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**Meeting Notes**

**IRRC Leadership Team Meeting**

**Phoenix, Arizona – January 19, 2016**

**Attending:** Jennifer Almeda (SC), Doug Boline (KS), Jessica Castañeda (TN), Jennifer Crofford (OK), Susan Durón (META), John Farrell (KS), Mary Haluska (AZ), Sue Henry (NE), Mary Leininger (NM), Michael Maye (IRRC), Geri McMahon (IA),Tomás Mejía (CO), Will Messier (NY), Barb Patch (CIG Coordination), Brenda Pessin (IL), Terry Richard (DE), Beth Robinson (IL), Bernardo Sánchez-Vesga (GA)

States Attending: 13

States Unable to Attend: 1 (Maine)

**8:30-9:00a – Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Overview, Budget Items**

Michael welcomed everyone to the IRRC Leadership Team (ILT) meeting and asked Directors, their representatives, and others to introduce themselves. He then described the objectives of the meeting, reviewed the agenda, and described the materials included in participants’ packets.

Next, Sue Henry—Lead State Director—asked if there were any questions that participants had about the IRRC budget. Terry asked if anyone had any suggestions about how to respond to their state financial units as they have a great deal of difficulty with how the CIG funds operate. She always has to explain a lot about the costs of participating in the CIG. Beth mentioned that Illinois does an intergovernmental agreement as a competitive grant with a payment. As the award is an increase to the MEP state allocation, the cost to participate in the CIG can be done as a contract for services.

**9:00-9:45a – Member states’ reports on ID&R activities**

Each state representative gave a 3-5 minute report highlighting one unique or interesting component about their state’s ID&R program or plan.

**1) ARIZONA** – The state is different in many ways from others who have reported. They still have school district based recruiting with 70 data clerks and recruiters. About 80% of migrant families work in the Yuma area. Mary spends about 3-4 days a week in Yuma in the southwestern part of the state. This area is the Winter Lettuce Capital of the World. They currently serve 10,399 migrant children and youth in Arizona and have both temporary and seasonal workers. In the Gila area, they have shrimp farms and are trying to tap the fishing industry. In the north, workers come for forestry work.

**2) COLORADO** – The state wants to expand its presence through the ID&R of all areas of the state. The MEP has organized a meeting in which various stakeholders come to the table to consider ways to partner for recruiting and delivering services to farmworkers and their children. The groups that will participate include: HEP, CAMP, Colorado Department of Labor, Aricore, Colorado Department of Agriculture, and more. The purpose of the meeting is to provide outreach to the various agencies to discuss eligibility issues, services, and ways to partner to avoid duplication and ensure that student needs are being met. Colorado has MOUs with many of these agencies. At the March 10, 2016 meeting, Lisa Ramírez from OME will be presenting. Currently, Colorado uses a Regional recruiting model and has 24-25 recruiters.

**3) DELAWARE** – Forty percent of the Delaware landmass is agricultural-based. They have three counties and mostly serve as a summer receiving state; but the workers come in February/March and by September are gone. At one time, the migrant population decreased to about 800, but it has increased by 25% over the last two years. There are a lot of Guatemalan workers with the second largest population being Haitian Creole workers. There are five poultry processing plants and mobility occurs most frequently between Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. There are no intermediate agencies to assist with recruitment and it comes straight from the state office. Many of the migrant workers in the state have H2A status and work in crab and oyster processing.

**4) GEORGIA** – Bernardo showed the group the state’s six-chapter, comprehensive ID&R Handbook which includes a solid plan for statewide recruitment. It includes quality control, record keeping, and everything needed for recruiters to do their jobs successfully. As a medium-sized state, Georgia has about 9,000 students, although at one time, 23,000 were served. Eight state recruiters coordinate ID&R services under the leadership of Bernardo; and there are 140 part-time/full-time SSPs. To serve in this capacity, recruiters need to be certified—a process that is done by the state recruiters. The process has four levels from Novice to Master recruiter.

