



Members in Attendance

- Patricia Smith – Little Dudes Learning Center
- Sul Ross – Gulf Coast Workforce Solutions
- Howard Morrison – Texas Education Agency
- Reagan Miller – Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)
- Lana Estevilla – Department of Family and Protective Services
- Pattie Herbert – Infants 123
- Doug Watson – Healy-Murphy Child Development Center
- Sharon Davis – North East Texas Workforce Solutions
- LaShonda Brown – Texas Early Learning Council

Participating by phone:

- Mary Clare Munger – Amarillo College Child Development Lab

Members not in Attendance

- Dr. Elaine Zweig – Collin County Community College
- Rebecca Latimer – Just Kidding Around
- Sandra Solis – Lower Rio Workforce Solutions

Additional TWC Attendees

- Laurie Biscoe – Deputy Director, Workforce Development Division (WDD)
- Patricia A. Gonzalez – Director WDD Technical Assistance and Child Care
- Phil Warner – Child Care Program Supervisor
- Regan Dobbs – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
- Kimberly Flores – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
- Adela Esquivel – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
- Anjali Barnes – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Roll Call and Overview of the Agenda

Reagan Miller began the meeting after all public comments had been received.

Approval of Meeting Notes

May 1, 2014 meeting notes were approved for posting without changes.

Review of Public Comments on TRS Measures

The workgroup began discussion of overall comments received, including those submitted by Dr. April Crawford from the Children’s Learning Institute. LaShonda Brown stated that the group ensures that there were incentives to encourage providers to achieve higher levels of quality through the star levels, making the program a win-win for all.

Pattie Herbert noted that she is in favor of the four year degree requirement for Directors for a 4 star



designation, but wonders if it's practical for everybody. All noted that there were several comments related to Director qualifications.

LaShonda suggested education and caregiver qualifications be revised to a point structure. They could receive points for the things they are doing well.

The workgroup then began discussion on all comments based on the specific category of measures.

Director and Staff Qualifications and Training

Discussion resulted in the workgroup recommending the following changes:

Formal education–Change to process measures

Experience –Change to process measures

Mary Clare suggests breaking experience into two measures: overall experience and experience at the current facility. Sul's concern is it puts a heavier weight on experience.

Career Lattice Level- Remains structural

Remove level 6 out of 4 star for career lattice. Reagan suggested the need to develop a career lattice worksheet to document where the individual stands on the career lattice level.

Director Training – Change to process measures

Add specific topics for the different levels. Mary Clare suggested specific training that links Early Learning Guidelines to lesson planning. This may be established for 3 and 4 star levels.

Director Certification course- Remains structural

Mary Clare suggested using CLI model- completion of modules – tied to progression, based on completion of modules.

Caregiver Qualifications – Change to process measures. Keep percentages, apply points to percentages reached. Remove D – Monitoring - Emerging Practice – allowing for 2 years of experience. Supervision Definition- Specify “direct” supervision- someone in their room (at least 2 years' experience). Orientation and training is to remain structural.

Add new training process measures that address the top ten indicators of quality; and add specific topics for the different levels (maybe for 3 and 4 levels only).

Members suggested that the following training topics be contained within the process points: Early Learning Guidelines, lesson planning/curriculum and warm and responsive style.

Members assigned points to the following measures:

- 2 star level – core competencies

-1 point: 50% training on core competencies, that focuses on lesson planning and warm and responsive caregiving

-2 points: 75% of their staff on core competencies, that focuses on lesson planning and warm and responsive caregiving

Caregiver Staff Training –Remains structural



Deleted measure: The director ensures that all caregivers meeting minimum training requirements by either arranging or providing for designated training activities. Provider assists caregiver staff in meeting training criteria by arranging or providing training opportunities.

Director Training-Remains structural

Members suggested adding another measure to this section.

Add measure 2. Ensure all caregiver staff have a formalized training plan

Pattie would like the training for home providers to be specified higher quality.

Members requested this be added to a future meeting agenda: Review of licensing requirement to determine who is qualified to provide training. There is concern about “general knowledge about,” and other language which is vague.

Indoor/Outdoor/Nutrition revisions:

Measure changes:

Full time programs – no more than 60 minutes of Screen time daily, part time programs- no more than 30 minutes of Screen time, and no television during meal time.

Howard pointed out that due to the Technology domain, this may need to specify that educational screen time/programming is permitted.

Parent Resources discussion:

Member asked about the testimony from this morning’s session that addressed parent resources. Staff clarified that the parent resources would be included in the appendix.

