

Texas Rising Star (TRS)
TRS Workgroup Meeting

May 1, 2014
1:00pm to 4:00pm

Location:
1117 Trinity Room 304BT
Austin, Texas 78778

Agenda:

Tab 1 – Welcome, Roll-Call and Overview of the Agenda (Attachment 1)

Approval of Meeting Notes

Tab 2 – March 6, 2014 (Attachment 2)

Review of Draft Parking Lot Items

Tab 3 – Review of Scoring to Determine TRS Star Level (Attachment 3, 3a)

Tab 4 – Review of TRS Provider Facilities that Move or Expand (Attachment 4)

Tab 5 - Follow Up Discussion on TRS measures:

- Director/Staff Qualifications
- After School Programs



Members in Attendance

Reagan Miller	- Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)
Patricia Smith	- Little Dudes Learning Center
Sul Ross	- Gulf Coast Workforce Solutions
Howard Morrison	- Texas Education Agency
LaShonda Brown	- Texas Head Start State Collaboration Office, Texas Early Childhood Professional Development System
Sandra Solis	- Lower Rio Workforce Solutions
Rebecca Latimer	- Just Kidding Around
Michelle Adams	- Department of Family and Protective Services
Mary Clare Munger	- Amarillo College Child Development Lab
Doug Watson	- Healy-Murphy Child Development Center
Dr. Elaine Zweig	- Collin County Community College
Sharon Davis	- North East Texas Workforce Solutions
Pattie Herbert	- Infants 123

Additional Attendees

Cristina Thi	-Department of State Health Services
Laurie Biscoe	- Deputy Director, Workforce Development Division
Patricia A. Gonzalez	- Director Workforce Policy
Regan Dobbs	- Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
Anjali Barnes	- Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
Kimberly Flores	- Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
Adela Esquivel	- Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
Sue Flores	- Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
Jessica Crawford	- Adobe Connect Facilitar

Meeting Summary

Welcome, and Roll- Call

Reagan welcomed the group, conducted roll call and began with a review of the meeting notes for the January 31, February 4, and 13 meetings. Meeting minutes were approved. Reagan continued with the next agenda items, reviews of subcommittee recommendations to gain consensus on the draft documents presented by each subcommittee lead.

Parent Involvement and Education –

Reagan Miller began by asking the workgroup if there were any questions or revisions to the Subcommittee 4, Parent Involvement recommendations. The workgroup had no additional revisions. The entire section is accepted 'as is' and Patricia Smith thanked the workgroup and her subcommittee.



Caregiver-Child Interactions –

Mary Clare clarified that the group size reflects what was discussed in the workgroup meeting held December 19. A comment is made that a note would be helpful to indicate that for 3 and 4 star, 2 star criteria must also be met. Doug noted that the 0 scoring are all very negative behaviors that would earn disciplinary action or staff termination at his center. Reagan confirms that the 0 scoring descriptions will be removed for all measures.

LaShonda wanted to ensure all measures for interactions measure teacher behavior. Mary Clare stated that wording can be reworked or strengthened to keep emphasis on teachers.

Curriculum/Physical and Social Activities –

Indoor Outdoor Learning Environment:

Michele sent a more recently updated document and shared some of the new recommended measures to give the workgroup an idea of the changes. She and her subgroup continue to condense and enhance process measures. For her subgroup, a score of 3 also includes components of 1 and 2.

Copies of these changes were provided to the workgroup so that they could review and discuss the revisions. Pat Smith asked for additional detail regarding one measure involving “emotional outdoor play”. Michele says this could include elements such as a stage for play and says she will provide additional detail in the process measures.

Reagan provided an overall comment that TWC is planning to enlist an outside individual to help with consistency throughout the standards.

Health and Nutrition:

Reagan reviewed the changes to the matrix regarding menu options, primarily regarding meat alternatives and breaded meat. These changes are based on workgroup feedback about healthier options available. The prohibition on desserts was removed, to avoid describing what was or was not an acceptable dessert (vanilla wafer, graham cracker, animal cracker etc).

