Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) Meeting Minutes March 23, 2012

Members Present: Judy Swett, Jessica Mattson, Genie Potosky, Andrea Bejarano-Robinson, Karon Joyer, Tim Finn, Cathy Nelson-Messer, Roxanne Botz, Karen Adamson, Karen Cadigan, Maya Nishikawa

Members Absent: Joy Birr, Barb Dalbec, Nancy Jost, Mary Ann Marchel, Dr. James Moore, Michele Willert, Sen. Terri Bonoff, Sen. Ted Daley, Rep. Carol McFarlane, Rep. Nora Slawik

Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) Staff: Lisa Backer, Kara Hall Tempel, Michelle Dockter

Guests: Karen (Region 8), Linda Sents (Region 6), Deb McKittrick (Region 6), Becky Tennis-Hanson (Region 10) Kim Williams (Region 2), Colleen Goltz (Region 1), Janell Schilman (Region 11), Suzanne Levy (Region 11), Marilyn Nelson (Region 3), Julie Domino (Region 5), Bonnie Henningsen (Region 5), Becky Crane (Region 3), Lisa Dummer (Region 7E), Carol Meisner (Region 4), Shawn Holmes

Agenda Item:	Meeting called to order; introductions were made. Quorum established.	Action: Approved
Opening Logistics	Motion made and seconded to approve agenda. Motion carried.	
	Motion made and seconded to approve the minutes. Motion carried.	
Agenda Item: Public Comment	See below for a description of the comments provided by representatives of Interagency Early Intervention Committees (IEICs) and the follow-up questions of the ICC.	
Agenda Item: Responsibility Chart	The Responsibility Chart was shared with the ICC to ensure that new ICC members were aware of this division of state/regional and local labor that had been adopted by the ICC in January 2011.	Action: None
Agenda Item: Statements of Assurances	The statements of assurances for IEICs and Special Education Administrative Units (SEAUs) were shared with ICC members as a means of pointing out differences in priorities of these two entities. Differences in the Follow Along Program (FAP) were highlighted as part of this discussion. ICC members were invited to contact Shawn Holmes with any questions about FAP. Shawn.holmes@state.mn.us	Action: ICC members are invited to contact Shawn Holmes with any questions about the Follow Along Program. Shawn.holmes@state.mn.us
Agenda Item: Formative IEIC Restructuring Evaluation	Three evaluation options were shared with the ICC: 1) MDE; 2) Minnesota Management and Budget (MMB) evaluator; or, (3) independent evaluator. It was explained that the most expedient option was to have MDE's newly created evaluation unit provide the service. Another option is to use the evaluation functions of MMB. Option 3 is to create a Request for Proposals (RFP) and contract with an independent outside evaluator. The ICC discussed the positive and negative aspects of these options.	Action: MDE will contact MMB to begin the process of evaluation of the restructuring of the local IEICs.
	Motion made by Karen Joyer and seconded by Tim Finn to request MMB to develop and conduct an evaluation	

	of the IEICs.	
Agenda Item: 2011 Part C Application	The Part C Application will be posted for a full 60 days. No comments were received during the 30 day comment period so the application will be submitted as posted. Questions posed by ICC members during the March 2012 phone call on application details were reviewed.	Action: None
Agenda Item: Professional development activities	Statewide training on the 2011 Part C regulations will take place during May and June. A cross-division team will implement seven face-to-face full-day events and a more intensive workshop as part of Summer Institute. The service coordination modules are with a contractor who is turning the content and video into adult learning activities.	Action: MDE will distribute information about all professional development activities to ICC members.
Agenda Item: Early Learning Challenge Grant and Office of Early Learning	Office of Early Learning – Karen Cadigan introduced herself as the Director of the Office of Early Learning which is headquartered at MDE but is really a set of relationships and governance that spans the Department of Human Services (DHS) and the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH), as well as MDE. Early Learning Challenge Grant (Race to the Top) – The \$45 million grant awarded to Minnesota will be transformative. Karen described Part C and Part B 619 as being the only programs that include all of the components that we would like to see in all programs – well-trained staff, engaged parents, ongoing assessment, and measurement of outcomes. Karen described the supply and demand side of early childhood programs, creating an analogy to higher education.	Action: None
Agenda Item: Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Leadership Conference	Each year OSEP hosts a leadership conference that includes one day devoted to early childhood and an ICC preconference day. Judy will attend through her work at PACER. Andrea moved to send Jessica Mattson to the OSEP conference and the ICC pre-conference day. The motion was seconded by Karen Cadigan. The ICC discussed the importance of Jessica bringing information back to the ICC. Motion carried.	Action: MDE will complete approval process to allow funds to cover Jessica's participation in the OSEP Leadership Conference.
Agenda Item: Legislation	The status of legislation introduced this session to mandate referrals of children in child protection or experiencing homelessness was reviewed. The action has shifted to requiring the Children's Cabinet to submit a report to the state legislature by February 1, 2013. The language of that amendment is: "The Children's Cabinet, established under Minnesota Statutes, section 4.045, must examine the short-term and long-term costs and benefits of expanding participation in the Part C program by infants and toddlers for	Action: None

