

Missouri Coordinating Board for Early Childhood
Special Board Call - CBEC Expenditures
December 14, 2012 from 2:00-3:30

MINUTES

Present on call: Daryl Rothman, Shirley Patterson, Stacey Owsley, Jim Caccamo, Carol Scott, Candy Shively, Mayme Young, Roseann Bentley, Val Lane, Gail Vasterling, Patsy Carter

CBEC Chair Jim Caccamo called the meeting to order at 2:05pm. A quorum was determined.

A request was made to vet each proposal one by one and allow for questions and discussion. The comments/decisions regarding each proposal were as follows:

Polling Project: The board voted to approve moving ahead with this project, contingent upon careful determination of what specific questions would be asked. Discussion included consideration of possible linkages with the broader Public Awareness Campaign. Some felt that effective polling could procure pertinent information to inform the campaign, but ultimately it was reiterated that the campaign that had been proposed was to specifically have a social-emotional focus, and so the two projects would not necessarily be created in tandem. It was agreed that the polling questions would be carefully crafted, and might include some social-emotional focus.

Adaptation and validation of the Child Observation Record for home visitation: The board decided to table a decision on this proposal pending ascertaining answers to a variety of questions/concerns. Questions included propriety and authority—in terms of who precisely would own the product, and whether the Missouri EC system stood to benefit, or whether this more a testing ground for a national roll-out that would be exported/sold. There were some inquiries as to whether DESE had any role or authority in this process. There was some concern that supporting the proposal would amount to CBEC funding R & D for a for-profit entity (High Scope) through P.A.T. There was also the perspective shared that this could indeed comprise a valuable opportunity for the early childhood system in our state. There was a suggestion that *if* the proposal were ultimately adopted, a statement in the contract delineate that CBEC would own the product. Patsy Carter stated for the record that she retained additional concerns.

Public Awareness Campaign: The board voted to move ahead with this proposal, and to increase the suggested amount from \$50,000 to an amount to be determined. (Additional funds would derive from reductions in other proposals—as described.)

Pursuant to Goal 2 of HS Data Pilot, commission a study to compare progress of HS children v. peers: The board approved this proposal, and asked Daryl to contact DSS and the University of Missouri to ascertain whether the fiscal/procurement process might be expedited via a contract amendment.

Commission a white paper that reviews mechanisms used in other states to support/increase compensation in the child care/early education workforce: The board

suggested this activity be incorporated into the fiscal resource analysis currently being bid, this freeing up \$10,000.00

Develop a review paper that examines states' career lattices, identifying common features and comparing successful implementations: The board approved this proposal with the reminder that the analytics and deliverable be clearly delineated.

Commission a literature review of research on parents' perceptions of quality in child care/early education programs: (see below)

Survey Missouri program directors to learn what clock-hour training they had in 2012 and map the geographic availability of director-appropriate content: The board decided that this proposal should be combined with the preceding one (review of parent perceptions), to save money, and also asked that a substitute for the word "quality" be chosen. The board also requested to see the revised draft prior to the proposal being enacted.

Engage a consultant to complete a comprehensive assessment that will help define the home visiting system, assess the system's capacity, and prioritize areas for improvement: The allotted meeting time expired before this proposal could receive a vote; it shall be considered when the board next reconvenes by call or email to make final determinations on the proposals.