**5) ILLINOIS** – The state is trying to increase its recruitment of temporary workers and hopes to gain strategies through working in IRRC. Brenda asked: *How many states have done ID&R resource mapping?* (About ¾ of the group raised their hands). Illinois is working to build a database that is driven by the mapping. They are collecting: Information on employers, crops, seasonal patterns (when they come and how long they stay), contact information, GPS locations, etc. in order to arrive at accurate numbers of children who qualify for the MEP. They are trying to work in a collaborative manner using a cloud-based data system. As recruiters from various programs engage in their activities, they update the information in the cloud-based database so that it is automatically shared with users/partners. Illinois has done mini-blitzes to old motels where farm workers are staying as the old concept of labor camps are few and far between. More families are arriving from Africa to work in pork processing plants.

**6) IOWA** – Over the last couple of years the MEP is being redone. Recently, Iowa went from a local ID&R model to a regional model and hired a Coordinator. There will be 5 regional recruiters. The state MEP is doing sweeps- helping recruiters in their own regions and statewide. Partnering with Proteus (Medical clinics), Workforce Development (they post MEP information provided by the state MEP).

**7) KANSAS** – Recruiting in Kansas is divided up statewide with regions including NW, SW, NE, SE, and Central. Mike Toole serves as the statewide ID&R Coordinator. The Kansas MEP has many positive relationships with packing plants; dairies; hog, and poultry farms; and employs 24 full-time recruiters. The state is seeking to combine services that currently are independent in an attempt to be more efficient and would include some recruiting combined with the delivery of instructional services to OSY. They will be looking closely at a model similar to that used in Tennessee to allow them to “get more bang for the buck” as they are anticipating a funding reduction at some point in the future.

**8) NEBRASKA** – They have 5 regional ID&R sites and strong agribusiness relationships. Recruiters go onsite to agribusinesses weekly as part of a new hire program. Recruiting is also done onsite at agribusinesses. Workers fill out a referral sheet. To do seasonal recruiting recruiters know who the crew chiefs are and they give recruiters a heads up on when workers will be arriving. Through interstate coordination with states such as Iowa and Kansas, Nebraska plans jointly and does mass recruiting.

**9) NEW HAMPSHIRE** – While not a Consortium state, Barb Patch was asked to report on New Hampshire’s recruiting as they have a long-established MOU with the Department of Labor (DOL) to communicate and share information about migrant farm workers to enable them to be more efficient in ID&R. The DOL provides the MEP with names and contact information to assist with recruitment when job applicants who are migrant H2-A apply. They also have an agreement with the state Homeless agency since the definition of homeless and migrant-eligible coincide. Another positive agreement that New Hampshire has is with Vista and the MEP has a Vista worker that reports every day. Also, a corporate lawyer works with the MEP as a volunteer.

**10) NEW MEXICO** – Mary Leininger reported on activities in southeast New Mexico, especially the Dexter/Roswell area. The state previously had school-based recruiting, but they have moved to a regional-based model and are experiencing some success with this change. Because the state has large, remote, rural areas with a sparse population, recruiting can be difficult and learning strategies for this type of recruitment is one reason for participating in the Consortium. Some of the key activities in New Mexico are dairy, alfalfa, corn, chile, and tomatoes.

**11) NEW YORK** – The New York MEP has an MOU with the State University of New York (SUNY) system. Will Messier directs the data and ID&R which conveniently allows for obtaining information. As a border state (with Canada), ICE has a strong presence in the state and keeps close tabs on workers. Businesses in the state are hiring many workers from Puerto Rico. They currently have 2,500 migrant students in grades K-12. Services are provided through regional sites. New York uses the “blitz” for recruiting as well as for a quality control procedure. They have MEP staff that go into camps to recruit. Regional programs provide one-on-one tutoring to OSY students in a home-based model. Given the current numbers, the state expects to take a slight funding cut with Reauthorization.

