



## Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council

NEVADA EARLY CHILDHOOD ADVISORY COUNCIL (ECAC)  
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

### NEVADA EARLY CHILDHOOD ADVISORY COUNCIL (ECAC)

Special Meeting to Edit ECAC Strategic Plan – Public Meeting

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 2018 • 9:00 AM

*“Nevada’s children will be safe, healthy, and thriving during the first eight years of life, and the system will support children and families in achieving their full potential.”*

#### Meeting Locations:

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Nevada Department of Education	9890 South Maryland Parkway	Las Vegas, Nevada	Las Vegas Board Room
Nevada Department of Education	755 North Roop Street	Carson, Nevada	Upstairs Conference Room
Early Childhood Professional Development Center	240 Rock Blvd	Reno, Nevada	
Great Basin College, High Tech Center	1500 College Parkway	Elko, Nevada	Modular Conference Room

#### SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

(VIDEO CONFERENCED)

#### 1. WELCOME, CALL TO ORDER, AND ROLL CALL

Marty Elquist, Nevada Early Childhood Advisory Council Chair called the meeting to order, 9:04 AM. Quorum is met.

#### Council Members in Attendance

##### In Las Vegas:

- Cheryl Joyce, Child Care Licensing
- Angela Triche, Sunrise Children’s Foundation, Early Head Start
- Daina Loeffler, DOE
- Dolores Hauck, Southern Nevada Nonprofit Early Childhood Programs
- Carrie Paldi, Creative kids Learning Center

##### In Reno:

- Marty Elquist, The Children’s Cabinet
- Anna Severens, NDE
- Sherry Waugh, UNR CFRC
- Tina Springmeyer, WCSO
- Megan Wickland, APSD

##### In Carson City:

- Christell Askew, DWSS/CCDP

#### Public in Attendance

##### In Las Vegas:

- Mary Regan, LVUL
- Stacey Joyner, NDE



- Cheryl Joyce, Child Care Licensing
- Patty Oya, NDE

**In Reno:**

- Jennifer McCann, The Children's Cabinet
- John Cregg, NevAEYC TEACH
- Cindy Johnson, NDE
- Lois Ann Porter, United Way
- Janice Lee, UNR Nevada TACSEI
- Cristal Roldan, The Children's Cabinet
- Shelly Nye, Registry
- Karen Mkklish, Child Care Licensing
- Bradley C. Bauler, DCA

**In Elko:**

- Lisa Calder, Elko County School District
- Connie Zeller, Independent Consultant

**In Carson City:**

- Alycia Burton, DOE
- Tiffany Olivas, DOE
- Anna Lisa Acosta, Child Development Center
- Frances Sullivan, WA Tribe Head Start
- Kemdra Tuttle, Carson City School District Special Ed.
- Yehudit Nadler, Easter Seals

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

- No public comment

**3. ITEM A: REVISION OF THE ECAC STRATEGIC PLAN**

- The ECAC gathered feedback on draft strategic plan. Feedback was sent to respective subcommittee chairs. The following subcommittee chairs presented feedback for each of their sections. Feedback for all sections and ECAC action on each comment is provided on the attached pages.
  - Early Learning presented by Anna Severens and Tina Springmeyer
  - Family & Community presented by Angela Triche and Dolores Hauck
  - Health presented by Cheryl Joyce and Megan Wickland