Adjourned	Motion made by Roxanne and seconded by Andrea to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 12:58 p.m.	Action: None
	A phone-in option will be available, at a minimum, for each meeting to aid the group in establishment of a quorum. Members who are not able to attend an established meeting should notify Kara in advance.	
	Meetings will be held 8:30 to 2:30 and lunch will be provided.	
	• July 18, 2013.	
	• April 18, 2013; and,	
	October 11, 2012;January 3, 2013;	
	• July 19, 2012;	
	Quarterly meetings:	
	Retreat: June 21, 2012	
	Future Meeting Schedule:	
	Karon Joyer suggested the retreat not be counted as one of the standing meetings.	group to achieve a quorum.
	accordingly when a part of a meeting is needed to be missed.	those items requiring formal ICC action to assist the
	Karen Adamson suggested future agendas clearly identify those items requiring a vote so members can plan	ongoing option. The agenda will be developed to cluster
Schedules	the ICC. Cathy suggested avoiding summer Mondays or Fridays.	conference calling as an
Meeting	A question was raised about a possible summer retreat to be devoted to the development of a work plan for	Action: MDE will arrange for
	remedial services, and may contain supplementary funding recommendations as necessary."	
	jurisdiction over the Part C program. The report must estimate the potential growth in participation in the Part C program and examine the potential decrease in participation in school-age special education and other	
	Cabinet must report the results of the study by February 1, 2013, to the committees of the legislature having	
	whom a child maltreatment has been accepted for an investigation or family assessment. The Children's	

Identified progress, challenges and support needs:

The Region 8 representative reported that they have established the committee and that membership includes representation from each county and constituent group (minimum of 18 members). They are working to develop a public awareness plan. Local public health funds are used to fund the intake and there is concern about continued funding, the future of the FAP, and loss of availability of local funds, local interest and buy-in. Referrals are down and it is thought to be due to lack of local public awareness efforts. There may be too many members at the table to be effective. Not as much guidance has been received from the state as was hoped. No money to do local coordination projects. There is a lack of a local team to promote Help Me Grow (HMG) and no money to incentivize

local coordination. Region 8 is wondering how to fund the administrative duties of the IEIC. So far, the agency represented by the chair of the IEIC has been eating that cost. They would appreciate solid direction of what they are supposed to do and how to be most effective.

The Region 6 representative reported that they are left with much less buy-in from public health. The goal of local collaboration is now missing unless there are strong people who choose to meet locally because they believe it is the right thing to do. Region 6 still has some local meetings though it feels like local efforts are drifting. The quarterly meetings of the Regional IEIC have not provided enough time to make a plan. The assessment survey is in and compiled but not yet acted upon. While a nine-county area is large, there is good representation and good relationships. Parent speaker activities have not happened due to lack of funding—causing frustration. They believe that FAP is a valuable child find effort, in spite of an acknowledgement of its weaknesses. The money has been divided and supplemented. Assuming that the counties will fund FAP is not a viable option.

The Region 10 representative reported that referrals are down. Local committees are still meeting but with less commitment. Overall, there are fewer opportunities for working together due to fewer local activities. Current IEIC includes two representatives from each county. Workgroups have been established. Referral sources have been identified and a three-year rotating outreach schedule has been created. An outreach kit is being created for each county and will be ready in fall 2012. FAP is a huge issue and they are trying to figure it out. They are creating a database to be able to compare "apples to apples" at the end of the year and are creating a referral response form to create uniformity throughout the region.

