicators achieved

Overall Rating for Section 3. Coordinated Eligibility Determination		
Total Number of Indicators	Description	Overall Rating
0-4	Some evidence of coordination on eligibility determination.	<input type="checkbox"/> Starting Point
5-8	Evidence of coordination on eligibility determination and attempts at implementation to ensure consistent and efficient processes for families.	<input type="checkbox"/> Progressing
9-12	Evidence of coordination, consistent implementation, and efficient data management to ensure consistent and efficient processes for families.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standard
13-16	Strong evidence of coordination, consistent implementation, efficient data management, and evaluation to ensure consistent and efficient processes for families.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Above Standard

Section 4: Coordinated Application, Matching, and Registration

4.1 PERFORMANCE STATEMENTS AND INDICATORS

Networks should develop a plan for the ideal implementation of a coordinated application, matching, and registration that monitors each application until the child is placed, and that actively prevents duplication of applications.

Section 4, Item 1	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p>Implemented a community-wide coordinated application matching, and registration process for families.</p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with program partners to develop a community-wide coordinated application, matching, and registration process</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. OneApp, the community-wide coordinated application, matching, and registration process held its 8th application and lottery processes for the 2019-2020 school year.</i></p>	<p>✓ Implemented a coordinated application, matching, and registration process that eliminated unnecessary steps that were overly burdensome to families</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. The application process is designed to allow families to apply to all their school / program choices using a single application and matching process, eliminating the burden of going from center to center to learn about and apply to desired options, as well as eliminating the possibility of some families receiving multiple matches and others receiving none. While the verification process continues to prove burdensome for families (see above), families have indicated that the application is easy to submit, understand, and access from home. Application data supports this.</i></p>	<p>✓ Ensured that the community-wide coordinated application, matching, and registration process was used by <u>all</u> program partners across all program types</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program types, across all public funding streams, participate in the application and lottery process.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the coordinated application, matching, and registration process to identify opportunities for continuous improvement</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Possible improvements to the application and lottery are considered annually (and continuously), both with governance bodies such as the Steering Committee, and internally within the enrollment team / NOEEN. Examples of improvements implemented for the 2019-2020 process include highlighting geographic and zone priority information for families to better understand options close to home; changing waitlist policy so families do not continuously receive waitlist offers, which is confusing for them and bad for programs; launching a waitlist portal for families to be able to make changes to waitlist preferences from home; directly contacting families who have or have not applied out of their current program, based on guarantee structures, about the possibility of losing their seat / not having a seat, etc.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

Section 4, Item 2	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p><i>Provided comprehensive training on the application, matching, and registration process for staff and program partners.</i></p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with representatives from all program types to develop or update materials and schedule for annual training on the application, matching, and registration process</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Enrollment trainings were held with all partners, and included any relevant system and process updates.</i></p>	<p>✓ Provided training for staff and program partners on the application, matching, and registration policies and procedures to ensure consistency in communication and implementation</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Enrollment trainings were held with all partners, and included any relevant system and process updates.</i></p>	<p>✓ Ensured that <u>all</u> program partners and relevant staff were trained on the application, matching, and registration process</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Training opportunities were provided for all staff, including ad-hoc 1:1 sessions for any staff who missed group trainings, needed additional support, or joined after formal training sessions.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the training provided in order to identify opportunities for continuous improvement</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Trainings are updated annually for clarity and comprehensiveness. Any common points of confusion will be considered at the time of annual updates.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

Section 4, Item 3	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p>Implemented a data system to manage and monitor applications, placement and waitlist decisions for families and program partners.</p>	<p>✓ Collaboratively developed or updated a system to track and manage application, placement, and waitlist information that created efficiency and transparency for families</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. The application, placement, and waitlists processes are managed through a single-best-offer, weighted lottery system that prioritizes efficiency and transparency. Updates to the data system used to track and manage these processes were made in direct response to partner, parent, and provider concerns regarding the application portal and back-end data management interfaces. Ex: updates to waitlist management interface.</i></p>	<p>✓<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Used the data management system to ensure families are matched based on preference in a way that maximized the number of spots filled, and that provided transparent information on waitlist status for families</p> <p>Improvement needed. <i>The current lottery process maximizes family choice, not the number of spots filled. Programs with low demand or which serve over-saturated age groups did not fill their seats in the lottery because of insufficient demand. However, waitlist and placement information has been and remains transparent.</i></p>	<p>✓ Used the data management system to manage and monitor application data, placements, and waitlist information for <u>all</u> program types and funding sources</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program types and funding sources use the same application, placement, and waitlist management system, with necessary distinctions based on eligibility criteria and waitlist compilation.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the data management system to remove inefficiencies, improve transparency of information on waitlist status for families, and make improvements for future years</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Annual enhancements to the data management system are made in direct response to inefficiencies identified by parents and partners. A full list of enhancements is evaluated each fall and spring, and critical updates are workshopped with stakeholders before implementation.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