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

- No public comment

**5. ADJOURNMENT @ 3:26PM**

















Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
	PreK Standards program is not listed as a partner.		
13	<p>1<sup>st</sup> bullet: Develop a checklist for parents and preK providers...Do you already have one that is being used from Children's Cabinet?</p> <p>Partners:</p> <p>Funds Needed:</p>	<p>2nd bullet: The last sentence is not complete</p> <p>Add NV PreK Standards, and for NDE include OELD, OSSS, OSIS, OSRL Funds needed for child, program and workforce standards work.</p>	<p>Removed</p> <p>Added</p>
14	<p>Reword objective 3</p> <p>Change objective to not be about unifying under The Nevada Registry. There is a lot of work to do here and not sure this is what the Strategies are about.</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> bullet--Strategy: Define the value of membership in the Nevada Registry for K-3 teachers and other adults supporting education in education in elementary school settings. Concern: The current Career Ladder is based on education in ECE. Many K-3 teachers do not have the ECE specialization needed to place at levels commensurate with their degrees. This creates a barrier to participation.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet- change to</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup> bullet – Change to</p> <p>6<sup>th</sup> bullet: Strategy: Assess all ECE training offering for CEUs, Training Hours and College Credits. Concern: What does this mean?</p> <p>Strike 7<sup>th</sup> bullet</p> <p>8<sup>th</sup> bullet:</p>	<p>Unify Birth-3<sup>rd</sup> Grade workforce within and/or aligned to The Nevada Registry. Change Objective 3 to: Unify early childhood and early elementary workforce from birth through grade 3.</p> <p>In order to be able to fully bring the K-3 workforce into the Registry, there needs to be a pathway that doesn't currently exist. Whether a new pathway is created or the existing Career Ladder is modified, it will have significant impacts on the Registry's workload and will take a significant amount of time to develop and implement (particularly if significant changes are made to the Career Ladder, all members would need to be re-evaluated).</p> <p>Determine the steps, resources and/or desires to register all K-3 adults in school systems as members of the Nevada Registry and/or identify another strategy or pathway for enhancing and integrating K-3 educators.</p> <p>Work with DOE to make registration automatic through technology or create process to share aggregated data to identify the early childhood and early elementary workforce.</p> <p>Changes to the Career Ladder and/or the development of alternative pathways should be driven by The Nevada Registry within the context of the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Add: Utilize the tiered reimbursement system to reward early childhood and early elementary educators for continued professional learning on career pathway.</p> <p>Promote online early childhood and early elementary education opportunities offered by Nevada's community colleges and universities to support the workforce in rural areas..</p> <p>Focus B-3 training investments in geographic and demographic areas of greatest need.</p>	<p>Added</p> <p>Removed</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> bullet removed</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet: changed: Determine the steps and resources necessary to create a comprehensive workforce data set of all early childhood educators in The Nevada Registry and the early elementary workforce and to align professional development opportunities.</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup> bullet removed – Save as activity</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup> bullet removed – saved as activity</p> <p>6<sup>th</sup> bullet – changed as identified</p>

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
	<p>10<sup>th</sup> bullet – other community colleges besides Great Basin have online opportunities. Change to reflect all CCs. Change to</p> <p>11<sup>th</sup> bullet: strike</p> <p>12<sup>th</sup> bullet:</p> <p>Timeline: Year 1 and 2: Review, research and create a K-3 pathway that is aligned with the Nevada Registry and teacher licensure.</p> <p>Year 3: Initiate implementation through existing data and new pathway creation.</p> <p>Funds needed: Registry and licensure</p>	<p>The timeline of the strategic plan should take into account the internal timelines of the programs that will be impacted and/or required to do the work. For instance, the Registry is currently developing an online system for membership application and renewals. This is a significant project that will likely not be complete or fully implemented for another two years. The strategic plan estimates the ECE workforce is estimated at 15,000. The Registry will be better equipped to manage the influx of 8000+ new members after the online system is fully implemented.</p> <p>The Registry just launched an improved training approval system in January 2017. The strategic plan needs to be mindful of the work that has already been completed being careful not to undermine the progress made at the program level. A TAS Advisory Workgroup has been created to help with the ongoing development of the training approval system as well. Some systems are already in place so it's unclear how the ECAC will interact and engage and to what level.</p>	<p>7<sup>th</sup> bullet-removed</p> <p>8<sup>th</sup> bullet changed</p> <p>10<sup>th</sup> bullet change</p> <p>11<sup>th</sup> bullet-removed</p> <p>12<sup>th</sup> bullet reworded as noted (focus B-3 training investments...)</p>
	<p>1<sup>st</sup> bullet</p> <p>Potential B-3 Strategy:</p>	<p>Explore the value of membership in the Nevada Registry for K-3 teachers... Review and enhance K-3 professional learning avenues and opportunities that are incorporated and/or aligned to NV Registry.</p> <p>Align existing professional learning (i.e. coaches, learning strategists, etc.) opportunities and support for PreK-3<sup>rd</sup> grade workforce that supports ESSA and Rb3 guidelines and recommendations.</p>	<p>See above – all included</p>
15	<p>Under benefits, Not sure we want all B-3 workforce registered under The Nevada Registry?? Also, add “their” after with to read</p> <p>Under Strategy Implementation Partners,</p> <p>Funds Needed: Additional resources are need to organize credits, hours and CEUs and pathway development.</p>	<p>... The Nevada Registry with their complete credentials and educational...” Also add “children” in second to last sentence to read “ECE to meet the needs of children and families in Nevada.”</p> <p>Change UNR, UNLV, Great Basin to NSHE. It has to be throughout our higher ed system.</p>	<p>Added</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Changed</p>
15	<p>Reword Objective 4</p>	<p>Review and align child care licensure and Part C IDEA program requirements and/or structures with other B-3 entities.</p>	<p>Changed – reworded per discussion: Explore the pros, cons and steps needed to move IDEA</p>