Pat Smith asked for a requirement for fresh fruit. Additionally, Reagan stated that she plans to add criteria (as discussed in the subgroup) that specify that facilities not participating in CACFP would need have their menus reviewed by a nutritionist, to ensure they meet menu requirements. Pat wanted clarification as to which individuals would



qualify as a “nutritionist”; she suggested that they must have a bachelor’s degree in nutrition or be a dietitian.

Reagan stated that the subcommittee does expect to receive public comments about providing more guidance about meat and fish.

Curriculum/Activities:

Howard noted that the group did incorporate PreK guidelines as well as infant toddler guidelines into the matrix.

Sul expressed concern with the specificity of “written curriculum”, throughout this section. He asked if the group wanted to require that curriculum be written. His staff told him there is often evidence of a curriculum in practice, but certain elements are not written. LaShonda stated that is why they included the list of key evidence to describe what teachers need to do and activities to demonstrate that they are following a curriculum.

Mary Clare added that typically, in a college class, there is a chart divided into domains; however the chart may not have directions for activities or goals for the teacher or a supply list, etc. She wanted to know if it would count if an activity chart references a teacher guide. She suggested curriculum can come in many forms and it could include curriculum through a lesson plan, a supplement or combination of both.

The recommendation is to remove “written curriculum”. A score of 2 will include “teacher made activities”. The proposal is that a score of 3 will include an evidence-based, state adopted curriculum list. Pat stated the redesign is clearer. Sul wanted to make sure the score of 3 remains attainable; he is hesitant to add a list which has not been developed.

Pat asked where, in the measures, the number of times children are read to daily or weekly is addressed. LaShonda stated that overall that curriculum is aimed to capture quality and not measure exact quantity.

Director and Staff Qualifications -

Elaine reviewed the matrix and clarified that all measures are structural. Sul commented on the first measure for directors, that the 4 star measure requires an AA, BA/BS in Early Childhood Education (ECE) or ECE related credits. He stated that many directors do not have this. LaShonda, Doug and Elaine responded that this caused considerable discussion within their subgroup, and that they reached this decision after weighing all sides.

LaShonda said they relied on research and added that other measures give an either-or approach.



Doug pointed to the generous time-line to grandfather directors into the certification and added that there is nothing wrong with being a 3 star provider. LaShonda shared that the Early Learning Council (ELC) and the Texas Association of the Education of Young Children (TAEYC) offer scholarships for directors to return to school.

Reagan shared that TWC announced at the Alliance meeting that Teacher Education and Compensation Helps (T.E.A.C.H) was awarded \$500,000 for professional development scholarships.

Mary Clare stated that there is a certificate available that requires 42 hours of early education, but no math. An AA requires 18 additional credits. Mary Clare says most people will earn all of those 18 hours, except the math class, which is required.

Reagan stated this is good context and suggests moving forward with the current recommendation, pending public comment.

Reagan noted small corrections to make in the document. Sul asked about the training for licensed and registered homes. On page 3 for primary caregivers it says 36 hours, but on page 6 it says 24. The reason is that the 24 hours refers to a caregiver, other than the primary caregiver, in the home. This came up in the previous meeting, so group will add clarifying language.

Discussion on Previous Meeting Notes:

Sul would like to revisit notes from Jan. 31 meeting. The notes should state that at least 50% of classrooms are assessed for annual monitoring site visit. The notes were not clear on this point.

The other correction is the "00%" needs be "100%." The notes have been corrected and posted.

Discussion on Next Meetings

- **March 20** - Public meeting, in person, TWC Main Building, Room 244 (9:00am -3:00pm)

Subcommittee participants/public will be invited to attend the March 20 meeting.



Mary Clare discussed what we may expect in addition to the proposed measure review at this meeting. She suggested that an additional document outlining what work group knows at this time about the time-frame, who will do what, process, direction, etc.

Additionally, a suggestion is made to prepare a press release about the education scholarships available for professional development opportunities.

Sul requested a document or blurb regarding the March 20 public meeting and subsequent comment period in order to inform his contact.

Reagan stated that staff will update and reformat these documents by early next week. TWC needs any revisions from work group by COB Friday, March 7.

After the March 20 meeting, written comments will be accepted through March 28. Subcommittees will meet during the week of March 31 to review public and written comments.

- **April 10, 2014** – Workgroup Meeting, TWC Trinity, Room 304AB (1:00-4:00pm)
- **April 17, 2014** – Workgroup Meeting TWC Trinity, Room 304AB (1:00-4:00pm)

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 pm.

