Members in Attendance

Reagan Miller	– Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)
Michelle Adams	– Department of Family and Protective Services
Patricia Smith	– Little Dudes Learning Center
Sharon Davis	– North East Texas Workforce Solutions
Sul Ross	– Gulf Coast Workforce Solutions
Doug Watson	– Healy-Murphy Child Development Center
Sandra Solis	– Lower Rio Workforce Solutions
Mary Clare Munger	– Amarillo College Child Development Lab
Rebecca Latimer	– Just Kidding Around
Howard Morrison	– Texas Education Agency
Dr. Elaine Zweig	– Collin County Community College
Dr. John Gasko	– Texas Early Learning Council, QRIS Subcommittee

Members not in Attendance

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
Kimberly Berry	– Governmental Relations
Jonathan Viet Luu	– Senator Zaffirini's Office
Susan Klein	– National Accreditation Commission
Alison Reis-Khanna	– Texas Partnership for Out-of-School
Shari Anderson	– Child Care Group
Rhonda Rakow	– Child Care Group
Lonnie Hutson	– Kids R Kids
Angelica S. Brandt	– Office of Head Start TTA Network
Kim Kofron	– Texas Association for the Education of Young Children
Cynthia Pearson	– Day Nursery of Abilene

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Roll-Call and Overview of the Agenda

Approval of November 20, 2013 Meeting Notes

Doug Watson moved to approve the minutes as drafted; Michelle Adams seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved with no objection.

Final Recommendation Qualifications for Mentors and Evaluators
During the meeting, workgroup members expressed concern that one year of experience in addition to a bachelor's degree may not be enough for qualified mentors and evaluators. There was also a concern that requiring more experience could limit the pool of applicants. One member suggested that preference should be given to Directors of Accredited or TRS facilities. The group concluded to leave the one year experience with a bachelor's or associate's degree, as a minimum requirement, but add the preference for directors of accredited or TRS facilities.

Discussion on Child Assessments/TRS Application-Monitoring Processes
Presented results of the survey and discussed criteria for consideration. Members had the following comments regarding:

Child assessments: Should one tool be selected or should a menu of tools be available? If a standardized tool is used, child progress can be compared across the state; however, individuals expressed interest in a menu of tools. Additionally, a member stated that teachers should plan intentionally; they should know the needs of the children in their classroom.

Who will select the child assessment tools? One suggestion was that the Workgroup can make recommendations and then TWC will review the recommendations. Additionally, a member suggested a survey of tools be conducted.

TRS application process: Should applicants be required to attend an orientation or watch a video for a TRS overview? The Director Qualifications subcommittee will offer recommendations on orientation. Suggestions included video, CBT or web based orientation in order to provide consistent training and information.

Should applicants be required to complete a TRS Self-Assessment tool as part of the application process? The group consensus was yes.

TRS monitoring process: How often should programs be monitored (for TRS criteria and/or TRS required licensing requirements)? Some members are in favor of keeping the 1, 2 and 3 year certifications, according to star level, with annual reporting and random sampling visits to verify. The members also suggested that monitoring visits be annually when moving from one star level to another.

Should the assessment/monitoring process include provider self-reports? Discussion included self-reporting for certain criteria or based on star level.

How many classrooms are assessed at each site? Options considered by the workgroup included 100% of age group/classroom, a specified percentage based on size of center, and/or a specified percentage based on licensing deficiencies. The workgroup discussed and agreed that random visits should be used as a part of the process.

Should penalties exist for programs not maintaining their star level? Loss of the star level will be considered a penalty. The workgroup considered charging a fee for mentoring visits for providers placed on a Technical Assistance Plan.

The members agreed for staff to draft a document with member feedback and comments for all members to review and consider at the next meeting.

Data from Other States
TWC staff provided QRIS – Observational Tools and Frequency of Observational Assessment as a resource.