**12) OKLAHOMA** – The State of Oklahoma is working to build the program in a climate of recent transition. They have 13 districts and currently use a district-based model. There are only about 500-700 migrant students, but they know there are more that need to be identified and recruited. Oklahoma wants to move toward a regional recruiting model; however, they are worried about backlash in areas that have historically been controlled locally. Farming and ranching are the major activities but there are two large meat processing plants in the state. Students typically come from Mexico and Central America but recently there have been migrant workers from Asia and Africa. The state MEP is looking for advice on building program infrastructure and capacity. They know and understand that ID&R is crucial to this process.

**13) SOUTH CAROLINA** – As a summer receiving state, South Carolina has many H2A workers who work with peaches and watermelons. A strong collaboration is in place with an adult education program created by higher education to give workers 12 hours of credit needed. Many workers come from northern or southern Mexico and are out-of-school youth (OSY) and want to learn. Some only stay from one to three weeks. Challenging demographics arise from indigenous workers from southern Mexico and Guatemala who have very little formal education, minimal Spanish, and no English. The state has gone to a regional model with 2½ recruiters. They are short on resources and want to benefit from the CIG to get other recruiters to come in. They have only two sub-grantees in the regular year and have close partnerships with Migrant Health and Migrant Head Start.

**14) TENNESSEE** – The state has limited funding so they have to streamline everything they do in the program. There are basically two populations of seasonal farmworkers who work in tomatoes, tobacco, and some other agricultural activities. All recruiters are cross-trained to become instructors who multi-task. They do occupational surveys and they all know both how to recruit and also provide instructional services to migrant children and youth. Recruiters do a daily report which has been very efficient and it serves the purpose of rapidly exposing if a member of the team is not pulling their weight. All staff are trained on how to make a unit relevant to grades K-12. The instructional units are Common Core aligned. Tennessee only has a $500K grant. They have nine staff members and many part-time workers. They try to stretch their limited resources as much as possible.

**9:45-10:15a – FII Questions and comments**

The next session was facilitated by Susan Durón, the IRRC evaluator from META Associates. She noted that the Fidelity of Implementation Index (FII) is the “roadmap” for carrying out the activities of the IRRC Consortium based on the proposal. At least monthly—and most often weekly—the evaluator and IRRC Director check in to review progress using the FII to make sure the project is on target to meet goals and objectives. There will be three FIIs, one for each project year.

Susan shared the most recent FII and introduced a jigsaw activity in which each table was responsible for reporting out on two key issues for each of the three IRRC goals as written in the proposal. The feedback and comments from participants at each table as to their summary of the key issues follows:

***Goal 1 – Design and develop systems, materials, strategies, and resources for the ID&R of eligible migrant children and youth.***

* The way the law and non-regulatory guidance are interpreted varies from state to state.
* Who pays for travel for TRI teams to go to another state?
* ID&R models and organizational structures vary from state to state.
* As a brand new consortium, the MPOs for Goal 1 seem ambitious, especially for the first year of the project.
* Adapting the goals and outcomes to the various needs of each state is a concern.
* Inter-rater reliability with training and the TRI Team systems is a concern.
* The adaptability of systems, materials, strategies, and resources to the IRRC models needs to be worked out.

***Goal 2 – Expand states’ capacity through resource collaborations, mentoring, professional development, and technical assistance.***

* Is a national agreement feasible for building partnerships with agri-businesses that benefit all partner states?
* It may be difficult to develop signed partnership agreements that are meaningful (e.g., FERPA, HIPPA).
* Coordination of the efforts between IRRC and GOSOSY on the development of competency-based ID&R skills test needs to be watched carefully to ensure that there is no duplication.
* What is the expectation of the skills test? Is it a “certification?” Is it possible for it to apply to all states? Will it be required? Can it be adapted?
* A concern is how to collaborate enthusiastically and make contributions to a national project when a state is already busy and overextended with running programs.
* How do states adapt so that a training/professional development session is relevant when states could have differing needs and operate under different conditions?

***Goal 3 – Disseminate effective practices and evidence-based ID&R practices throughout the MEP community.***

* What will the process be for ensuring that there is an organized process for material submission for the website?
* The Resource Roundup should have a needs assessment to help determine needs, format, and preferences.
* There are multiple activities that need to be accomplished in a short time during Year 1 of the project.
* There needs to be a template/rubric developed for the ID&R action plan.
* There needs to be a word count standard and format developed for states to help them put together the topics and content for the IRRC electronic newsletter.
* The literature review needs to narrow the focus from those developed by previously-funded CIGs and OME.
* What are the components of the needs assessment? Bulleted points?
* Examples are needed in terms of types of materials/resources sought for the Resource Roundup.