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
			Part C Office into the Nevada Office of Special Education along with Part B.
16	<p>Under Strategy, first bullet,</p> <p><b>Under Strategy, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet, this is just Washoe County, makes is sound like there are separate county licensing standards across Nevada.</b></p> <p>Under Strategy, last bullet. This is confusing as there is not licensure for programs operated by municipal or county Parks &amp; Recreation. Does this intend to add OST programs to licensure requirements? Need clarification on our intent here.</p> <p><b>Under Strategy Implementation Partners, The Children’s Cabinet should not be listed here. Maybe DWSS as OST programs have to meet CCDF requirements?</b></p> <p>Strategy: Move Child Care Facility licensure to Nevada Office of Early Learning. Concern: What are the perceived benefits of making this shift? Does this include Washoe County Licensing?</p> <p><b>Strategy: Align stricter county licensure standards with state standards. Is this referring to Washoe County Child Care Licensing? Is the plan to move ALL licensing into the OELD? (see above)</b></p>	<p>Add “B” in front licensing in “along with Part licensing” <b>Add Washoe in front of county.</b></p> <p>Moving ALL Child Care Facility licensure to one agency makes complete sense and will reduce confusion that currently exists and create better consistency in the enforcement of regulations across the state.</p> <p><b>Coordinating Agency: Washoe County Human Services Agency should be added if the intent is move ALL licensing to the OELD.</b></p>	<p><b>Added</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet – reworded per discussion:</b> Explore the pros, cons, and steps needed to move Child Care Licensing to Nevada Department of Education.</p> <p>6<sup>th</sup> bullet reworded per discussion: Establish common statewide licensing standards.</p>
16	<p><b>Under Strategy, first bullet, I think B is missing from the last line; Part licensing</b></p>	<p>1<sup>st</sup> bullet: 2<sup>nd</sup> line after the word Part, should the letter C be added? <b>Add B?</b></p>	Addressed above.
17	<p>Vision:</p> <p>This strategy appears to be only for 0-5, if so we should state such...</p> <p>B-3 Strategy:</p>	<p>Change “early learning workforce” to “early childhood and early elementary workforce”</p> <p>Revision suggestion: Advocate for greater investment in wage or incentive program that rewards increased education levels, TEACH scholarships, and/or faculty training.</p> <p>Strategy for faculty training? Strategy and/or incentives for administrators?</p>	<p>Changed</p> <p>B-3 Strategy Reworded to: identify incentives &amp; opportunities for pre-K teachers and administrators</p>

