



Members in Attendance

- Reagan Miller – Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)
- Howard Morrison – Texas Education Agency
- Sul Ross – Gulf Coast Workforce Solutions
- Patricia Smith – Little Dudes Learning Center
- Sharon Davis – North East Texas Workforce Solutions
- Sandra Solis – Lower Rio Workforce Solutions
- Doug Watson – Healy-Murphy Child Development Center

Participating by phone:

- Mary Clare Munger – Amarillo College Child Development Lab
- Lana Estevilla – Department of Family and Protective Services

Members not in Attendance

- Pattie Herbert – Infants 123
- LaShonda Brown – Texas Early Learning Council
- Dr. Elaine Zweig – Collin County Community College
- Rebecca Latimer – Just Kidding Around

Additional TWC Attendees

- Laurie Biscoe – Deputy Director, Workforce Development Division
- Phil Warner – Child Care Program Supervisor
- Anjali Barnes – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
- Adela Esquivel – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
- Sue Flores – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
- Regan Dobbs – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
- Rudy Sandoval – Governmental Relations

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Roll-Call and Overview of the Agenda

Approval of Meeting Notes

The May 15 and May 22, 2014 notes were approved for posting.

Continue Discussion of Draft Final Recommendation Matrix

The Workgroup continued the discussion on the Draft measure matrix. For the Parent Education performance measures, Reagan suggested to express the percentage of elements met numerically.

Pat expressed concern as to how the assessors would determine if an event really took place and suggested to date each event.



Reagan continued discussion on the TXPOST recommendations. She mentioned that after the Workgroup's consideration to adopt TXPOST recommendations for After School, a crosswalk was made and it was discovered that these recommendations have several discrepancies with DFPS licensing. Workgroup recommends that for School Age programs, the 12 college hours be modified to 60.

Reagan also recommended adding as option 7 in the TXPOST document, 9 college credit hours in child development and 6 hours in management.

On the curriculum plan, Reagan suggested including the Pre-K guidelines and not only the Early Learning guidelines. She asked if there were any concerns with LaShonda's previous recommendations. There were no concerns.

Reagan asked if Workgroup agreed to adopt Mary Clare's language to the measure on page II-14; the Workgroup agreed.

Reagan inquired if Workgroup agreed to adopt LaShonda's suggested draft descriptions to Lesson Plans and Curriculum, Planning for Special Needs and Respecting Diversity, and Instructional Formats and Approaches to Learning. These descriptions include consistent opportunities available throughout the day for the measure "staff supports learning through encouraging hands-on manipulation of real objects". The workgroup agreed.

On page IV-2, Workgroup agreed to delete "music and movement".

On page IV-I, for clarity, at the beginning it should read "written policies"

Draft Scoring Recommendations

Phil and Reagan explained the scoring document.

Reagan determined that a section of the document needs to be grayed out since it is not applicable to infants. She also mentioned that the Workgroup needs to determine how many "Not Observed" will impede a center from scoring.

Sul mentioned that the score of each classroom needs to be known and not only the score of all the measures. Laurie stated that the tool that will be provided; will be able to view the median for each classroom.

The workgroup decided that centers will not achieve a 4 star rating if they have one classroom with a score below 3. If providers have a classroom with a score below 3, the center will be re-assessed within four weeks.

Minimum Licensing Standards



Lana reviewed the average number of licensing deficiencies by facility size:

- Smaller facilities average 6 deficiencies
- Larger facilities - 6.22 deficiencies

Reagan suggested that the language needs to be revised to say:

- Exceeds 10 or more deficiencies
- Exceeds 15 deficiencies

It was suggested to add “specified” deficiency to Section 3.

Pat wanted clarification on deficiency - 746.201 (9) Complying with child care licensing law in Chapter 42 of Human Resource Code. Lana responded that this deficiency is cited when several deficiencies are found and the permit holder is not in compliance. Doug asked if this deficiency would be applied if a provider is cited multiple times for the same thing, such as background checks and transportation. Lana responded yes.

Reagan brought up the public comment regarding self-reporting of deficiencies and the thought that it might hinder a provider to self-report. Doug added that we are never going to have a system to that will be perfect. Providers should be honest and report when needed. Doug asked if there was a penalty for not reporting. Lana clarified there is a penalty applied if a provider does not report.

Reagan asked about the frequency of licensing compliance history checks. Checks need to occur at initial certification and year two and year three observations – in the ensuing months what is the likelihood that this will be reported to the assessor? Lana clarified that you would need to wait for the DFPS’ final decision. Lana continued to explain that licensing does not post anything on the web-site until the due process is complete; if the decision is upheld, it would be included in the provider’s public record, posted on the web-site.

Lana continued to explain that the TRS assessor would not be able to take action until the information/action is finalized by DFPS and posted.

Sul stated that a substantial percentage of providers will have more than 9 deficiencies. Lana stated that they may be able to provide the percentage of facilities that have over 9 or 14 deficiencies.