Reagan clarified that TWC is developing a Parent Resource Portal, where parents can access information.

Caregiver child interactions:

Sul commented that the definition for the score of 0 was removed and asked what this item looks like when it is not met? LaShonda asked for clarification. Her understanding was that if assessors are unable to score an item, that item would receive an N/A, in other words, they receive a free pass, no quality. In the current scoring, it is a 0 score. Sul responded and stated that in interactions, you have to ask, what does it look like when it is really not worthy of any points. He added that he did not think that a 4 point scale is necessary.

Also, remove MLQ, HLQ etc, however; keep descriptors.

Workgroup agreed that assessors need to know more than just “not met”. They need to know what not met looks like. LaShonda said it will help show what is needed to improve. Sul says interactions are different. He advocates for the descriptions.

Curriculum:

Sul requested clarification regarding the lesson plan/curriculum. On page 3-1, the first measure states lesson plan / curriculum, the next measure addresses curriculum-linked lesson plan. Definitions for curriculum and lesson plan may need to be added for clarity.

LaShonda suggested defining curriculum as those that align or support the early learning domains.

Reagan suggested to do an RFI (Request for Information) to inquire which curriculum would be



determined to align/support the early learning domains.

LaShonda suggested that many corporate facilities have their own in-house curriculum.

Page 3-2 – is stricken through, the key evidence is no longer included on the matrix, staff needs to add that back then. Streamlined measures, LaShonda said, helps with the subjectivity challenge. Sul stated that people who use instruments will be accustomed to this phraseology “frequently, rarely, etc” LaShonda remarked that this goes back to training of the assessor on the tool.

Sul said frequency that specifies numbers, up to 7, depends on how much the assessor will spend in the classroom. Sul’s staff estimates they will spend 2 hours per classroom.

Sul asked what curriculum meant, compared to lesson plan and recommends defining it for clarity somewhere. LaShonda said the intent was to have lesson plans that are linked to the curriculum. Sul wants to know what qualifies as curriculum.

Mary Clare commented that it will be tough for assessors to determine what counts as curriculum. Sul sees center developed curriculum frequently; some are good and some are bad. TWC does not have a review panel to check those curriculum submitted for a list.

LaShonda explained that curriculum is scope, sequence, a collection of materials that teachers can pull from for classroom activities. Mary Clare said lesson plans are more of an outline. What the subcommittee wanted are comprehensive lesson plans, with some intent to link to guidelines. Does the provider have a curriculum? Is it in writing? How well is it implemented? That was the original structure for this section.

The Workgroup decided against the TWC compiled list of approved curriculum, but opted to add a statement about Boards supporting providers in selection of appropriate curriculum.

Page III-7 Dr. Crawford added numerical activities to produce the point score, related to bilingual, diversity, and special needs. LaShonda noted the newly established Health and wellbeing domain needs to go back into the curriculum plan section, starting on 3-1 and integrate it into physical health and development.

Page III-12 Lesson plan and implementation include key indicators. Staff will rework, social and emotional development, using 3-10 Item 2 behaviors.

Page III-21 Nutrition; add a phrase about days when providers serve meals.

Menu review by a dietician needs to align with licensing verbiage.

Removed: Initial servings are small; this is incorrect according to CACFP. Footnote instead with “or as consistent with CACFP, if applicable”.

Indoor/outdoor Environment:

Workgroup discussed other changes made to director staff qualifications. They also noted that utilizing the median and allowing N/A to be scored for an age group not served, is good. However, there is concern on scoring measures that should have been observed and were not. Sul clarified that 'zeroes' still count for medians, they are not automatically thrown out. LaShonda wanted to know if N/A also applies to things that were not observed: it is raining so outdoor play cannot be



observed. Reagan suggested that in those that instances, the assessors would need to return to complete the assessment. Specify N/A only applies to the structure of the facility, not things you did not observe. LaShonda suggested a rating for not observed. Sul said they need to rate all measures. Doug reminded the group they will also be working from a self-assessment, which may help. LaShonda wanted to establish what threshold has to be observed for the tool to be valid.

Mary Clare proposed TWC create a statement for unique circumstances that assessors would return to complete the assessments.

Several measure discussions still pending along with other agenda items to carry over to the next meeting.

The workgroup decided they will need to meet again to complete all items pending. They will meet again on May 22 and determine at that time if another meeting is necessary, tentatively scheduled for May 29.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:05 PM