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
	Identify opportunities for K-3 teacher incentives and/or funding to support B-3 licensure.	<p>Include a strategy to research and identify appropriate wage/incentive programs.</p> <p>Benefits: Early childhood and early elementary workforce will have increased knowledge of child development.</p> <p>Coordinating Agency and Strategy Implementation Partners...replace TEACH with NevAEYC; since NevAEYC is the administrative home of the T.E.A.C.H. Program.</p>	<p>to implement the B-3 framework and moved to Objective 3.</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added</p>
17	<p>Under Strategy, are we mapping just workforce funding streams here? If so, we need to add “workforce” to read</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup> Bullet revision:</p> <p>6<sup>th</sup> bullet revision:</p>	<p>Map all B-3 workforce financing and identify all specific funding gaps.</p> <p>Explore county, municipal, and private funding rewards for Pre-K training and worker longevity.</p> <p>Explore significant funding request for TEACH to create greater scale for TEACH to include B-3 workforce in programs not participating in QRIS, principal leadership and/or B-3 teachers and administrators participating in B-3 implementation with RPDPs.</p> <p>Explore county, municipal, and private funding rewards for B-3 education and longevity.</p>	<p>Bullet 1 reworded per discussion: Map all B-3 workforce financing by funding source in comparison to the overall investment in the early childhood and early elementary system.</p> <p>Bullet 3 reworded per discussion: Explore significant funding request (i.e., state marijuana tax dollars) for workforce investments.</p> <p>Bullet 6 reworded per discussion: Explore county, municipal, and private funding rewards for 0-5 teacher education and longevity</p>
17	Time frame:	<p>Strike “for TEACH”</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> line under Benefits: should you add the word (an) between be/increased?</p>	<p>struck</p> <p>added</p>
18	<p>Reword Objective 6</p> <p>Under Objective 6 – Consider</p>	<p>Term “Manpower” (temp agency) is confusing? Allocate personnel and financial resources to integrate and/or align early childhood and early elementary data.</p>	<p>Changed to personnel</p>

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
	<p>changing Manpower to Staff. Discuss. Also, this objective seems to be duplicative with the coordination of ECE/K-12 data. Can we integrate the two if our intent is to integrate ECE workforce data and not necessarily “register” K-12 workforce in The Nevada Registry?</p> <p>Objective 7 under strategies, this Objective is still the most vague for me. I feel these strategies should be called out within the plan under the appropriate objectives. If not all B-3 strategies have a natural fit within our plan, why not and what are they?</p>		
19	<p>Move Objective 7 to guiding principles....</p> <p>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet</p> <p>Revise 4<sup>th</sup> bullet</p>	<p>See wording suggested above.</p> <p>Align training standards for literacy and learning instructional specialists and coaches. (Rb3, QRIS?)</p> <p>Align B-3 instructional practices and curricula standards across developmental domains. Not sure what 5<sup>th</sup> bullet means.</p> <p>Add: Integrate data from B-3 pilots and focus groups in statewide professional learning opportunities.</p> <p>Integrate B-3 guidelines and framework across professional learning opportunities to support administrators and teachers across the continuum.</p> <p>Under Vision 2<sup>nd</sup> line: delete the word (of) between phase/with</p> <p>Under Benefits the words School Districts is written twice. One needs to be deleted</p>	<p>Moved to guiding principles.</p> <p>Objective 7 removed and integrated as indicated above.</p>
19	<p>In the Coordinating Agencies ECAC is defined, but DCA is not.</p>	<p>I suggest defining the acronym to make it consist throughout the document.</p>	
23,25	<p>Southern Nevada United Way is not listed as either a possible community partner or a coordinating entity.</p>	<p>It possibly could be a great addition since Northern Nevada United Way is listed within the document.</p>	
45	<p>Table is helpful to clearly outline “high impact opportunities”, but am confused where the headings in the Early Learning System Building column come from?</p> <p>Should these be our principals or objectives?</p>		<p>This came from the interviewees</p>
46	<p>Add “Increased state investment in publicly funded preK” (i.e. PDG state match, Zoom, Victory, etc.) in Progress Column</p> <p>Revise #1 and #5 in High Impact</p>	<p>1) Advocate for Universal, voluntary state funded high-quality PreK while working incrementally, focused on low-income, “high need” children and families that provides funding flexibility that best meets individual district/program needs to serve highest need</p>	<p>Changed #1 &amp; #5</p>

