



Members in Attendance in Person

- | | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|
| Reagan Miller | – Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) |
| Patricia Smith | – Little Dudes Learning Center |
| Sul Ross | – Gulf Coast Workforce Solutions |

Members Participating in Call:

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| Howard Morrison | – Texas Education Agency |
| LaShonda Brown | – Texas Head Start State Collaboration Office, Texas Early Childhood Professional Development System |
| Pattie Herbert | – Infants 123 |
| Rebecca Latimer | – Just Kidding Around |
| Sharon Davis | – North East Texas Workforce Solutions |
| Sandra Solis | – Lower Rio Workforce Solutions |
| Mary Clare Munger | – Amarillo College Child Development Lab |
| Doug Watson | – Healy-Murphy Child Development Center |
| Dr. Elaine Zweig | – Collin County Community College |

Members not in Attendance

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Michelle Adams | – Department of Family and Protective Services |
|----------------|--|

Additional Attendees

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Kristina Gonzalez Guerra | – Kristi-Lin's Academy (Provider) |
| Graciela Gonzalez | – Kristi-Lin's Academy (Provider) |
| Laurie Biscoe | – Deputy Director, Workforce Development Division |
| Patricia A. Gonzalez | – Director Workforce Policy |
| 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 Flores | – Child Care Policy and Program Analyst |
| Houston Hill | – Adobe Connect Facilitator |

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Roll-Call and Overview of the Agenda

Reagan Miller welcomed the group, took roll-call and proceeded with the next item on the agenda by asking Elaine Zweig to present draft recommendations on Director and Staff Qualifications.

Director and Staff Qualifications – Elaine Zweig, Ph.D.

1A. Director Qualifications and Training



Measure: FORMAL EDUCATION

The facility director possesses the educational experience to provide developmentally appropriate programs for the ages served, and the ability to support the caregiver staff in implementing the program goals and activities.

Group Discussion:

Reagan commented that the measures listed were structural measures and not process (scored measures are associated with process measures); Elaine responded that it is a met/not met for each star level.

LaShonda further clarified that the new grid will be assigning by star level so technically they were trying to move towards this process.

Sul had questions regarding the education criteria; Elaine clarified that (for example) score of 2, the measures are “or”, not both.

Pattie asked if this will include homes; Elaine responded that the criteria for homes is in the far right column. Pattie added that she agreed with criteria as the qualifications need to be higher for homes.

Measure: EXPERIENCE

The facility director possesses the experience to provide developmentally appropriate programs for the ages served including home based, center based and school age care.

Group Discussion:

Reagan commented that this is a significant change for homes; Elaine responded that she agreed and that there was a lot of discussion regarding this within the group.

Measure: CAREER LATTICE LEVEL

The director assesses their education, experience and ongoing education to determine their career lattice level.

Group Discussion:

Sul wanted clarification how this would be determined. Elaine responded by clarifying that the director would need to use the career lattice resource.

LaShonda clarified that the career lattice document was created by the ELC in order to recognize and allow for the fact that professionals are at different levels. The lattice creates different opportunities for those to come in based on the individual’s education, professional development and experience. If an individual comes in at a high level in one area and a low level at another, she would default to the lowest level.

Patricia inquired about how the fields are used in the lattice.



LaShonda stated that the fields were based on fields used by other professional organizations in other states. The areas: Human Development, Psychology, Sociology, Social Work, Education, Nursing, Public Health, Home Economics/Family and Consumer Science, Recreation, Human Ecology, Child and Family Studies, and Business.

Mary Clare asked about the process of the career lattice. LaShonda stated that the lattice is at the first stage, only collecting data. Hopefully, at stage 2, it will prepopulate based on data entered.

Sul added that assessors would need to get documentation to verify until the system can provide the information.

Reagan asked if any of the subcommittees have addressed requiring the use of Workforce Registry. There were no affirmative responses from the Workgroup; Sul commented that he thought it would be great for the state to use the Registry, as it would take some burden off the assessors.

1B. Caregiver Qualifications

Measure: Not counting the center director, at least 50% of full-time caregiver staff, but no less than one caregiver in a child care facility, must meet one of the following measures: (For centers having only 3 or fewer staff and at least one full time staff caregiver)

- A. Have a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential, a Certified Child Care Professional (CCP) credential, or other TWC-approved child development credential, or an associate or higher degree in child development or early childhood education or;
- B. Have successfully completed twelve semester hours in child development or early childhood education and two years of full time paid experience as a caregiver working with children in a licensed or registered facility
- C. Have two years full-time paid experience working with children as a caregiver in a licensed or registered child care facility while working toward a CDA or a CCP credential or;
- D. Have two years full-time paid experience working with children as a caregiver in a licensed or registered child care facility while under the supervision of a staff person who has either: a CDA/CCP or other TWC approved credential; or an associate or higher degree in child development; or a degree in early childhood education or a related field.

Group Discussion:

Doug suggested that the “no less than one caregiver” be removed as it is not clear; Reagan agreed.

Patricia asked for clarification regarding option D: “2 years working under someone under a CDA”. Sul stated that the criteria (as it is in the current TRS Guidelines) are hard to measure; he suggested that we may need to specify at the same center.



Laurie commented that the measure may need to be amended to specify that a caregiver would need 2 consecutive years (where they are currently employed) supervised with specified credentials.

Reagan added that this may be easier to capture under the Workforce Registry, once this information is available.

Mary Clare added that it may be hard to capture someone who has worked towards a CDA, at any time.

Reagan asked if we needed to clarify that they are presently working towards a CDA; Doug responded that it would be good to add “presently” working toward CDA in Option C.

Measure: In addition to the 50% requirement, providers must sign an assurance that they recognize the value of well-trained staff and will work to achieve a goal of having 75% of all caregivers meeting the TRS Provider criteria for staff qualifications.

