



SECAC MEETING MINUTES - February 3, 2010

Council Attendees: Ricky Berry, Stacy Callender, Catherine Cliburn, Nadine Coleman, Jill Dent, Johnny Franklin, Kris Kaase, Lora Mederos, Fiona Qualls, Steve Renfroe, Lisa Romine, Festus Simkins, Holly Spivey, Nita Thompson, Rhea Williams-Bishop

Public Attendees: Katherine Culpepper, Dawn Trotti Hall, Annjo Lemons, Mimmo Parisi, Andi Quantey, Cynthia Ware

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action to be Taken
Call the Meeting to Order	Coleman called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.	
Approval of the Minutes from 10/29/09	Copies of the minutes from the October 29, 2009 meeting were distributed to the Council. Minor corrections were suggested. A motion to accept the minutes with corrections, made by Renfroe and seconded by Romine, were approved unanimously. Dent requested meeting minutes to be distributed within two weeks after a meeting to ensure follow through.	Callender will provide Council members with a copy of meeting minutes within two weeks after a meeting for review.
Introductions of Council & Guests	Coleman asked attendees to introduce themselves and name the entities they represented.	
Updates from the Chair	Coleman did not report any updates in the interest of time.	
Updates from the ED	Callender provided updates on legislation, PK-K licensure, and three technical assistance opportunities (i.e., Early Head Start, Inclusion, Policy Summit). Renfroe expressed concerns about Callender's role in lobbying for legislation. Discussion followed about how to react to legislation that may impinge upon the Council's activities and the need to provide information and/or education for Legislators.	Callender will report on legislation affecting early childhood or Council proposals for any position to be taken. DHS may also promote issues of concern to the Council.
Committee Reports	Callender reported on a recent conversation with the ACF grant administrator emphasizing the importance of sustainability of proposed elements and their willingness to working with our proposal if clarifications or corrections are warranted.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workforce Development Committee (Dent) 	Dent provided handouts and presented the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget will have to be modified as the total proposed is too much; will work with CREATE which may provide match Proposal elements include a career ladder with an age-specific certification (currently being developed by the Extension), CDA (this training already exists both for free and for fee), A.A./A.S., B.A./B.S., M.A./M.S., & Ph.D./Ed.D.; implementation of the T.E.A.C.H. model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total proposal cost: will revise amount to \$300,000 (\$100,000 per year)

	<p>(description was provided); provision of training/retention bonuses (\$100 for age-specific certificate, \$300 for CDA, \$500 for Associate Degree), and articulation between 2YR & 4YR programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expected expenses: Coordinator with salary, fringe, travel for 3 years, Bonuses for participants, T.E.A.C.H. license • Discussion: Renfroe asked if we could work with WIN Job centers to provide the scholarships; Qualls asked about the development of a loan forgiveness program; multiple suggestions were made to first explore possible coordination/collaboration with other agencies including MESCC, Vo-tech (CDA), high school-community college dual-enrollment programs, and the MSU Research & Curriculum Unit; Romine suggested that year 1 of the proposal could focus on research to develop specific activities further and to combine opportunities available from other agencies to make the best possible comprehensive career ladder plan and years 2-3 could focus on implementation. • A scaled down proposal could focus on development of the career ladder, articulation, and degree alignment for \$100,000 per year 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data System/Data Sharing Committee (Kaase) 	<p>Kaase provided handouts and presented the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal elements include the development of a data warehouse model over a 3 year process to tie into the federal proposal for a statewide longitudinal data warehouse. SECAC would work with nSPARC, who has an existing state relationship working on the statewide longitudinal data system. Year 1 of the proposal would focus on securing agreements (MOUs) and identifying data elements and policy questions. Year 2 would focus on resolving technical issues and collecting, cleaning and inputting data from all participating agencies into a database Year 3 would focus on analyzing data and developing reporting practices and formats. • Discussion: Renfroe reminded the group to maintain a focus on data sharing and data use with practical implications (not just general research); several agencies expressed concerns about data security; several other state initiatives may impact this proposal including the Lt. Governor's push for a central data repository and ITS's virtual data plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total proposal cost: will cost in excess of \$1,000,000 but will use other funds to bring costs in under the total grant amount
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Provider Registry Committee (Dent) 	<p>Dent provided handouts and presented the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal elements include the registry (which is currently being implemented) • Discussion: Thompson questioned the incentives for registration for home providers as there is not a certification/licensure process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total proposal cost: \$2400 (\$800 per year)

	<p>required for home providers; Dent reported that home providers get access to training and a referral to participate in the Nurturing Homes Initiative; other questions were brought up about the security issues and the ability to share data stored in NACCRRAware</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only costs for the proposal are the \$800 per year costs for the additional server space; all other expenses are covered with federal funds and therefore are not eligible for the match. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated Service Models Committee (Renfroe) 	<p>Renfroe referred to a visual presentation and presented the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal elements include hiring a consultant to conduct a work processes study and the development & implementation of a coordinated service model in 4 communities in the state • Discussion: several concerns were voiced about the language of this proposal specifically those making claims of possible reductions in costs and increases in services; other concerns were expressed about the potential impact on agencies, including the time and staff required to complete the process, and what we would really get out of a review by an outside organization (would agencies actually implement the recommendations developed); suggestions were posed to consider partnering with the State Interagency Coordinating Council for Early Intervention to promote the joint development of Local Interagency Coordinating Councils for both early childhood and early intervention to reduce potential duplication of effort and to build state infrastructure that is currently missing to implement coordinated service delivery models in local areas; additional concerns were raised about the lack of consideration given to funding the implementation of coordinated service delivery models in local areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renfroe will get an estimate for the contract (to guide grant submission and RFP) • Total proposal cost: \$600,000 (\$200,000 per year)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthcare Access Committee (Bishop) 	<p>Bishop referred to a visual presentation and presented the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal elements include hiring consultants to compare Mississippi's and other states' medical policies and to review options for alternative health practices; these studies will lead to recommendations and the gathering of critical information that could be used to support grant proposals for improving accessibility to comprehensive health services • Discussion: Bishop clarified questions about the proposed time line and planned budget items 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total proposal cost: \$80,000 (\$80,000 in year one only)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other costs for grant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Callender noted that there are additional items that are required for grant applications that include additional costs such as periodic needs assessments, travel to meet with grant administrators, public hearings, travel for SECAC members to attend meetings, and any long-range state plan development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Callender will develop a projected budget for additional costs

Business		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARRA Grant 	The available grant is not large enough to cover all of the projected costs included in the current proposals. Renfroe proposed creating an ad hoc committee of all committee chairs to recommend components for inclusion in the final grant proposal.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State EC Resource Directory 	Callender distributed copies and requested additions and/or corrections for inclusion.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines for Public Comments 	Renfroe recommended minor edits. A motion to adopt the guidelines, made by Simkins and seconded by Renfroe, was approved.	
Public Comments	Annjo Lemons described an upcoming meeting in March, Caring Communities, where she will present Excel By 5.	
Other Business	<p>Council members were invited to discuss or share any additional information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coleman requested Council members look for opportunities to share Executive Summary. • Several questions were asked about the open meetings requirements and Council members decided committee meetings were not subject to open meeting requirements. • DHS representatives mentioned a subsidized employment program between emergency TANF and MESC 	Callender will price making 1000 copies of the Executive Summary.
Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.	