****

**Meeting Notes**

**IRRC Leadership Team Meeting**

**Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania**

**October 5th and 6th, 2016**

**Attending:** David Fisk (ME), Will Messier (NY), Linda Mirabal-Pace (SC), Bernardo Sánchez-Vesga (GA), Jan Lanier (TN), Denise Rocha (TN), Brenda Pessin (IL), Lura Lee Braun (OK), Louie Torrez (NM), Mary Haluska (AZ), Sue Henry (NE), Tomás Mejia (CO), John Farrell (KS), Doug Boline (KS), Jessica Castañeda (KS), Michael Maye (IRRC), Susan Durón (META), Barb Patch (CIG Coordination)

States Attending- 12

State unable to attend- 2 (IA and DE)

**October 5th- 1:15 – 1:30p Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Overview**

Michael welcomed everyone to the IRRC meeting and asked participants to introduce themselves. Michael thanked everyone for their attendance, then quickly reviewed the agenda for Wednesday and Thursday.

**1:30 – 2:45 pm- IRRC Data Collection- Susan Durón, META Associates**

Susan covered our data collection and reporting needs for Year 1. She went through IRRC reporting forms and explained that year 3 funding is based on the Year 1 APR. A draft of the APR will be sent to states on Friday, November 4th. Directors will have the authorized representative for their states sign the cover letter and send it back to META Associates by Friday, December 2nd. Susan took a few minutes to explain the materials pilot review process and Form 3 that is associated with this process. Then she went through where we are with data collection by sharing a chart that lists what items states have submitted and what materials still need to be sent in. Then Susan outlined IRRC accomplishments from year 1:

* Hired director and evaluator
* Set up TST and workgroups
* Convened 3 ILT meetings
* Convened 4 workgroup meetings
* Designed and launched the IRRC website
* Prepared and posted 2 Agriculture Trends and 1 IRRC newsletter (autumn edition to come)
* Developed an FII and completed 100% of FII activities
* Developed TRI protocols and materials and deployed teams to DE, IA, OK, NM, and SC
* Developed a State Plan Template and Checklist
* Prepared training materials and hosted 2 ID&R webinars
* Developed a Competency Skills Assessment to certify Master Recruiters. Certified recruiters in 13 states
* Drafted ID&R training scenarios
* Training received a high mean rating of 2.85 out of 3.0 and 78% of participants reported a mean pre/post growth
* Put into place 5+ signed partner agreements
* Prepared 14 State ID&R profiles
* Determined logistics for the Year 3 Resource Roundup
* Completed an ID&R literature review
* Posted on the IRRC website: OSHA-compliant farm safety signs, a School Screening Survey, qualifying activity lists, and more
* Developed materials for ID&R quality control to decrease interview/re-interview errors

State representatives reflected on successes and lessons learned as a result of participation in the IRRC project:

Successes

* NE – State ID&R fall training helped with planning Statewide ID&R activities in areas of state. Supported the action planning process to help with their activities.
* IL – Got to know another state better (AZ) and had them come out and help w/training at the state workshop.
* GA – After using the assessment, the recruiters are more positive and feel more included and part of a national program. They are more proactive now.
* SC – TRI activity helped to increase ID&R activities and numbers
* TN – Literature review has helped because of brand new leadership. MEP office has distributed this material.
* KS – Opportunity to work w/different states has opened us up and provided more focus to our training. This group of states has all kinds of expertise. We have SMEs in different areas and helps expand horizons. Great deal of consistency has been achieved among core group of states (KS, NE, IA) that engage in interstate coordination.

Lessons Learned

* ME – ID&R is unique and there aren’t a lot of resources. The CIG partnerships have increased and in YR 2, we can expand knowledge.
* Jessica C. – You learn as you go to other states. Some things work with some states; others for another state. It expands your abilities.
* Barb P. – The website is being used by states in addition to CIG states. It is an unanticipated outcome.
* NY – Planning for TRI teams. Look through our own lens and need to plan extra time Thursday-Sunday may not work.