Group Discussion:

Several members of the Workgroup felt that this criteria was hard to measure and not needed.

Elaine agreed with the suggestions and Reagan confirmed the group was in agreement to remove the measure.

Measure: Each primary caregiver:

A. Meets DFPS Minimum Child Care Licensing Standards

B. Has a minimum of one year of experience as a caregiver working with children unrelated to the caregiver in a licensed or registered facility; and has 36 clock hours of child care related training acquired during the previous year of operation or employment. Applicable only to primary caregiver's first-time assessment.

Group Discussion:

Reagan asked how this relates to the 3 year experience mentioned earlier in the grid; Elaine replied that this would apply if there is additional staff

For clarity, it was suggested to remove “Applicable only to primary caregiver's first-time assessment”.

1C. Orientation Qualifications

Measure: Before beginning child care duties all caregiver staff receives documented, in-person, interactive orientation with the director/administrator to improve knowledge of the child care operation, specific job responsibilities and needs of children.

Group Discussion:

Reagan asked how the scores of 1, 2 and 3 reflect above minimum standards.



Elaine responded by stating that Measures J-M- go above CCL Minimum Standards and clarified that Score of 2 and 3 are the same criteria. This is met/not met criteria – (You have CCL minimum standards only or CCL minimum standards plus the extra criteria.)

LaShonda stated that Measure M refers to lesson plan activities and that she sees this as more as activities in program; Elaine disagreed and said that she interpreted this as knowledge that caregivers need to have.

This topic was tabled for group discussion

1D. Caregiver Qualifications and Staff Training

Measure: The provider has a specific, individualized written training plan for each caregiver. The caregivers and director should develop the plan together.

Measure: The plan is based on the Child Development Associate (CDA) competencies or the Certified Childcare Professional (CCP) Ability areas, Texas Early Childhood Core Competencies for Practitioners and Administrators

Group Discussion:

It was suggested to combine measures (above) to read: “An individualized written training plan based on CDA competencies, CCP Abilities Areas, or Texas early Childhood Core Competencies for Practitioners and Administrators is observed in the caregiver’s staff file

LaShonda requested to add “formal education” to the measure.

Mary Clare suggested that the criteria reflect the need to show training progression (Beginning, intermediate, advanced skill sets) Training needs to match what the mentor has recommended.

LaShonda suggested adding beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels.

Doug commented that this leaves too much license to the assessor and added that sometimes caregivers are reluctant to go back to school. Additionally, training resources may be an issue for rural areas.

Mary Clare suggested that mentors be trained to ensure that caregivers are trained in new and different topics; Reagan responded that this can be added to the assessor /mentor training.

Measure: The individualized written training plan was approved by TRS assessor

Group Discussion:

It was suggested that this measure be removed.



Measure: DIRECTOR TRAINING

The director participates in ongoing professional development to stay abreast of new research, best practices and trends in early childhood. The individualized written training plan provides for a minimum of 36 clock hours of training, with a minimum of 6 clock hours in program administration, management and supervision.

Group Discussion:

Reagan suggested that this measure be moved to the Director Qualifications Section.

Additionally, it was suggested that all the home criteria be moved up in the section with criteria for centers.

Measure: TRS Orientation (attendance by the director or owner at orientation will act as the initial step or trigger) indicating that a provider is interested in becoming a TRS provider.

Group Discussion:

Lashonda asked if this measure needs to be marked as met/not met; Reagan responded in the affirmative.

Measure: TRS Director Certification Course

Group Discussion:

Reagan asked if this would be a standard course to take; Elaine stated that this was the case.

Pattie asked if this would be required for homes; Elaine responded that the group didn't address this.

Pattie suggested that the criteria should be added for homes; Elaine responded that she agreed that it should be added for homes.

Doug added that this piece is merely a suggestion that the group thought about issuing RFP to write the training but the group did not consider the components of the training.

Patricia asked if a director has an advanced degree would this criteria be waved; Reagan clarified that there is no money allocated towards this, so there might be a cost associated that would not be covered. Currently, Boards have the discretion to select a director training program

Doug added that this measure was included because the director is considered the gatekeeper of the program. There needs to be buy in at the director level to ensure that things are as they need to be in the program.

Reagan stated the TWC staff would research the costs of various programs in the state and again clarified that these criteria may be an issue due to the associated cost.

This topic was tabled for further discussion.



Measure: Caregiver Staff Training (0-5 years) 30 clock hours – specific to the age of children in their care

Measure: FULL TIME Caregiver Staff Training (6-12 years) 20 clock hours of training, with a total of 12 clock hours related to school-age development and curriculum.

Group Discussion:

Reagan asked if this would apply to all star levels; Elaine responded that this would apply to all star levels.

Patricia stated that she didn't think that any school age caregivers are considered full time; Elaine responded that some school district school age care programs consider their staff as full time.

Measure (RCCH and LCCH) Primary Caregiver has 36 hours of documented training, with a minimum of 12 clock hours of instructor -led training.

Measure (LCCH) If applicable, caregivers have 30 hours of documented training, with a minimum of 12 clock hours of instructor -led training.

Group Discussion:

It was suggested that clarification be added to specify staffing at homes.

RCCH (usually only one individual), LCCH (in some cases, there is additional staff)

Outstanding February 26 Agenda items:

Workgroup did not have time to review Attachment 3, Review of updated Draft Recommendations from February 13 meeting. Workgroup agreed that all group recommendations and the subsequent feedback will be reviewed at the March 6th meeting.

Discussion on Next Meetings

- **March 6** - Workgroup Meeting
The meeting is scheduled from 1:00-4:00.
- **March 20** - Public meeting, in person
The meeting is scheduled for 9:00 – 3:00.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:10 pm.