



Members in Attendance:

- Reagan Miller – Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)
- Michelle Adams – Department of Family and Protective Services
- LaShonda Brown - Texas Early Childhood Professional Development System
- Sharon Davis – North East Texas Workforce Solutions
- Howard Morrison – Texas Education Agency
- Mary Clare Munger – Amarillo College Child Development Lab
- Sul Ross – Gulf Coast Workforce Solutions
- Patricia Smith - Little Dudes Learning Center
- Dr. Elaine Zweig – Collin County Community College

Members not in Attendance

- Doug Watson – Healy-Murphy Child Development Center
- Rebecca Latimer - Just Kidding Around
- Sandra Solis – Lower Rio Workforce Solutions
- Pattie Herbert - Infants 123

Additional Attendees

Texas Workforce Commission:

- Laurie Biscoe – Deputy Director, Workforce Development Division
- Patricia A. Gonzalez – Director Workforce Policy
- Phil Warner – Child Care Policy and Program Supervisor
- 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 Lee Flores - Child Care Policy and Program Analyst

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Roll Call and overview of the agenda

Reagan Miller welcomed the group and explained the purpose of this meeting was to review the matrix and provide clarification where needed.

Review of TRS Measures Matrix

Phil Warner reviewed the sample of the scoring matrix. Elaine stated that when her group reviewed the Caregiver/Staff Qualification criteria, they amended the scoring to 1, 2, 3 and 4 to correspond with star rating levels. She described their thoughts in shifting the scoring, with structural measures met /not met applying to each level; not only to 2-star.

Reagan clarified that structural will be either met/not met criteria with documentation and does not require an onsite observation. The structural will not have assigned points. For example, 2 star elements are mainly structural with met/not met scoring.



Mary Clare added that met/not met scoring might not work for child interactions. She asked how that would relate to her group's work.

Reagan clarified that interactions need to be observed, which would be process-related measures. Additionally, Reagan reviewed the scoring process that her group developed, which they defined as:

- 0 – Not meeting/No elements met
- 1 - Minimal evidence
- 2 - Moderate
- 3 – High/consistent evidence

Additionally, she clarified that at a previous meeting it was decided that at the Star 2 certification level, all measures would be structural and 100% of the measure at that level would need to be met. For TRS levels higher than 2 star, 100% met of the structural measure would need to be met and points would be assigned.

New TRS facilities need to show evidence for 2-Star before it progress to 3-Star status with an onsite visit. The new facilities will have 100% assessment to determine what star level.

LaShonda clarified how her sub group developed the director/staff criteria. The group defined criteria as met/not met and then added points based on progression through the criteria.

Additionally, LaShonda asked for clarification about scoring: for example, if a staff had a CDA, how would they score compared to other experience? Reagan responded a structural measure could have an assigned point level. Also, a Bachelor's degree could be assigned more points than a CDA credential. There would be enhanced requirements for structural met/not met at levels 3 and 4, while not assigning points.

Phil added that it could be required to meet certain criteria within an assigned level.

Sul commented that it would be cleaner with no points and leaving scoring at met /not met, as it seemed the workgroup had already reached consensus around that concept.

Lashonda wanted clarification and asked if at star level 2 all structural would be met?

Reagan responded that yes, all star 2 structural measures would need to be met.

Additionally, Reagan clarified that if the three star level has a higher structural requirement, they would be required to meet all higher structural requirements.

Reagan asked if a measure start out structural, and then change into a process type measure at a higher level (Example: group size measures).



Mary Clare replied and stated that the intent is to reward those that are doing a good job with ratios.

Mary Clare and Sul both commented that some facilities could score high in some structural measures and poorly in others. (Ex: Good group sizes but poorly trained staff)

The intent is not to go backward on standards that currently exist.

There is a special focus on infant group sizes (which are currently at minimum standards)

There has been input from at least one provider saying that increased (especially, changes to infant group sizes) would be problematic and cumbersome for providers.

Pat Smith added that cost comparison analysis is needed. She asked if there had been any talk about how this will impact providers, specifically a change in ratio – group sizes which may require providers to hire more staff.

LaShonda commented that the focus belongs on child interaction and that there needs to be consideration given also to the cost to the provider impact as a result of group size changes. She proposes aiming for an “and both” approach capturing in the measures both quality group ratios and quality interactions by process outcomes.

Mary Clare and Sul agreed that there should be a focus on the interactions and warm relationships in the classroom.

Reagan then asked for confirmation regarding the rating scale.

Elaine explained how her group changed the scoring scheme. They changed the scoring to 1,2,3,4, as there was confusion in what the structural measures met. Also, she stated that her group will have to go back and review the 3 and 4 star level criteria. (In particular, where structural measures will fall into these levels).

LaShonda added that there could be considerations based on quantity vs. quality and assign this per star level. (Quantity would be measured at the lower levels and quality at the higher levels).

The star level (the lowest earned across all categories) will determine the overall star level

Reagan asked who would be ready to reporting out on their criteria for the next meeting:

For February 13th meeting, the following group will report out:

Groups 4 (parent interaction) and Group 3 (nutrition and indoor outdoor environments) and Group 2 (interactions, sections they have Completed so far)



For February 20th meeting, the following group will report out:

Group 3 (Curriculum) Group 2 (remaining interactions) Group 1 (Director/Staff Qualifications)

LaShonda is working with Susan Landry and Howard Morrison to collect the work that they have done on curriculum and activities.

Live meeting, document view will be available for both meetings (2/13 and 2/20).

We are going to aim to have the criteria out to TRS Workgroup prior to February 13th. Therefore we will need to have the documents by Monday, February 10th at Noon. .

For February 20th meeting, we will need to have materials by February 14th.
(President's Day Holiday is February 17)

The Licensing subgroup will set up a call prior to the March 6th workgroup meeting.

Next Meeting

- **February 13** - TRS Workgroup Session (in person at TWC or via conference call)
Subcommittees 2, 3 & 4 presentations on TRS measures.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:05pm.