Scoring to Determine TRS Star Level DISCUSSION POINTS

During the November 7th TRS Workgroup Meeting, the workgroup agreed to the following:

2-Star Measures and Scoring

All the measures for the 2-star level must be met in order for the provider to be certified as a two-star and must continue to be met as the provider works to move up the star levels.

3-4-Star Measures and Scoring

The total number of points the provider scores will determine the star level for each category. Categories include:

1. Director/Staff Qualifications and Training;
2. Caregiver-Child Interactions;
3. Curriculum and Indoor/Out Door Activities;
4. Nutrition; and
5. Parent Involvement and Education.

NOTE: For scoring purposes, staff recommends that the Curriculum and Activities subcommittee be separated into two distinct categories — 1. Curriculum and Indoor/Outdoor Activities; and 2. Nutrition.

However, each subcommittee may elect to require selected measures to achieve a minimum number of points in order to be certified at a particular star level. Note: no category has indicated the necessity to utilize this option at this time.

Finally, in order to ensure that the provider meets a certain level of quality across all categories, the overall provider star level will be based on the category of the lowest star level achieved.

For example, if a provider scores at a 4-star level in two categories, at a 3-star level in one category, and at a 2-star level in one category; the provider would be certified as a 2-star TRS provider.

The workgroup also has agreed that the scoring will be conducted on a classroom level. TRS assessments will occur every 3 years and assess 100% of classrooms. NOTE: The facility assessment and monitoring process will be discussed in a subsequent discussion paper. The workgroup still must reach consensus and clarify the methodology that should be used to determine the score on an individual measure level when multiple classrooms are assessed.

Furthermore, the workgroup must also finalize the minimum scores that must be met at the 3-star and 4-star levels.

Methodology for Scoring Measures

Option 1:

The score for a measure could be based on an average of all the classroom scores. For example:

Measure #1:

Classroom 1 Score = 3

Classroom 2 Score = 2

Classroom 3 Score = 2

Classroom 4 Score = 1

Classroom 5 Score = 0

Average Classroom Score = 1.6

Measure #2:

Classroom 1 Score = 3

Classroom 2 Score = 2

Classroom 3 Score = 1

Classroom 4 Score = 1

Classroom 5 Score = 1

Average Classroom Score = 1.6

Option 2:

The score for a measure could be based on the median score of the classrooms (the 'middle' classroom score). Even though the average scores are the same for the two measures in the example above, using a median:

Measure #1 above would have a Median Classroom Score of 2.

Measure #2 above would have a Median Classroom Score of 1.

The example above has a median score of 2, with 50% of the classrooms scoring above a 2 and 50% scoring below a 2.

This methodology would place less emphasis or weight on any outliers present in the overall observation of classrooms and may yield a truer indication of the most typical value.

However, when the sample size (number of classrooms) is large and does not include outliers, the average score generally provides a better measure of central tendency.

The attached spreadsheet provides an example of the difference between using the average classroom score and the median classroom score.

Methodology for Determining Star Level

The star level for a category could be based on the average score (total points scored divided by number of total measures) for the category based on the following:

3-Star – Average Score is 1.50 to 2.24 (50% to 74.9% of total points)
4-Star – Average Score is greater than 2.25 (75% of total points)

For example:

Category #1 (e.g., Caregiver-Child Interactions) = 10 Total Point Measures

Classroom Scores:

Measure #1 = 1.5

Measure #2 = 1.75

Measure #3 = 2.25

Measure #4 = 2.5

Measure #5 = 1.25

Measure #6 = 2.1

Measure #7 = .5

Measure #8 = 2

Measure #9 = 2.75

Measure #10 = 3

Total Points for the Category = 19.6

Average Points for the Category = 1.96

Star Level = 3

EXAMPLE SCORING FOR A TRS CATEGORY

	Classroom 1	Classroom 2	Classroom 3	Classroom 4	Classroom 5	Option 1	Option 2	Classroom Rankings				
						Average Score	Median Score	Hi		Med.		Lo
Measure 1	3	3	2	3	1	2.40	3.00	3	3	3	2	1
Measure 2	3	3	3	1	1	2.20	3.00	3	3	3	1	1
Measure 3	3	3	3	1	1	2.20	3.00	3	3	3	1	1
Measure 4	3	3	2	1	3	2.40	3.00	3	3	3	2	1
Measure 5	3	3	3	1	0	2.00	3.00	3	3	3	1	0
Measure 6	3	2	2	3	3	2.60	3.00	3	3	3	2	2
Measure 7	3	3	3	3	1	2.60	3.00	3	3	3	3	1
Measure 8	2	2	2	0	0	1.20	2.00	2	2	2	0	0
Measure 9	2	1	2	3	0	1.60	2.00	3	2	2	1	0
Measure 10	1	2	3	1	3	2.00	2.00	3	3	2	1	1
Measure 11	0	0	0	3	3	1.20	0.00	3	3	0	0	0
Measure 12	1	2	3	1	3	2.00	2.00	3	3	2	1	1
Measure 13	2	2	3	0	0	1.40	2.00	3	2	2	0	0
Measure 14	3	2	2	2	1	2.00	2.00	3	2	2	2	1
Measure 15	3	3	3	3	1	2.60	3.00	3	3	3	3	1
Measure 16	3	2	2	1	1	1.80	2.00	3	2	2	1	1
Measure 17	3	3	2	1	0	1.80	2.00	3	3	2	1	0
Measure 18	3	2	2	3	1	2.20	2.00	3	3	2	2	1
Measure 19	3	3	2	3	1	2.40	3.00	3	3	3	2	1
Measure 20	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
Measure 21	1	2	3	3	3	2.40	3.00	3	3	3	2	1
Measure 22	3	3	2	3	1	2.40	3.00	3	3	3	2	1
Measure 23	3	3	3	1	1	2.20	3.00	3	3	3	1	1
Measure 24	3	3	3	1	3	2.60	3.00	3	3	3	3	1
Measure 25	1	2	3	3	3	2.40	3.00	3	3	3	2	1
Measure 26	3	2	3	3	3	2.80	3.00	3	3	3	3	2
Measure 27	0	0	0	3	3	1.20	0.00	3	3	0	0	0
Measure 28	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0
Average Score						1.95	2.25					
						3-Star	4-Star					

4-Star	75.00%	100.00%
	2.25	3.00
3-Star	50.00%	75.00%
	1.5	2.24

TRS Provider Facilities that Move or Expand
DRAFT DISCUSSION POINTS

Facility Moves

Definition: Moves are defined as a facility closing and relocating to a new location. *The move does not alter the composition of the director, staff, or number of classrooms.*

When facilities move locations the facility must initiate a new application and obtain a new license number from DFPS. DFPS staff:

- visit the facility to do a fire inspection and inspect the physical plant standards. They provide a new license number to the facility.
- issue a new licensing number .(Statute says the permit is revoked)The facility does not carry their 12 month licensing history with them to the new location
- issue a non-expiring license (After 3 months)

Recommendation for Facility Moves:

Based on the group's discussion, because the move does not alter the program staffing, including the director, or children served, the following was determined:

- The facility will retain their star level during the move.
- A full TRS reassessment will take place within the initial 3-month period.

Facility Expansions (and Splits)

Facility Expansion:

Expansions are defined as when one facility continues to operate at an existing location with the existing classrooms and age groups served, but an owner/provider *opens a new facility to expand and add additional classrooms or age group served.*

Facility Splits:

Splits are defined as when one facility continues to operate at an existing location, but an owner/provider opens a new facility and *moves a subset of the staff and part of the children served to the new facility.*

A split involves establishing a new director - either at the new location or at the existing location. A split also involves a modification of the current classroom structure and staffing. Therefore this does not meet the requirements for a "move" as defined above.

DFPS considers both Splits and Expansions as new facilities for licensing purposes.

Recommendations Facility Expansions:

Because an expansion and split both involve a change in staffing and classroom composition, the group recommends that both of these circumstances be treated as new operations. In the case of new operation facilities, there is no licensing history; and there are a variety of new components related to the change that must be assessed. Therefore, split/expansions should be treated as new facilities.

The group recommends that the facility will need a permanent license and 12 months of licensing history in order to begin the TRS certification process.