

**Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC)
Meeting Minutes
February 8, 2011**

<p>Members Present: Barbara Wolfe, Sandy Simar, Karen Adamson, , Linda Wintz, Jackie McCormack, Joy Birr, Barbara O'Sullivan, Jill Haak (via phone), Sarah Thorson, Genie Potosky</p> <p>Members Absent: Lisa Lehmann, Angie Kniss, Anne Hennessey, Michelle Willert</p> <p>Staff: Loraine Jensen, Lisa Backer, Kara Hall, Lisa Cariveau</p> <p>Guests: Judy Swett, Roxanne Botz, Tim Finn, Cathy Nelson-Messer</p> <p>Observers: Melissa Wiger, Shawn Holmes, Janelle Schilman - Dakota County Help Me Grow Representative</p>		
<p>Agenda Item: Review of handouts and revisions made since January 28, 2011 meeting</p>	<p>Meeting was held to answer questions submitted regarding the Interagency Early Intervention Committees (IEIC) restructure that arose as a result of the January 28, 2011 ICC meeting.</p> <p>Barbara Wolfe called the meeting to order and thanked people for their attendance.</p> <p>Handout – Revised list of final recommendations from the restructuring workgroup. Clarified that workgroup members gave feedback to review statements of assurances in SERVS application.</p> <p>Handout – Responsibility chart - terms defined in the new responsibility chart per January 28 meeting. Language clarifications are underlined. Changes are to create consistent use of terms throughout the recommendation column. Definitions are pulled from statute. Special Education Administrative Unit (SEAU) is the smallest unit that delivers services directly to infants and toddlers with disabilities. SEAU is responsible for the delivery of the required educational services. Split out the state vs. state lead agency.</p> <p>Handout – List of questions from ICC members. A question from one member was added. There is a number by each of the questions that pertains to the recommendation number.</p>	
<p>Issue #1</p>	<p>Question: Do the IEICs submit annual reports to the ICC?</p> <p>Response: There is no requirement for IEICs to report to the ICC.</p> <p>Discussion: Face-to-face reports would be a part of the formative and summative evaluations. Recommendations also built in a one-year and three-year evaluation period related to the restructure. There is fiscal oversight and program oversight over the IEICs related to the Part C funds.</p>	

	<p>Question: Are there plans for the state to fund Follow Along Program (FAP)?</p> <p>Response: No. However, a Local Education Agency (LEA) or IEC can choose to use the funds to support FAP in their region.</p> <p>Discussion: The state is currently discussing child find strategies. FAP is one of those strategies. Some IECs contribute some funds to FAP and the counties depend on it. We will continue to discuss this at a state level and as a strategy. The option to use funds for FAP is not off the table.</p> <p>Question: How does the regional IEC concept include participation from our Early Intervention (EI) partners as it relates to the central directory?</p> <p>Response: The state is required to maintain a central directory. An IEC will be responsible to identify current services and funding within their member communities.</p> <p>Discussion: Individual IECs were developing their own directories but they were not necessarily keeping up with what was in the central directory. A central directory leads to consistency throughout the state. Relates to “economies of scale” discussion.</p> <p>Question: Will the Centers of Excellence (CoE) address and support appropriate practice for health and social services in addition to education?</p> <p>Response: CoE will strive to meet the professional development needs of all sections of the early care and education community specific to infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities and their families.</p>	
<p>Issue #2: How should the IECs be structured to meet their responsibilities?</p>	<p>Question: How many IECs are left as a result of the governor’s economic development region?</p> <p>Response: There will be a maximum of 13 regional IECs that will interface with SEAUs and interagency partners, with Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) as lead.</p> <p>Discussion: There will be some discretion to determine what works for the particular regions. For example, Regions 1 and 2 can either stay together or split.</p> <p>Question: What other options were presented to consider by the workgroup?</p> <p>Response: The workgroup generated multiple options as part of a brain storming process.</p> <p>Discussion: Groups ranked the options as either being a high likelihood or low likelihood of</p>	

being all or part of the ultimate solution. The total on the power point slide is the number of high ratings. No state staff contributed any of these options. As a workgroup, there was a consensus building to not create another set of random boundaries. There was no strong logic to how they were drawn the first time around.

How can you make the new structure fit when the population within one region is so different? Any thought to how a region like Region 11 would be managed? There are already successful partnerships operating within Region 11.

Will there now be 50 members in the IEC? There may be regional meetings with certain participants as well as subcommittees or smaller groups. Who represents what area may change. At the regional level and at the local level, families and community partners need to continue to participate. There are five IECs in Hennepin County; they will cease to exist as an IEC but they will still exist as a local entity.