**10:30-11:00a – Data collection and reporting; performance measures, tools**

Susan discussed how data collection helps determine progress toward meeting the three IRRC goals and that documentation is essential to addressing the goals in the Annual Performance Reports (APR). The Federal reporting requirements ask Consortium Incentive Grants (CIG) to submit the following:

* Interim performance report due 5-1-2016 (data through 4-1-2016);
* Year 1 APR due 12-30-2016 (data through 9-30-2016);
* Year 2 APR due 12-30-2017 (data through 9-30-2017); and
* Year 3 Final performance report due 12-30-2018 (data through 9-30-2018).

While the above mentioned are all the due dates for reports to be sent to the Office of Migrant Education, the following are IRRC data reporting timelines **for 2016**:

* Interim APR data is due to META by Thursday, 3-24-2016; and
* Year 1 APR data is due to META by Thursday, 9-15-2016

The following data collection forms to be completed by all IRRC CIG states were discussed.

Form 1 - Director/coordinator survey

Form 2 - Training and technical assistance survey

Form 3 - ID&R materials pilot survey

Form 4 - ID&R consultation log

**Form 1** is due March 24, 2016 as a baseline and to meet the May 1, 2016 Interim APR Report timeline established by OME. On Form 1, list ID&R collaborations in which your state participates. Document and keep track of collaborations on the form. Because IRRC—unlike the other CIGs—is not based on student achievement; rather, it is based on ID&R and day-to-day increases in state ID&R capacities and infrastructures, the importance of documenting any changes states have undergone is the evidence needed for the APRs.

**Form 2** documentation on consultation and training provides the source data for item #5 on Form 1. Susan asked the group to provide recommendations for any needed future trainings. Form 2’s should be scanned and emailed or mailed to META after each training or TA event.

**Form 3** is the Materials Pilot survey and only used by staff who participate in the pilot. By 8-1-2016, all states should pilot three new ID&R materials. Upon completion of pilot activities in each state, the individuals piloting are asked to scan and email (or mail) these forms to META. Please use the comments section on Form 3 if “not at all” or “a little” is chosen for Question #1 and Question #2. Use the comments section if “a lot” or “very much” is chosen for Question #3.

**Form 4** is the ID&R communication log. In Year 1, this is to be used by Michael Maye, and Team Leaders Cye Fink, Mike Toole, Jessica Castañeda, and Lindsay Ickes. These individuals will keep the log on their desk or desktop and update after each substantive consultation or communication. Form 4 will be submitted to the evaluator quarterly beginning on March 24, 2016. The ILT discussed that Form 4 could be submitted by a state MEP director, state recruiter, etc. on an optional basis if there is a substantive activity to be documented; however, only the above mentioned are required to turn in Form 4.

**11:00a-12:15p – IRRC overview and Workgroup Activities**

Michael Maye gave an overview of IRRC—specifically the goals and activities. He underscored the work that will be done to establish reliability and consistency in the interview/re-interview process, the consistency in state ID&R plans and structures, and the establishment of the consortium infrastructure.

IRRC will result in increased interstate coordination, improved and more consistent eligibility determination in member states, updated, revised, and more consistent State ID&R plans, an IRRC website, and a national IRRC materials sharing event.

Through the Consortium, all 14 states will have a revised plan for ID&R in place. This project will help to ensure that a systems approach is in place that will support state agencies and local school districts.

Next, Michael reported on the workgroups and gave a progress update. This was followed by smaller group break out sessions.Input and feedback generated during break out sessions were then shared with the larger group after discussion at the tables.