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
	Opportunities	populations specifically in rural communities. 2) Sustain and expand rural mobile PreK opportunities for 3-4 year olds to compliment school-based PreK while providing funding flexibility to meet rural district needs, such as the Classroom On Wheels, etc.	
47	Add #4 in Early Literacy	Expand B-3 implementation beyond pilots and across initiatives (pilots, Rb3, etc.)	Added
48	Alignment:	1) Birth to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Approach (strike initiative) 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet: Starting with Churchill, WCSD, and Mater Charter School in Las Vegas 2-4 do not connect to progress bullets	Struck  Reworded slightly to flow.
49	Data:	1) NDE led Universal Screening of all children in licensed child care and state PreK using Brigance. 2) ...will help assess where children are upon entry to kindergarten and/or track for K readiness.	Changed both
51	Support for children with disabilities	Increased state inclusion rate? Guidance document?	Added both

## Feedback: Family Support & Community Engagement

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
21	Last paragraph on this page, last sentence change pre k-3 to B-3	"...embedded aspect of Nevada's B-3 education system"	Change made
22	Under Daily Vroom, third bullet, daily guidance under Vroom. It is not clear that phone calls can be made to parents who lack internet access; however, there are printable tools for those that cannot receive regular smart phone access. Additionally, there is opportunity to write a proposal to support this distribution to Nevada parents and caregivers.		Reworded per discussion "Research Born Learning (www.bornlearning.com), Daily Vroom (www.joinvroom.org), and other available resources and adopt those with evidence-based practices, materials, and information to share with parents."
23	First paragraph under bullets, Key Measures are not identified in other parts of the plan. I feel we need to be consistent in the formatting of the plan. Either remove or put in key measures for all other Objectives or save for the work plan.		Removed. Key measures not consistent with other parts of the plan.
24	Under Coordinating Entities, list seems short sighted. I would recommend adding Head Start, Early Head start and Home Visiting at a minimum.		
24	Under other areas of the plan, Implementation Partners are listed as Strategy Implementation Partners. Under this objective, these are under the heading of Key Implementation Partners to Explore. I actually like this better and recommend we change all section to Key Implementation Partners to Explore.	Add Home Visiting, Head Start and Early Head Start as Key Implementation Partners to Explore.	Added entities and changed to <b>Key Implementation Partnerships to Explore</b> Throughout plan.
23 & 25	Southern Nevada United Way is not listed as either a possible community partner or a coordinating entity.	It possibly could be a great addition since Northern Nevada United Way is listed within the document.	Added
23	Under Time Frame, not time frame for years 2 & 3 identified. This is an overall inconsistency in the pan and I think we need to be specific for each or take out in this version and include in the workplan.		DCA Will address throughout
23	Strategy Implementation Partners – this is an overall comment for the entire plan. I think it is more helpful to list partners for strategies as it is not clear what agencies will work on		DCA will address in workplan.



Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
	what strategies. Thoughts from the group???		
24	Funds needed. Not sure we would need funds to reach out to these entities. We would need funds to update the Economic Impact plan. Also question if The Children's Cabinet should be listed here at all. Again, should funding strategies be specific to our strategies?		Added funding need to Objective 1 in EL. Not sure why this comment is here.
24	Bullet Strategies to be consistent with other sections of the plan.		Added bullets
25		Change Nevada Home Visiting Network to Nevada Home Visiting	changed
25	Under Funding Needs, Do the books have to be new? Spread the Word Nevada does a great job of taking used books and distributing. They are going statewide too.		Per discussion, changed to: "A key need is to buy age-appropriate."
26		Change Nevada Home Visiting Network to Nevada Home Visiting	Changed
27	Under Vision, what does the 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet mean? We need to be specific here. Additionally, in the 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet, I'm a little confused about putting OST Programs here. We need to define if we feel OST belongs in EL or Families & Communities. I strongly feel that the 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet under Strategy belong under EL as this is about aligning ECE workforce training.		Per Discussion, changed to: These will be offered in a variety of community locations that are easily accessible to families  4 <sup>th</sup> bullet changed per discussion to: Encourage non-profit programs to offer services during non-traditional business hours to expand access.  Moved 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet to EL.
28	Under Time Frame, Year Two. We need to have additional strategies (I think in EL) to drive need/demand for OST trainings. There are not regulations or standards that require these trainings. We promote, but do not get participation at the level for		Moved to EL