IECs are policy bodies, not direct service providers. Dollars will flow to SEAs and they are charged with developing collaborative partnerships to ensure that the work gets done at the local level. Collaborative language is specified in statute. SEAs have an obligation to implement policies and procedures adopted by the IEC. There is also a statement of assurances for the dollars that flow to the IEC. We have assured representation at the regional level because membership is specified in statute. We need to think about how we can ensure that family representation occurs. The new structure may create more consistent parent participation.

Question: Crossing regional boundaries – can IEC members choose to belong to one or both?

Response: Those partners may decide for themselves if they want to belong to one IEC or more than one.

Discussion: Head start or child care resource and referral are included in this. IECs are policy entities.

Question: Was there any thought to having representatives from the IEC on the ICC?

Response: ICC membership is clearly defined in statute.

Discussion: There is some history of dual membership between IECs and the ICC. All workgroup

	<p>members were given information on the application process for ICC. IEICs may include representatives from other public or private entities, including school nurses.</p> <p>Question: How will the new structure support or enhance the balance of power in local interagency work?</p> <p>Response: Statute states it is a joint responsibility of school boards and county boards. 125A.29(c); (1) and (2).</p> <p>Discussion: As the workgroup was evaluating the change in the system, they ensured that changes would closely align with statute.</p> <p>Does accountability mean that districts will have more power and voice at the table? There needs to be a framework laid out and the voices need to be heard. Provide information to ensure the balance exists.</p> <p>County boards currently fund respite care, Public Health Nursing (PHN) home visitor. Public Health (PH) gets FAP dollars. County social services do not get Part C dollars. There is a big difference between education and the other agencies. Education gets all of the money now anyway and that gets distributed out – not a big change from what currently happens.</p> <p>Concern that SEAU language relating to developing the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) will exclude the family in the planning process. Suggestion to add language that clarifies requirement to include interagency partners and parents, even though it is in statute.</p> <p>Concern about getting the right people at the table. We can reevaluate this in one year.</p> <p>There was a desire for the state to provide leadership and guidance. MDE could create a template of components of operating procedures to ensure responsibilities. Local and grassroots input needs to be supported. Would template exist before or after implementation of the restructure? Some before and some after.</p>	<p>Action: Will clarify in the recommendations that how things are done now will not change in regard to IFSP development.</p> <p>Action: Create a template of components of operating procedures to ensure responsibilities are met.</p>
<p>Issue #3: What resources are needed for the IEICs to</p>	<p>Question: Part C dollars were to be used as “glue” money and not for direct services – has this changed?</p> <p>Response: Part C funds may be used for direct services to eligible children and their families that are not otherwise provided from other public or private sources (34 CFR 303.3(b)).</p>	

do their work?

Discussion: For example, evaluations of children referred outside of traditional school calendar. Early Intervention (EI) services provided outside of traditional school calendar. Service coordination (SC). SC is not a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) special education service.

Question: What accountability is there surrounding Part C funds and activities?

Response: SERVS (restricted finance grid) ensures that recipients of federal funds only spend dollars for targeted purposes. District data profiles – public reporting of the status of each SEAU in meeting the Part C requirements. State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) process. Compliance and fiscal monitoring.

Do Part C funds only apply to children age 0-3? Yes.

Question: What school district will host the IEIC 10 percent and the Comprehensive System of Professional Development (CSPD) 10 percent?

Response: Any entity serving as a fiscal host for these federal funds must be an education entity with an identified organizational number within SERVS.

Discussion: Different SEAUs may serve the IEIC and SEAU funds at the selection of the Regional IEIC. Funds flow to SEAUs with one Local Primary Agency (LPA) per Regional IEIC and that LPA is identified by school and county boards. SEAUs would receive funds to implement service aspect of Part C.

Will the IEIC decide how the money gets allocated to the SEAUs? Part C dollars that flow to SEAUs will in part be used to implement EI system. Role of the IEIC is to establish policies and procedures for how the boards implement the system. County boards and school boards would designate a LPA. Need to get the right people around the table, including a policy/decision maker. Current estimated cost of the current IEIC system, per IEIC - \$350,000.00, just to meet the meeting requirements. Thirteen IEICs do not resolve that problem because of all of the sub committees, 120 SEAUs, etc.

What mechanisms and supports can we give to families so they have their group and a regional representative on the IEICs? Parents who sit on Special Education Advisory Committees (SEAC) as a liaison to IEIC? We can make suggestions as the IEICs restructure themselves. IEICs are a policy body and some of those activities will be planned through other

entities.