**State ID&R Plan Workgroup** – The Team members are Lindsay Ickes (Team Leader), Bernardo Sánchez-Vesga (GA), Irene Sánchez (NY), Travis Williamson (SC), Zach Taylor (SC), Terry Richard (DE), and Jennifer Crofford (OK). The Workgroup objectives follow:

* Develop a State ID&R plan format for member states to use as a model;
* Plan for how technical assistance around the state ID&R plan will be offered to member states; and
* Create a work plan for the development of state profiles and state ID&R Action Plans.

The process the Workgroup used for developing the state ID&R template was outlined. This involved and included:

* Reviewed OME documents for requirements and guidance
* Reviewed current State ID&R plans and identified strong examples and recurring themes
* Drafted the outline for State ID&R Plan templates including the 5-step process and necessary components
* Revise the draft template and make revisions to objectives, strategies, resources, etc.

The State Plan 5-Step Process includes:

1. **Mission Statement** - Will be completed by states
2. **Measurable Objectives** – Outline will be provided for consistency; will include states’ identified measurements.
3. **Strategies/Activities -** Includes specific strategies recommended to reach measurable objectives. Additional strategies/activities may be added by states.
4. **State Resources -** Will be customized by states to include specific resources used through strategies. Those currently provided are model resources from IRRC states.
5. **Action Plan -** Extends the ID&R plan to focus on implementation for achieving measurable objectives. Will be completed by states and include staff responsible, timelines, and monitoring/documentation.

The next steps for the Workgroup are to:

* Revise the ID&R Plan Template based on feedback from the ILT.
* Disseminate the ID&R Plan to IRRC states through a webinar.
* Coordinate with the TRI Workgroup to implement the ID&R Plan through state support.
* Provide State Profiles with agricultural data and mapping as an ID&R resource.
* Provide technical assistance to IRRC states for implementation of State ID&R Plans.

ILT Table Discussion and Feedback for the State ID&R Plan Workgroup

* Agree with everything; however, regarding the mission statement, a general framework for the statement should be included that establishes compliance with federal guidance, laws, and regulations.
* The objectives are good. A strategy is needed for the first objective. Put together a small group to consider this. Can we create a rubric or template to evaluate recruiter effectiveness/performance? See page 2, Item #4. Not a knowledge assessment. Some objectives might be voluntary, some mandatory.
* The items could be BOLD if required by the OME or state (or some other way of identifying it).
* The TST can look at OME’s monitoring tool (See attached) and refer to it in the State Plan. Have it all in one spot. Look at the ID&R Toolkit to ensure compliance. Component on the basic indicators—a section for indicators that are state-specific or customized.
* Do an action plan strategy: Who is responsible and by when in a checklist form.
* Prepare a rubric to allow states to assess their own state plans.
* Jessica reported that in Tennessee, they pay recruiters an extra 1-2 hours each week for paperwork, but for that they do a report of their activities at the end of the day. This helps immensely in terms of accountability.

**1:30-2:15p – Competency Skills Test Workgroup Activities**

After lunch, Michael continued with discussion of the Competency Skills Test Workgroup followed by table discussion and feedback. Members of this Workgroup are: Cye Fink (Team Leader-OR), David Fisk (ME), Eva Jiménez (IL), María Mendoza (DE), Barb Patch (CIG Coordination), and Linda Root (AZ).

The objectives of the Competency Skills Test (CST) Workgroup for the initial TST meeting in Atlanta, GA were:

* Review existing certification materials from member states;
* Establish baseline knowledge a recruiter should have;
* Set general expectation of what a recruiter should know; and
* Develop a common, standardized process for certification.

The Workgroup outlined the general parameters for the CST as having 30 questions, all multiple choice and weighted equally. The content would include questions on eligibility determination, scenarios, COE completion, general categories, and best practices. The test would be housed at the IRRC website--taken online. Scoring would be automatic and the results would be forwarded to the state MEP Director, ID&R coordinator, or any person designated by the individual state.

The proficiency levels suggested by the Workgroup include:



Next steps for the CST Workgroup are to have a draft of the test completed for review by March 2016 and the professional development component rolled out through a webinar. The finalized instrument would be available for implementation by May 2016.