Region 2 includes three reservations and county-based services. They have completed the environmental scan and have appreciated state support to help define tasks. Time is a huge challenge. Region 2 is sparsely populated so subcommittees have not seemed reasonable when trying to assure adequate representation from all constituents without the group becoming too large. They are working on standardized tracking procedures. Data is being collected and used to answer questions. Locals are continuing to meet because relationships are valued. Bemidji is the major metro area so many of the contacts are relationship-based. The task feels daunting but benchmarks are appreciated. They would like the state to develop and distribute standardized resources.

Region 1 shared that while Regions 1 and 2 often work together, they chose to establish separate IEICs due to differences in demographics. Region 1 reported no current challenge in referrals – they have not changed their process. Only two districts act as their own central point of referral. The remainder of the region continues to utilize public health as their central point of entry. They recommend reconsideration of the current allocation system. An identified challenge is caused by their large, rural, sparsely populated area so subcommittees are not workable. The support from Kara and Shawn has been appreciated. The region is still collecting data for the environmental scan. Schools are a challenge in that they have not been promoting HMG—this was an "aha" moment. Many gaps are being identified. While change is painful, they hope to ultimately have a stronger process.

Region 11 is working to approve by-laws and budget. They have active subcommittees in place: By-laws, child find and budget. There are challenges in trying to figure out this new system and identify which person or entity is responsible for various duties. From this year's budget they funded the FAP for all but two programs. A good plan is in place to figure out the role of MDE in public awareness/follow along, compared to the roles of the IEIC and Local Education Agencies (LEAs). There is now one brochure throughout the metro with the MDE phone number. Some local groups continue to meet but not everyone is at the table. Family support activities have fallen off. Outreach to the hospitals has fallen off. How does the IEIC get all districts to comply with data collection requirements? How do they communicate resources and still do the business of the IEIC while members have full-time jobs? Region 11 has chosen to fund coordination positions. They need to know what MDE is doing to avoid duplication.

Region 7E has met four times and has one final meeting scheduled this year. They have finalized their membership, by-laws, rules of order and budget. The budget has been most challenging—how to create regional uniformity while also meeting local needs. There is hope that they will be effective. One of biggest challenges is creating an understanding of what is happening throughout the region to know who is doing what. Parent representation has been difficult to obtain consistently. Helpful support has been received from state staff. Continued support is needed.

Region 5 is working across six main counties and has 14 members on the IEIC determined on a rotating schedule. Like other IEICs, they are working on the environmental scan. The Region 5 representative shared that it has been interesting to learn what is working and where the gaps are. They are tracking referrals and will use that data for budgeting purposes. They have contracted with public health for continuation of FAP. Some SEAUs have also supplemented these funds. Brochures are being updated. A statewide brochure will be used that will also include three local numbers. Much communication is being done electronically. A good core group of people has helped with this transition process. Region 5 is big enough. A Region 5/7 IEIC would have been much more difficult so they are pleased with their initial decision to divide. Some of the local opportunities have been lost though some continue to meet. Region 5 would like support from MDE around organizing as continued involvement is needed. The parent perspective is missing on their IEIC. The funding for the parent retreat is gone so that opportunity is lost. Referrals are up in the region.

Region 3 has relied on a core team. The application is in and the budget is done. The IEIC has hired someone to help with the data collection needed for the environmental scan. The initial survey results have been disappointing in that many special education directors deferred to Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Coordinators. Local groups are continuing to meet under other names. Region 3 has anticipated that the transition from a local to a regional focus would be a challenge so provided some funding to locals. Data has been examined regarding number of children served – data beyond just referrals. Region 3 will fund an IEIC meeting facilitator next year.

Region 4 completed the environmental scan in March 2012, and has identified where follow-up is needed. They have balanced representation on their IEIC. Communication back to constituent groups has been difficult. A listserv is being developed to make communication easier. The need for local activity has been identified – especially related to public awareness and outreach. State support has been helpful. More direction was provided.

Questions from ICC: Parent participation – have not found parents interested in driving to regional meetings. Some report of challenges around parent involvement in past IEICs. They currently wonder where parent participation will come from. Region 3 reports providing financial incentives for parent participation. IEICs report that they have parent members who are also professionals in the field, so they therefore "wear both hats" in committee work.

Relationship changes among county programs and school districts: IEICs reported challenges in communication and commitments. The money was an incentive for the local partners to come to the IEIC table.

FAP: Former funding provided to FAP from MDH was eliminated. FAP is a priority when the local public health director values early childhood as a priority. This is not consistent across regions.