Susan conducted a quick/fun quiz on the material that was just presented. Then she reviewed some important dates for Year 2 and reviewed the Year 2 FII. Finally, Susan wrapped up the data collection and reporting portion of the meeting by thanking everyone for their good cooperation in reporting the data.

**2:45 – 3:15p Highlights of the IRRC Lit Review- Jessica Castañeda**

Jessica shared highlights on the IRRC Lit Review that was developed during Year 1. This material covers many of the underlying factors that influence migration patterns in the United States among the farmworker population. A variety of factors have caused numbers of farmworkers migrating from other countries and from state to state to decrease. This has caused labor shortages and has had an intensely negative impact on agricultural production and economic activity in the United States. Jessica presented to the TST a couple of weeks ago in Clearwater, FL and also presented to the IMEC meeting here in Pittsburgh.

**3:15 – 3:30p Break**

**3:30 – 3:45p IRRC Dissemination- Jessica Castañeda**

Jessica gave a brief overview of some of the newer items added to the IRRC website. Then she showed some charts from an analytics program that tracks and monitors website traffic and visitation patterns. This programs shows how many people visited, what part of the site they visited, and how long they stayed at this part of the site. Traffic seems to have increased since inception back in the winter time. The index/home page was the most visited portion of the site. The forms space was also frequented by visitors. The signs portion (farm safety signs) was visited a lot. There was a spike in the summer. This could have been the time when one of our states took the assessment online. We will explore ways to increase traffic on the site (mainly by developing materials and strategies that attract interest). Brenda Pessin recommended sharing information and links with partner agencies like HEP, CAMP, and Migrant Head Start. Linda from South Carolina recommended adding links to the site that could direct us to useful sites outside of IRRC.

**3:45a – 5:00p IRRC Competency Skills Assessment-Michael Maye and David Fisk**

Michael Maye began by outlining the alignment between the competency skills assessment and the FII component that refers to this area of the project as well as the performance measure that treats the competency skills assessment area. Then Michael provided a brief overview of the assessment development process since the first IRRC TST meeting back in January. David Fisk presented a tool that was created so that states could report an item by item tally that will help the competency skills workgroup to analyze results of the assessment in each member state so that adjustments can be made to improve the assessment itself. At this point, groups broke out by table to engage in discussion about the assessment process. Prompts were put up on the screen and each table took 15-20 minutes to discuss the assessment process. Louie suggested that the assessment in its present form is too long. Mary Haluska emphasized the area of test taking skills and suggested a test taking guide be developed. In Arizona results were not what they expected. People were OK with the assessment itself but not so happy with their results. In Arizona, recruiters took the assessment electronically. Recruiters were anxious. In Maine, 7 recruiters took the assessment during the summer. This small group did quite well and achieve the expected results. In Kansas, the first time they piloted, the assessment was in a more preliminary form. Some of the items could have been problematic. During a retake, 15 recruiters scored proficient. In New York, 19 recruiters scored proficient. Would like to see the assessment shortened and to assess logic and common sense decision making as opposed to technical understanding of rules and regulations. Will Messier advocated for an open book test. Bernardo from Georgia described a certification process they use in his state. He then mentioned that several assessment items were problematic for his recruiters. Michael mentioned that the key to the process is the increased level of consistency among and across our member states. After three years we will be in a position to indicate to OME that our 14 member states complied to the same certification and assessment process. The certification is the proof that this occurred. The whole process will allow recruiters across all 14 member states to achieve a more common understanding of laws, rules, and regulations regarding ID&R activities. Nebraska just implemented the assessment last week. Anxiety was a primary factor. In Nebraska, their strongest recruiter scored lowest on the assessment. Illinois had already implemented their own assessment as the summer season was getting underway. Brenda had questions about what to do when recruiters were right on the border of another proficiency level (if they were one correct question away from proficiency). Susan mentioned that if you reduce the number of items, it makes it more difficult to make adjustments because each item will be worth more points. The workgroup will analyze data to establish the proficiency standard/threshold. Illinois indicated that they would always like to see a COE completion component so that they know their recruiters have the capacity to fill out a COE. Group mentioned that it would be useful to have a video that explains and outlines the assessment process. Perhaps tutorials in which lessons and assessment questions are embedded in the video. Jan from Tennessee worked in assessment area for decades. She mentioned that questions that were either right or wrong a very high percentage of the time should be thrown out as they are problematic items. The workgroup will spend a few months analyzing data. Then in the early part of 2017, a new version will be rolled out.