Doug suggested that an administrative hearing be held at TWC. Reagan expressed concern over the cost of administrative hearings solely for TRS eligibility. The group discussed and agreed that appeals related to TRS assessments should be handled at the local level, by the Board.

Sul reviewed other states QRIS systems and indicated that they do not address the number of deficiencies. Reagan clarified that the Commission has expressed concern



with TRS providers that have substantial deficiencies.

A workgroup member suggested building something into the screening to ensure that there are no repeated citations of previous findings. However, the group noted that the assessor won't really be able to resolve a provider's compliance issues.

Discussion continued on compliance and star levels. For providers on a Service Improvement Agreement (SIA), Reagan clarified that the May 8th meeting notes stated that the SIA should not last beyond 6 months.

Reagan requested input from the group on the following scenarios. For providers with deficiencies:

- Exceeding 9 – should they lose a star level or should it result in a SIA?
- Exceeding 14 – should they lose TRS completely or lose a star level?

Sul expressed concern for those providers with 9-14 deficiencies; and said he believes there will be many providers that fall into this category. Reagan asked for input on providers already on SIA and what happens when licensing finds more deficiencies (but doesn't exceed 14). What steps are taken? Doug suggested that the SIA is extended.

The group continued discussion and came to consensus on the following:

Deficiency maximums for TRS certified providers:

- 10-14 deficiencies – 6 month probation, if recited for same deficiencies - lose star level. New deficiencies cited probation is extended.
- Above 14 deficiencies – Lose certification

Facility Assessments and Accreditation

Phil reviewed the information on Facility Assessments related to Accreditation and discussed the following:

- TRS monitoring report will be submitted to assessor; assessor cannot take action until DFPS determination made and results posted on the DFPS web-site.
- During the annual monitoring visit, TRS staff will work with providers to decide if a full assessment is needed to determine if the provider has reached a higher star level.
- Accredited facilities will be initially awarded a star level, as determined by a crosswalk of accreditation (to be developed).
 - Accredited providers will need to complete the TRS application process, required of all TRS applicants.
 - The provider will be subject to comply with the annual TRS monitoring procedures for minimum licensing standards required of all TRS-certified facilities.
 - If the nationally accredited provider receives is certified or recertified



through an on-site visit by the accrediting organization within the 3 year TRS assessment period; the provider will not be required to have a full TRS assessment.

Phil stressed that military installations will not have licensing history, as they are exempt from licensing. Staff will contact the DOD to request information on compliance.

Reagan asked the group if all accreditation bodies should be included. Several members responded that it may depend on the crosswalk of accreditation standards and the new (proposed) measures. Reagan suggested that a request for application be sent to the current recognized accreditation bodies; they would be responsible for preparing a crosswalk to the new (proposed) measures.

Long-Term Financing

The workgroup discussed long-term financing. The total amount is \$539 million; \$11.22 million for infant quality earmark; \$19 million quality expansion; \$9.4 million on 2% quality; TEACH funds; 4% quality to set aside and over \$3 million to support the TRS staff for the Boards.

The workgroup discussed other TWC quality initiatives such as inclusion training and partnering with DFPS to providing technical assistance and training for inclusion across the state.

There was discussion on the Adult Literacy/CDA initiative and other child care quality initiatives. The workgroup also discussed the parent website to provide information on quality of child care, online parenting courses and professional development opportunities.

The TRS enhanced rate will be part of HB 376 and the funding of TRS is being appropriated by legislation. As the TRS program expands, perhaps there will be a need to look for partnerships with private organizations.

TRS Assessment Reconsiderations

The workgroup discussed reconsideration if the provider disagrees with the TRS assessment and star level. TRS assessments do not go through a formal appeals or reconsideration process. A provider may request a TRS reassessment at the Board level.

The group agreed that if a provider disagrees with the assessment, the disagreement should not go through the TWC appeals process in Chapter 823. Because the assessment is based on on-site observations, it would be difficult at best for an appeals officer to rule on what was observed.



The workgroup emphasized assessor training and creating an objective tool for the assessor to eliminate subjective issues.

Reagan suggested creating child care advisory group in each Board area to discuss issues, challenges and best practices for providers, assessors and mentors. This may assist in mutual understanding of the measures and how the measures are assessed.

The workgroup agreed that the process for reconsideration of a facility assessment should be handled at the local Board level. This could consist of a second assessment either by a different Board assessor or the Board requesting another Board assessor to conduct the re-assessment.

Final Steps

TWC will work on creating training materials for assessors, parents, and providers. In addition, work will begin on the policy concept and rule development. The new challenge and phase now is implementation.

Recommendations were finalized for submission on all items that the workgroup considered;

- Assessor Mentor Qualifications
- TRS Measures
- Facility Assessments
- Minimum Licensing Standards
- Facilities the Move Location or Expand
- TRS Scoring for all Star Levels

Meeting adjourned at 3:20pm.