Misperception that every member of current IEIC committee will be driving to a regional meeting and there will be hundreds of people there. We are not taking away the responsibility of what the local Help Me Grow (HMG) area has; they will not be responsible for writing bylaws, etc. and other things that 95 IIECs are currently doing. IIECs can develop ways of communicating and reaching out to constituents. Look for other opportunities to get parent input in a way that is meaningful to families.

Question: What is the role of the professional development facilitators in regard to the restructured IIEC?

Response: Participate in groundbreaking event; serve as initial convener of regional IIECs.

Discussion: State will provide guidance and assistance. IIECs must elect a chair as per 125A.30

Question: What will happen to Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 IIEC carry forward funds?

Response: They will be redistributed by MDE according to current funding formula.

Question: How will SEAs combine resources to jointly fund positions or enter into agreements with county agencies?

Response: Districts will use existing fiscal tools to meet the interagency and cross-district obligations of Part C.

Discussion: Districts have considerable experience in these types of contracts and agreements. Local areas need to figure out what they need to do with union related issues. Need to get the word out as soon as possible as they do budget cuts this spring.

How does what goes to the SEAs (60 percent) get determined? Ten percent goes to designated LPA determined by boards. There will be a fiscal host of the 10 percent on behalf of the IIEC. Ten percent for CoE is designated by the state, not the IIEC.

Question: Can a portion of the IIECs funds (10 percent) be used to fund SC?

Response: School and county boards may develop an interagency (IA) agreement according to 125A.39 to establish agency responsibility that assures EI services are coordinated, provided, paid for and that payment is facilitated from public and private sources. There is nothing to

	<p>prohibit IECs from using some of their 10% to fund SC.</p> <p>Discussion: Sixty percent may be better used to fund SC; IECs need to establish how SC would be provided. Areas concerned that 60 percent is not enough. SEAU needs to look at what other resources may be available to fully support SC. We need to make sure we are spending the funds in the most cost effective way to make sure we get good outcomes for children and families. Current groups may still exist but could be configured differently. For example, a group of service providers may meet to identify and solve local problems but would not meet as an IEC, as they currently exist. Local child study teams, local IA referral teams function separate from IEC work.</p> <p>ICC is also a policy recommendation body. ICC needs to hear what some of the local policy issues are so they can affect change at the state level.</p> <p>Question: When will notice be given of the new structure?</p> <p>Response: Part C application will be posted for public viewing by March 1, 2011. There will be public comment on the Part C application from March 18 through April 18, 2011. Allocation amounts will be communicated in the middle of April with specific dollar amounts to develop budgets. Funds are contingent on the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) approval of Part C application. Part C application will be submitted to OSEP on May 10, 2011.</p>	
<p>Issue #4: How do we address the activities that are not a requirement for IECs to perform?</p>	<p>Question: What is the role of the ICC in relationship to these changes?</p> <p>Response: The ICC and "purple activities" do not interface. ICC makes policy recommendations and defines roles of the IECs.</p> <p>Discussion: Better guidance is needed on what constitutes allowable uses of the funds. There are specific examples of how not to use Part C funds. The assurances will clarify what local agencies are responsible for. Nobody is responsible for the "purple activities". If it is included in an IFSP, it is not a "purple activity". Local member agencies may implement additional activities. Must implement activities that are related to service provision. According to established guidelines? Do not use word "approved", as it implies that there is an approval process.</p>	
<p>Discussion: Evaluation</p>	<p>Preliminary plans for evaluation – Part C application will include a plan for external evaluation of the IEC restructure. ICC will provide input into the design of the evaluation and the</p>	<p>Action: Language added to</p>

of restructured system	<p>evaluation criteria. Results of evaluation will be shared with the ICC by January 1, 2013.</p> <p>ICC should be able to review any guidelines that are developed. Specify that in the recommendations using the language on the power point slide.</p> <p>Recommendation 6 – “Workgroup members and ICC will be given the opportunity to...”</p>	<p>recommendation.</p> <p>Action: Recommendation 4 would say that evaluations occur at one year and three years with an annual report to the ICC.</p>
Voting on Recommendations:	<p>ICC members will vote on all six recommendations as a package. Motion made and seconded to adopt the six recommendations as amended. Seven in favor, two opposed and one ineligible voter. Implementation is anticipated to begin on July 1, 2011.</p> <p>There will be multiple opportunities to discuss the restructure through the end of March, face to face and webinar. March 10 – ECSE leadership meeting; March 11 – Director’s forum.</p>	<p>Action: Recommendations passed by majority vote.</p>
Meeting Schedules:	<p>Dates: April: Thursday, April 14, 2011 Future meetings will be scheduled from 8:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m.; however, if possible, will try to have half-day morning meetings only.</p>	
Adjourned	Barbara Wolfe adjourned the meeting.	