**Meeting wrapped up for the day**

**DAY 2: 8:30 - 8:40a – Review today’s activities, agenda**

Michael welcomed the group back to the meeting and discussed reviewed the day’s activities.

**8:40-10:00a – Receiving State Directors’ Panel- (SC, substitute, and NM)**

Michael began this session by reviewing the alignment between the IRRC Fii and the activities of the TRI workgroup. Much of Year 1 was spent developing and finalizing protocols and documents for TRI activities. Michael then shared workgroup goals and objectives for year 2:

* Refine TRI forms and protocols as feedback is received
* Create a template for summary reports to be used at the conclusion of each TRI activity
* Create a library of educational “giveaways” for families
* Create a library of promotional materials and giveaways for agribusiness visits.
* Work with agribusiness partnership group to develop protocols for approaching businesses
* Develop training webinars for recruiters
* Revisit the pool of TRI recruiters to collect information about recruitment specialties and languages
* Develop IRRC identification badges/letters of identification for TRI deployment

During the summer months, there were a series of IRRC TRI visits to a number of receiving states (DE, SC, NM, IA, and OK). State directors from South Carolina and New Mexico agreed to respond to a series of prompts to highlights key components of a TRI visit.

What prompted you to request IRRC TRI support?

NM- *We only have 1 statewide recruiter to cover an immense area. We requested help to supplement our ID&R efforts.*

SC- *During the peak season of summer we are stretched very thin. We requested recruitment support to cover areas we would have had difficulty covering.*

How was planning and preparation initiated and how did it unfold?

SC- *There was a series of phone conferences with state ID&R coordinator, state director, and visiting team members. We discussed logistics and areas of concern. Zach Taylor and Emily Hanehan from NY worked on mapping target areas. There was an initial orientation when team members arrived to go over the SC COE and to discuss factors unique to South Carolina.*

NM- *For both visits there were many phone conferences and webinars. Michael was put in touch with local personnel. Local and regional needs were discussed. Logistics were planned for and initial orientations were conducted. Mike Toole oversaw the Las Cruces orientation and TRI activitiy. In the Roswell trip, extensive mapping resources were developed to use time more effectively.*

What was the impact of the visits?

SC- *Over 40 new children were identified and productive leads and referrals were generated. Maps and farm lists were updated that provided valuable information. During that week, in state recruiters were able to recruit other areas and train new staff.*

NM- *Between both trips, over 100 new children were identified. Local programs were provided with a wealth of information about their areas. Maps were updated and shared electronically. Farm lists were updated and revised. School district personnel were provided with valuable information about the community.*

What were some lessons learned?

*Giving away hand outs to potentially eligible children and families is invaluable- dictionaries, bags, resource pamphlets, program brochures, etc. Pre-planning is crucial. The more planning that takes place, the more teams can just get started with recruitment. They are already oriented.*

Discussion from group:

Kansas sent recruiters to Oklahoma to help with the re-interview process. At the time of this meeting 5 Kansas recruiters are in Oklahoma helping with recruitment efforts. Michael acknowledged the tremendous support and generosity offered by Kansas and Nebraska in promoting interstate coordination throughout the year.

**10:00 – 10:20a IRRC Year 2 Budget Review- Sue Henry, Lead State Director**

Sue Henry thanked all of the states for their commitment to the IRRC project and acknowledged that Year 1 activities and collaborations were a testament to the value of interstate coordination. Sue mentioned that, while we met our goals and objectives, funds were almost entirely used up. Envisioning that TRI activities will require additional financial resources and also allowing for the need to add a line to the budget to begin devoting resources to the 2018 Dissemination Event. If additional funds are not used they can be carried over to the next year, if funded. All carry over funds will be dedicated to the 2018 Dissemination Event.