Table Discussion and Feedback for the Competency Skills Test Workgroup

* Many of the activities overlap with the work of the TRI group.
* AREA 2: See the chart.
* Considerable discussion about the need for a comprehensive test that covers all ages: PK, school age, OSY.
* The important thing is to cover the content—not only have 30 questions. More might be needed.
* The test results should be provided as feedback to the test taker and the director.
* There should be a mechanism for responding to the test taker to alert them to what they missed and be able to expand their understanding. An item analysis would be useful for the director for formative assessment
* Develop an item bank so that in the future, the test taker takes a different test.
* Use the law and guidance
* Include OSY and Pre-K—a couple of questions for each
* Use those portions of the National COE materials that is unchanging.
* Don’t provide answers to test-taker. Keep the test secure. The director could discuss the answers with the test taker.
* Don’t limit the number of questions; if you feel it is too long to get in all the needed content, it could be broken into different sections that are completed at different times.
* Design training to address the test taker’s weaknesses as demonstrated in the test. Re-test.
* To take the complete the test at the MASTERY level, maybe it would be a good idea for recruiters to be pre-certified by the state.
* Include a practical component in the test.

**2:15-3:15p – TRI Teams Workgroup Activities**

After the break, Michael continued with discussion of the TRI Teams Workgroup followed by table discussion and feedback. The group members are Mike Toole (Team Lead-KS), Emily Hanehan (NY), Alex Johnson (IA), Bernardo López (NM), Hilary Maitlen (TN), Norma Garnica (CO), and María Pérez de León (CO).

The key activities of the Workgroup include developing procedures, protocols, and materials; as well as delivering support on: triannual independent re-interviews, recruitment assistance, additional quality control activities (including training), canvassing new/high need areas, and emergency assistance in high turnover cases.

It was determined by the Workgroup that: Team members need to be experienced staff and willing to participate. Team pairing should be based on states’ needs and team members’ experience, background, and/or expertise, connections, etc. There could possibly be utilization of existing summer recruiters during the off-season to augment TRI teams, as well as the determination of states’ on and off-seasons. Credentialing for TRI Team recruiters is desirable.

Some possible criteria that the Workgroup discussed as protocol for deploying TRI teams:

* Determining what has worked and what has not worked in the past in terms of interstate coordination
* Completing request forms
* Determining how requests will be coordinated
* Establishing priority for help in cases of multiple requests in an area
* Establishing a point person for taking requests and making decisions
* Determining geographical concerns
* Setting parameters for the scope of TRI team activities onsite
* Establishing how financial arrangements will be handled
* Developing a Confidentiality Agreement
* Determining if one protocol vs multiple protocols is needed (i.e., one uniform instrument, or state-by-state basis)

The Workgroup talked about a crossover with the IRRC Competency Skills Test Workgroup and establishing that TRI teams should be certified prior to initial deployments. Also discussed briefing/training on the goals and objectives of teams, briefing on states and areas they are going to visit (e.g., industries, processes that are unique to the state, demographics of the student population in state), and the utility of the training-of-trainers model.

The next steps for the TRI Team Workgroup include:

1. Determine trends indicated in intra/interstate coordination surveys to guide protocol

development

2. Collect further nominations for recruiters to serve on Targeted Response teams

3. Group states for deployment of TRI Teams

4. Develop request forms

5. Develop trial protocols

6. Training/certification of TRI Teams

7. Identify three states for pilot of TRI Team deployment.

8. Establish training needs and certification

Table Discussion and Feedback for the TRI Teams Workgroup

* How to respond/react on-site if a team member does not work well with others or if the group encounters unanticipated tensions among team members? Or if a team member does not adapt/adjust well to the local context. What are the protocols there? How is that addressed? What forms of training are needed to prevent that situation from arising?
* What if problems or discrepancies are discovered in a receiving state by the visiting TRI team members? How is this handled? (Confidentiality Agreement, reporting protocal).
* Explicit terms laid out, communicated in a formal Letter of Agreement between IRRC TRI Teams and the State that clearly outlines and articulates components of the arrangement.
* Explain how members of the teams will be selected. What are the criteria?
* How are you identifying areas of expertise?
* How do we match a TRI Team member and a Team? Also, how are assignments determined? Michael clarified that it might be geography, experience, expertise.
* What about if a state wants help with the re-interview process? Right now, Temporary is an issue.
* This process is like an “IRRC Dating Site” where you match the client with the right people
* Include language abilities on the criteria as it’s important to match, for example, a recruiter that speaks the language if at all possible.
* The TRI Teams should send someone who is the “whole package” and is able to provide technical assistance in ALL areas.
* There should be an agreement from the receiving state being that findings, reports, and recommendations will be considered and responded to in some way.
* TRI work group must formalize their processes.
* In Iowa, Geri McMahon described how interstate coordination with Kansas and Nebraska has worked and recommended that TRI Teams focus on a) pre-visit logistics and coordination; onsite visit logistics (e.g., are there enough laptops, who is going to manage data entry, what are the arrangements that have to be made for cars, lodging, agenda, etc…).
* Will stated that planning is #1 in any interstate sweep. The TRI Team has to study the data, know when people are coming, and be clear about the importance of confidentiality.
* Jessica talked about how in her state, when outside recruiters come in, they go through the list of farmers, the resource guides, where the churches are, etc. New York does all that, but then puts it into the recruiters’ GPS.
* Have a general checklist and logistics checklist.
* Make sure that the visiting team members have an identification badge, letter of credential, etc. to show the family being visited.
* Several of the states represented at the meeting identified themselves as having been involved in interstate coordination: KS, NE, IA, NH, NY

**3:30-4:15p – Dissemination**

Jessica Castañeda spoke about the dissemination component of IRRC and covered the website and newsletter. The website address is: [www.idr-consortium.net](http://www.idr-consortium.net) and members were directed to the site in order to provide feedback through a hands-on activity where they could indicate topics of interest. A graph showed the cumulative recommendations of the ILT and the Technical Support Team.

A listing of ID&R staff contact information will be included to promote coordination and communication among member state TST members and representatives. Jessica noted that a search bar will allow users to look up information on a specific topic.

ILT Member Discussion

* Who is the audience for the website? The website should have something for recruiters.
* There should be a disclaimer on the Q&A and discussion saying that the final decision is up to the state.
* We will be disseminating best practices as this is a key objective of the IRRC project.
* There should be a discussion on the website of the new NRG when it becomes available. Also, a section on how we’re going to establish temporary worker status without intent on the part of the worker. We can develop greater understand through dialogue with OME.
* When will shift from old guidance to new take place?
* For the first year of IRRC and until the new guidance is available we will focus on theme-based issues such as urban recruiting, dairy, and fishing.
* Include state trends in the recruiting resources on the website.
* Include a section on interstate coordination on the website.
* The “how to” of recruiting should be discussed.
* For the newsletter component, the question was posed, “what function or purpose should the newsletter serve and who is the target audience?” Terry Richard indicated that the newsletter should target recruiters and highlight recruiter needs and accomplishments (anedotes, success stories, recruiter of the month/quarter). Michael mentioned the goal of IRRC in terms of dissemination is to reach audiences far beyond the scope of the IRRC Leadership Team and the IRRC Technical Support Team. How we aim to attract readers from all across members states, non-member states, and all across the MEP community nation-wide.
* In terms of content for the Quarterly newsletter, a possible outline might be: Q1, preparing staff for ID&R activities for that year; Q2, peak season ID&R—mid-season progress report; Q3, post season (e.g., what worked and why, what didn’t work and why); Q4, post season ID&R and data gathering to complete debriefs that drive future trainings.

**4:15-4:45p – Summarize, wrap Up, Next steps**

Michael thanked the group for their good work and feedback. He asked everyone to consider possible dates during the National Migrant Conference in San Diego that would work. After determining that it would depend on the space availability, he was tasked with getting back with the group after checking with Conference decision makers about space for a dinner meeting Monday night, April 25 or Tuesday night, April 26; or for luncheon meeting Tuesday, April 26. This information will be communicated to the ILT by Michael Maye via email.