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change	ECAC Adopt?
	universal participation.		
28	Under Objective 5, Strategy, I hear a tremendous need for 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet regarding transition activities for children and families entering kindergarten. This also is prevalent in the B-3 plan.		Added: Identify pre-K to K transition activities for children and families and promote in each district.
29	First paragraph, second line, change to "offered in early 2019" as 2018 is not realistic	Change to "offered in early 2019."	changed
29	Under Time Frame, Year One, change third line to "families with children from birth to grade three"	Change to "families with children birth to grade three"	Changed

## Health Section Feedback

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change
9	Something is missing in create alignment – “objectives, and commonly measured in support”	Not sure what commonly measured is in reference to, is it common measurement? <b>ECAC: Changed.</b>
11	Objective one timeframe does not seem reasonable. There are no specific tasks assigned to agencies and there is not real deliverable at the end of year one. Is it to schedule a meeting, or get them to invest?	This needs to be more specific with regards to expectations and who is leading the work. Also, there should be a three year plan within this objective. What should be the target by the end of each year. <b>ECAC: Discussed. Will address in action plan format.</b>
12	The idea of the task force is not clear. Why is this needed to award CEUs? Is this to avoid the current system?	<b>ECAC: Discussed</b>
12	Provide ECE providers with a checklist for kindergarten readiness – if evidence base curriculum is used then isn't this already being done? I think this sounds like it is another way to teach to the test because providing a checklist is not telling someone how to prepare for those tasks.	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Yes, this is being done.</b>
12	With regards to Silver State Stars, why does there need to be greater value for a 1 star. We shouldn't want any provider to be a one star as that is baseline requirements to open doors.	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Agreed.</b>
12	Each of these strategies should have specific actions steps with specific agencies attached and their own timeframe. This would help clarify the work, the purpose and how to move forward.	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Agreed.</b>
14	If the Registry is responsible for all training approval, then a better system needs to be in place for determining approved trainers.	<b>ECAC: Discussed and already addressed by Registry.</b>
17	Expanding TEACH dollars is not the only barrier to participation. We have dollars right now that are unused because of the criteria associated with TEACH. There should be other funding mechanisms explore that could help increase education. Also it is unclear what the end result will be in year 3.	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Agreed. Benchmarks will be addressed in Action Plan.</b>
18	Data systems should only integrate education but also other social services as this will provide a more comprehensive data list.	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Need to discuss with action plan.</b>
19	Is there a reason to have a separate B-3 plan? If they both cover the exact same age then wouldn't it be better to have one plan to work from with assignments to different aspects of the plan?	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Integrated B-3 language throughout ECAC strategic plan instead of having separate objective.</b>
22	What is the research behind bornlearning information? There is nothing on the website that indicate the research behind the effectiveness of their materials or effectiveness in all or certain population.	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Changed language so we could research programs first.</b>
22	When discussion promotion of resources there is a lack of recognition of how to reach families that are not involved in social systems. This is a key part to serving families is to address their barriers to accessing information.	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Need to address in action plan.</b>
23	Are these two models the sole resources? If there	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Changed language so we</b>

