



Members in Attendance

- Patricia Smith – Little Dudes Learning Center
- Howard Morrison – Texas Education Agency
- Reagan Miller – Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)
- Lana Estevilla – Department of Family and Protective Services

Participating by phone:

- Mary Clare Munger – Amarillo College Child Development Lab
- Sul Ross – Gulf Coast Workforce Solutions
- Pattie Herbert – Infants 123
- Sandra Solis – Lower Rio Workforce Solutions
- Sharon Davis – North East Texas Workforce Solutions
- LaShonda Brown – Texas Early Learning Council
- Dr. Elaine Zweig – Collin County Community College

Members not in Attendance

- Doug Watson – Healy-Murphy Child Development Center
- Rebecca Latimer – Just Kidding Around

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
- Sue Flores – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst
- Kimberly Berry- – Governmental Relations

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Roll-Call and Overview of the Agenda

Approval of Meeting Notes

The May 8, 2014, notes were approved for posting.

Comments regarding revisions to Subcommittee 3, Nutrition:

Before reviewing the matrix, Reagan distributed a comparison of the proposed measures side-by side with previous TRS guidelines for nutrition and mealtime. The group commented there are many new measures being introduced. In that context, Reagan asked if the group would like to prioritize some measures. Howard indicated small groupings for mealtime and modeling friendly behavior may be duplicative and captured in other sections. Mary Clare asked if, rather than multiple menu items



about specific healthy requirements, there could be a summary statement about higher standards of healthy choices. LaShonda suggested reorganizing a bit to group program policies together and bullet the list. Reagan said staff could draft something for the group to review.

A member commented that outdoor physical measures, based on public comments, needed to be added to the matrix; the measures will be added.

Comments regarding revisions to Subcommittee 3, Curriculum:

Mary Clare wanted to ensure what the consensus was regarding curriculum and the link to lesson plans. Howard said that lesson plans would related to infant toddler and PreK guidelines. Mary Clare said that at the lab school, lesson plans are done on a monthly basis. There is a simple way to circle the resource at the bottom of the sheet to indicate where the activity was sourced. But, she continued, the best practice is to adapt the lesson plan based on what children are doing, and how they are responding and learning the material. Pattie stressed the importance of checking both lesson plans and classroom activities to ensure consistency. LaShonda reiterated the format of the section and the intention to do just that. A member asked how a provider would be able to link lesson plan/curriculum to the Infant/Toddler Guidelines. Other members commented that the provider would need to show/document the link between the activity and guideline domains. Laurie suggested that this may be a training issue. Mary Clare and Elaine offered to share templates of lesson plan documents. LaShonda offered to provide the group with a high level summary of what the Guidelines (I/T, PreK) contain.

Regarding Planning for Special Needs, (page III-7), Measure: Consideration for students with disabilities: key evidence. Plan includes specifications on how to make accommodations for children with disabilities. Accommodations should include but not be limited to, those that support learning for children with visual, motoric, and/or auditory problems.

Member asked how accommodation would be documented.

LaShonda commented that the planned classroom activity would need to address how activity is modified to support needs of child.

Regarding Measure III-7, Pat wanted clarification on how this may be documented on the lesson plan. Lana was concerned that this would be singling out the child on lesson plan.

Mary Clare suggested, use initials of child, and provide how the activity would be modified to meet the needs of the child or the information could be included on the back of the lesson plan.

Laurie clarified that it seemed that the group was in consensus. The group was in agreement to keep the language the same- this may be a training issue.

Additionally, it was requested that the text underneath the section title Planning of Special Needs and Respecting Diversity (page III-6) be moved up a line and that the language under score 0-3 be removed. Additionally, the group requested that the text on page III-7, regarding the accommodations for children with disabilities, include "if applicable".

Lesson Plan Implementation (page III-7):



Sul commented that an assessor is not necessarily going to see all of these things, should a note of clarification be added to curriculum to indicate that score is based on measures observed? He added that an assessor may see an activity on a lesson plan or part of a curriculum, however, they may not see implementation. There are areas that must be observed, such as on page II-8, (warm/responsive caregiver, as assessor must see evidence of the measure). An assessor would not be able to score Not Applicable (N/A).

The group was in agreement that curriculum/lesson plan implementation section should allow for the assessor to score Not Applicable (N/A) or not observable, on curriculum, if an item is not observed. Mary Clare wanted to ensure this will not count against providers. However, for caregiver/child interaction, an N/A score would not be allowed. It was suggested to gray out the area.

It was suggested that the proposed measure be piloted before going before the Commission. Laurie suggested that testing is conducted before implementation, as recommendations are currently incomplete and not finalized.

Adding descriptors to domains:

Members suggested that descriptors be added back to the domains (pages III-11 – III-16). They wanted to ensure that we do not lose the key evidence. One member suggested that the key evidence would aid an assessor during assessment.

Scoring:

On an added score, classroom would receive a rating, which would lead to a median score. Every measure is separate. There are 12 domains for each classroom (where applicable) each domain would be its own measure, each measure would stand alone.

Licensing deficiencies:

Lana wanted to clarify that facilities average 11 deficiencies over 24 months and 6 deficiencies per year. Therefore, the group may want to consider the 9 deficiencies that would lead to a Service Agreement and loss of star level and 14 deficiencies that would cause a provider to lose their certification.

Additionally, she addressed annual deficiency rate among larger facilities.

She shared that for facilities that have a capacity of 150 – 5.75 deficiencies per year, for 151—300 - 5.72 and for facilities licensed for 300 plus, they average 5.8.

Sul had a concern that the work group was placing too much weight on the number of deficiencies.

Laurie asked if the deficiencies included monitoring and self-reports; Lana responded that the data included both.

Because the meeting was coming to a close, Laurie asked the group to finish reviewing curriculum independently and share comments by COB the following day.

Next Steps:

- Start with nutrition at next meeting on May 29th. (Next meeting will be a full day meeting –



10:00-3:00)

- Add policy issues; Staff will draft a high level summary regarding Licensing compliance

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.