Doug Boline asked: What resources would be needed under the equipment line?” Michael responded that we would purchase a speaker to loop people into meetings who could not be physically present. The group asked what part of the budget the additional funds would be added to (which lines). Michael responded that funds would be split between the Dissemination Event line and the Technical Assistance line.

Brenda Pessin asked: “How are the fees and costs for the Dissemination Event to be handled? Who will be paying for what? Rooms? Travel?, etc.” The response was that there would be a Committee comprised of the IRRC Director, Lead State, and other interested state representatives.

Jan Lanier recommended developing a rubric to map and chart member state needs so that we can monitor the process through which TRI support is offered. This would help ensure that the process is equitable. The slight increase to the IRRC fees were again proposed. Louie Torrez from New Mexico made the motion; and Mary Haluska from Arizona seconded it. Ayes carried overwhelmingly. Tennessee requested that there be supporting documents with the invoice for year 2.

**10:20 – 10:35a BREAK**

**10:35–11:35a State ID&R Plan Workgroup Progress and Updates-Michael Maye**

Michael outlined the components of the IRRC FII that align with the State ID&R plan workgroup activities. He then outlined some of the year 1 activities, specifically, the development of the state ID&R plan template and checklist. Michael then provided a timeline the workgroup developed while in Clearwater at a recent TST meeting. By November, the workgroup will provide member states with feedback based on the ID&R plan checklists that were submitted during the summer. The workgroup is asking member states to submit drafts of a state ID&R plan by January of 2017. In March, the workgroup will offer peer reviews of the drafts submitted. Then May of 2017 will be the deadline for fully revised and completed state ID&R plans to be submitted. Michael then lead a session on the IRRC member state profiles. A draft of state profiles were distributed. These profiles contain basic information that was drawn from CSPR data and brief write ups along with basic agricultural information. Four prompts were placed on the screen in order to solicit feedback from states about the state profiles:

1. Who are they for?
2. What function should the state profiles serve?
3. Who are the users/target audiences for the state profiles?
4. What elements should the state profiles contain?

David Fisk from Maine suggested that each state could provide a write up on how their state MEP functions. Brenda Pessin agreed and suggested that the workgroup provide a template that clearly outlines and specifies how the states should add and fill in components (what elements to cover or include in the write up, and what elements to include in the content- seasonal/temporary work, migration patterns, demographics, student numbers, major crops, qualifying activities, etc…). Susan Durón indicated that the original premise of the state profiles was to provide a “snapshot” on how ID&R activities and efforts are engaged in and conducted within each member state- ID&R models, number of recruiters, contact info, how state ID&R activities are organized (statewide, regional, and local), processes, structures, etc… Michael will convey these ideas to the workgroup for their consideration.

**11:35 – 11:55a 2018 Round Up Event Needs Assessment- Susan Durón**

Susan presented some of the ideas that the IRRC TST came up with during their recent meeting in Clearwater, Florida. Then she gave the group some time for table discussion to generate additional ideas for the Resource Round-up event. Each person present had a sheet on which to generate and share ideas. Some of the ideas were:

* While days are separate, allow participants the opportunity to attend sessions on a variety of topics. Include transition time between the group (e.g., plenary sessions that cross over, motivational speaker that appeal to all groups)
* Topic: Technology
* Include agencies that help meet migrant non-educational needs (Migrant Health, etc. helps to increase recruitment)
* Under ESSA, changes that apply (e.g., COE)
* Formatting: Combination: roundtable discussions, best practices panel
* Look at data and trends
* Topic: Temporary employment studies
* Working w/agri-business partners
* Showcase deliverables developed through IRRC
* Something that is for new recruiters to veteran recruiters
* ID&R Assessment, regulations, and laws, questions/answers
* Finding recruiters and other challenges

**11:55a – 12:00p Next Steps, Summarize, Wrap up**

Michael Maye mentioned that the TST would be meeting in January. The TST has narrowed down location options to Phoenix, AZ and Charleston, SC. Michael will have Jennifer Quick begin the process of determining prices and availability for hotels in these two cities. Jennifer Quick will begin to generate invoices for annual dues.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.