Section 4, Item 4	Indicators of Success (Select All that Apply)				Tally of Indicators
Performance Statement	Planning	Implementing	Unifying	Evaluating	
<p>Established a community-wide system for notifying families of program placement.</p>	<p>✓ Collaborated with program partners to develop a community-wide system for notifying families of program placement</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Families are notified through a centralized campaign including text message, email, and portal-based notification from NOLA-PS. Providers also receive their new roster information and are equipped to reach out to their newly assigned families.</i></p>	<p>✓ Implemented a community-wide system for notifying families of program placement options, so that families were informed about placement in a timely and clear manner</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. Families are notified through a centralized campaign including text message, email, and portal-based notification from NOLA-PS. Providers also receive their new roster information and are equipped to reach out to their newly assigned families.</i></p>	<p>✓ The community-wide system for notifying families was used for communicating placement across <u>all</u> program types</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. All program types and funding sources are included in the standard notification methods, timelines, and processes.</i></p>	<p>✓ Evaluated the effectiveness of the community-wide system for notifying families of program placement options to identify opportunities for continuous improvement</p> <p><i>We believe we met the bar for this indicator. The success and efficacy of the notification process is evaluated annually based on whether or not parents and providers found it easy to understand their placement results and to act on that information in a way that maximizes children receiving care and families having choice.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

4.2 OPPORTUNITIES FOR PLANNING

How will the network’s responses inform decisions for the next year? This is an opportunity to reflect on your past performance and plan for the future. This item is optional.

Possible improvements to the application and lottery are considered annually (and continuously), both with governance bodies such as the Steering Committee, and internally within the enrollment team / NOEEN. Examples of improvements implemented for the 2019-2020 process include highlighting geographic and zone priority information for families to better understand options close to home; changing waitlist policy so families do not continuously receive waitlist offers, which is confusing for them and bad for programs; launching a waitlist portal for families to be able to make changes to waitlist preferences from home; directly contacting families who have or have not applied out of their current program, based on guarantee structures, about the possibility of losing their seat / not having a seat, etc. Improvements of this nature will be pursued prior to the 2020-2021 application launch, and again later in the spring.

4.3 OVERALL RATING

Determine network’s overall ratings that represent the performance level for the section of the coordinated enrollment process.

- Step 1: Sum the total number of indicators that you tallied in questions 1-4 in this section below.

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Total
Tally of Indicators	$\underline{\quad 4 \quad}$ (4 points max)	$+$ $\underline{\quad 4 \quad}$ (4 points max)	$+$ $\underline{\quad 4 \quad}$ (4 points max)	$+$ $\underline{\quad 4 \quad}$ (4 points max)	$=$ $\underline{\quad 16 \quad}$ (16 points max)

- Step 2: Check the level that accurately reflects the number of indicators achieved

Overall Rating for Section 4. Coordinated Application, Matching, and Registration		
Total Number of Indicators	Description	Overall Rating
0-4	Some evidence of coordination on the application, matching, and registration process.	<input type="checkbox"/> Starting Point
5-8	Evidence of coordination and attempts at implementation of the application, matching, and registration process to ensure consistent and efficient processes for families.	<input type="checkbox"/> Progressing
9-12	Evidence of coordination, consistent implementation, and efficient data management to ensure consistent and efficient processes for families.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standard
13-16	Strong evidence of coordination, consistent implementation, efficient data management, and evaluation to ensure consistent and efficient processes for families.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Above Standard

Assurances

By providing the information below, I am assuring that the self-assessment responses reflect the whole community, and not just one partner type. Diverse partners were included in completing the self-assessment.

- What Community Network do you belong to?

Participating Partners:

Please list each participating partner’s name along with his or her program/site name. You may choose to upload information to your FTP folder or list the participants below. Please select the option in which you choose complete your assurances.

Dr. Keith Liederman <kliederman@kingsleyhouse.org>	Kingsley House (Head Start)
Ms. Joy Mitchell <joymitchell78@gmail.com>	Children's Palace Early Learning Academy (NOEEN City Seats, Pre-School Expansion Grant, CCAP)
Ms. Maria Blanco <mblanc@lsuhsc.edu>	LSU Health and Human Development Center (Early Head Start, CCAP, Private-Pay)
Mr. Sean Perkins <sperkins@nolapublicschools.com>	New Orleans Public Schools (LA-4, NSECD)