Other TRS Workgroup Considerations

Licensing Deficiencies
Staff presented the TRS checklist - its components and how it is used. The workgroup discussed how TRS assessors use child care licensing deficiencies and determinations. Staff noted that TWC and DFPS are working together on possible recommendations for modifications to the use of the DFPS monitoring frequency based on understanding how that information is used by DFPS. The question of how TRS certification should take into account number of licensing deficiencies was discussed. The number and types of deficiencies are considered by assessors by looking at licensing deficiencies and monitoring reports. The workgroup discussed that the licensing specialist has discretion in making determinations; may be problematic to put a concrete maximum number of deficiencies. The size of the center is a factor that must be considered in the maximum number of deficiencies allowed.

Grandfathering National Accreditation or Military
The workgroup is considering if accreditation should lead to certification as a 3 or 4 star provider.

Existing TRS Providers; Transition to New TRS standards
The workgroup discussion included working on a timeline to have rules by January 2015 and how this will result in a timeline for all TRS providers to be assessed using new TRS standards. There are questions on how to prioritize which providers to assess first. Options discussed included retaining star level and allowing Boards time to be assessed during blackout period of 12 months (exact time period TBD) and allowing all TRS-certified providers become 2 star and retain 5% rate during transition period. The workgroup will continue discussion of options for implementation of new standards.

Provider location changes
The question of how a TRS certification is affected when providers moving from one location to another was discussed and whether or not the 12 months of licensing history requirement should be waived. Currently, Boards have the option to perform 100% assessment when a provider moves from one location to another. The group clarified that there is a difference between expanding to multiple sites versus moving an existing site to another location. The issue is pending further discussion in future meetings.

Discussion on Measure Template

The members reviewed the definitions for Process and Structural Measures, noting that a Process measure is observed by the assessor and Structural measures are either met/not met or yes/no. All 2 star measures are structural and/or submitting provider policies. The workgroup noted that there are some structural measures that subcommittees have considered scoring. The workgroup

agreed that further consideration should be given regarding the structure for structural and process measures.

Discussion on Measure Template

The members reviewed the definitions for Process and Structural Measures, noting that a Process measure is observed by the assessor and Structural measures are either met/not met or yes/no. All 2 star measures are structural and/or submitting provider policies. The workgroup noted that there are some structural measures that subcommittees have considered scoring. The workgroup agreed that further consideration should be given regarding the structure for structural and process measures.

Subcommittee Reports: Work Scope, Work Plan, Parking Lot

Director & Staff Qualifications and Training – Elaine Zweig, Ph.D.
The subcommittee has divided into four subgroups to accomplish the work, they are:

- Director Qualifications
- Staff Training
- Caregiver Qualifications
- Staff Orientation

Discussion included:

- Qualifications should include formal education, experience and career lattice.
- Grandfathering Directors while they obtain qualifications
- Develop new Director's course
- Pilot program certification/administrative classes
- Possibly do an RFP for Director certification course
- Require 50% of fulltime staff to have 2 years of experience

Caregiver-Child Interactions – Mary Clare Munger, M.Ed.
The subcommittee has divided into three subgroups to accomplish the work, they are:

- Systems
- Ratios/Group Size
- Child/Caregiver Interaction Measures

Discussion included:

- Recognize that the Child care ratios and group size have been established by DFPS and TRS is aligned with those
- Caution to look at valid indicators

Parent Involvement and Education – Pat Smith
The subcommittee has divided into three subgroups to accomplish the work, they are:

- Criterion and Measures
- Board Resource Information for Parents

- Provider Resources

Discussion of subcommittees has included:
  - Integrate orientation with school readiness
  - TRS library for providers - all information provided to parents is research based
  - Parent-teacher conferences / education, communication and involvement
  - Overview of child development (in person or by phone)
  - Require parent engagement as part of eligibility and recertification
  - Logo, branding and marketing

Curriculum/Physical and Social Activities – Dr. John Gasko

The subcommittee has divided into three subgroups to accomplish the work, they are:

- Curriculum /Activities
- Indoor outdoor environment
- Health and Nutrition

Reagan thanked the group for their work, noting that there is still much more to do.

Next Meeting

January 24 - TRS Workgroup Session (in person at TWC or via conference call)

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:05 pm.