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change
	are others will they be added? What is the priority, to get consistent information disseminated or a consistent program.	could research programs first.
24	Guidance in health care settings seems very limited to reach out and read, doctors can also be discussing early learning at home and overall development including conducting developmental screenings. They should be pairing the importance of health and education and how they impact each other. They could also help parents start to consider educational avenues from a young age. This also does not consider the issues of individuals getting to the physicians or the ability to afford care.	ECAC: Discussed. Need to address in action plan.
25	The needs assessment mentioned, if it is conducted by home visiting, this is a very specific audience. IT would seem that a broader approach would be needed, unless they already conduct this at a community level. It is not clear from the information provided.	ECAC: Noted.
25	It mention a cross walk training between health workers and home visitors which may not be necessary. First identify the skills that are needed in this goal to determine who has them and who does need them.	ECAC: Noted. Can we address via action steps?
25	Agencies need to be in 211 for it to be a better system for families	ECAC: Noted. Can we address via action steps?
25	There is not a clear description of linkages that are needed between home visiting and schools. It is assumed this handoff is not done?	ECAC: Discussed. Need to address in committee via action steps.
26	The measure of progress focuses of home visiting which serves very little families in the state. This seems like a very narrow focus for this goal. Also, community health workers and home visiting is not the same program and it sounds like they are trying to make community health workers the same as home visitors. I think this needs clarification as this would not be possible or maybe not reasonable.	ECAC: Discussed. Not the intent. Cross training is the intent.
27	It would be interesting to know how many OST there are that serve 0-5 or is this more targeted to 6-8? I think there should be different targets and goals for these age groups because I am not sure who is an OST from 0-5 if the child is not in school? It seems like this should be part of the assessment process to determine what experiences are available and how to address barriers of cost and transportation, and parent potentially have multiple children that don't all meet the criteria for the target program.	ECAC: Discussed. OST is for children K & Up, not 0-5
28	Family engagement is a struggle even at later grades so I am not sure using a model that might not currently work for target families is the right approach. Looking for innovative ideas to increase family participation that takes into consideration the	ECAC: Noted. Will discuss in committee and identify via action steps.

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change
	barriers to participation might be a more successful approach.	
36	One strategy is to put community health workers in settings such as head start or home visiting, however these individuals are usually already trained or have set staff that help with these same services. I thought the idea of community health workers was for these individuals to go into the community to reach families that were not currently connected or receiving services to help get them connected. If these workers are in the same settings and just have a broader knowledge base, while that is helpful it will not address the issue of families that are disconnected.	<b>ECAC: Discussed. Intent it not to have CHWs in same setting. Cross-training is the intent.</b>
37	It is mentioned that community health workers are trusted in the community however they are new to our community so I am curious if this is an assumption or if it is a fact in our community given that the program is newer.	<b>ECAC: Noted, no change</b>
39/40	I am not sure we have enough resources that are evidence based to refer families to these programs. While we should be funding EBP and promoting when possible, if they are not yet available this makes it challenging.	Part of this needs to include a review of programs available and their openings. If there are no openings then this should be a goal for later years or start by increasing availability of EBP and then to promote them. <b>ECAC: Included Strategy</b>

**Comments:**

This plan is a good start but lacks specific activities assigned to specific agencies that include timelines and measurable outcomes. Also, being a 3 year plan, it makes it harder to see next steps and the activities that might come next. In the fields on Family Support and Child and Family Health, participation was also lower so I hope more individuals were able to review this plan to find additional pieces so this plan is comprehensive within each focus area. Our agency has started to do a cross walk with this plan and other state plans to try to determine missing factors. It is not yet complete, but we hope it will be within the next month and I will send it to the NECAC for review. (Amanda Haboush Deloye)

**ECAC: Work plan will happen next and include these specific activities, timelines and outcomes.**

**Comments:**

Maria Teresa Johnson: I do not have any questions/concerns or anything else to add. I think that the Health strategic plan addressed all the points that we had discussed during our teleconference. The goals and strategies are realistic and achievable. The document was well put together. Thank you.

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change
19	2ND sentence in n5 on	phase of ?
17	IS objective 5 meant to target home providers as well?	If so, add step to explore funding to enhance income/wages of home providers w/out increasing burden of parents.
<del>17</del>		
25	The focus seems to be primarily on home visiting to support parents.	*including funding for parent programs if needed identified such as ESL families or parents who are not literate. Literacy programs for parents?
	*This may be addressed in objective 4, but that's not clear to me *	
	Clarification on need assessment	
	- how will it capture children placed in foster care, children with other caregivers/ extensive needs, etc.	Step in objective seek funding + partner with agencies to address children with high needs.

Comments: Tammy Goodall

Page #	Question/Clarification/Concern	Recommended Change
35	by 8 (under funds needed)	by (type)

Comments: Karen Micklish