

# TRS Workgroup Conference Call #2 Notes

Thursday, August 29, 2019

11:30 AM – 1:45 pm

## **TWC provided the Workgroup with some updates:**

- 2 New Commissioners have been appointed, including Chair; Chairman Bryan Daniels representing the public and Aaron Demerson, Commissioner representing employers.
- Ed Serna has been appointed as TWC's Executive Director.
- TWC moved Child Care & Early Learning to be its own division and Reagan Miller will be the Division Director.
- TWC is adding one more face to face workgroup meeting; date TBD (sometime early December).

## **Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Framework**

Workgroup discussed the CQI framework and how it might look within Texas Rising Star (TRS).

- Examples were provided from other states as a reference: Massachusetts CQI and Illinois CQI
- Texas will mimic the intent and content of some of these models.
- Workgroup discussed that the CQI framework should ensure consistency in support is being provided between all 28 boards.
- CQI framework will be an expansion of the technical assistance that is currently provided by TRS mentors and potentially replace certain guidelines that are in place.
- CLI will create a mock version for Texas Rising Star and will be provided for review when it is completed.
- Workgroup would like for TWC to provide some "best practices" from other states' CQI models.

## **Implementation Considerations**

The Workgroup discussed items to consider providing accountability for participation within CQI:

- 1. Require participation within a CQI plan for all Texas Rising Star early learning programs (ELP). Mentors would be tasked with creating the CQI with the ELP and then following up with the ELP to denote if there has been completion of the goals stated within the CQI. A structural measure could be added within Category 1 that simply accounts for a CQI plan being in place and in process.**
  - Consensus is to require participation while looking at the potential ramification of a mentor's caseload.
  - Concern for implementing a scorable measure related to CQI is that it can be difficult to score a measure that can take up to 3 years to complete.
  - The Workgroup would like an example of a scoring measure to look at before making a final decision on whether a point based or met/not met measure is best. Therefore, no consensus was reached on if the CQI measure should be points based or met/not met.
  - The Workgroup likes the idea of having accountability and incentives to go along with the CQI plan
- 2. Options for failure to comply: immediate reassessment with possible change to star level or local flexibility to not allow participation in quality activities**

- The Workgroup suggests that the first step should be to find out why the provider is not complying.
  - The Workgroup likes the idea of having a tiered repercussion for non-compliance.
  - The Workgroup agrees that a uniform procedure across the state is needed.
  - TWC will follow up with a tiered repercussion model
- 3. CQI plans would be created at full assessments and modified at category re-assessments or monitoring visits with options of completion timeframes and minimum mandatory mentoring timeframes (3-month, 6-month, 9-month or 12-month).**
- Concern is that boards might not have enough mentors to implement a minimum timeframe.
  - Additional concerns about if an early learning program will be able to come into TRS if they are ready before the six-month timeframe.
  - Consensus on no minimum timeframe for mentoring.
- 4. CQI plans would be reviewed by the assessor at the monitoring visit to denote that the plan is in process. Results from the monitoring visit may require the CQI plan to be modified to assist the ELP in maintaining current star level recognition. CQI plans are meant to be working documents. This would allow for Service Improvement Agreements (SIA) to no longer be needed.**
- Workgroup member asked who currently creates the SIA? Assessors do; although the intent is for assessors to work with mentors. The assessor writes the SIA and the mentor implements it.
  - Workgroup agreed to keep the SIA and instead of denoting a TA plan shift the focus of the CQIP into an improving phase that is targeted to specific goals identified within the SIA.
  - Workgroup suggested that it would be helpful to the field if there was an automatic notification generator within Engage between mentor and assessor for completion of CQIPs.
- 5. CQI plans are leveled (Entry, 2-star, 3-star, 4-star Maintenance Plus), so that they only focus on what is needed for the ELP to advance a star level. This would be specific to the ELP needs and goals set by the mentor and the director.**
- The Workgroup agreed that these levels make sense.
  - Workgroup member asked if this implementation piece will be a paper or an electronic form, i.e. will the plans be prepopulated or open ended? The intent is that there will be both options, pre-populated and open ended.
  - Discussion on TRS CQIPs have an entry level, there can be a preliminary assessment conducted by the program or conducted by the mentor. No consensus.
  - Discussion on ensuring that if we keep items up for removal they would be added to the CQIP

**List of items for removal**

- TWC staff explained that based on the request for more information and the CLI study's final report summary, no decisions on these items will be discussed at this time. The list was provided by request from a previous meeting.

### **Ratios**

- Consensus is to retain ratios but to modify them.
- CLI study is showing that it makes more sense to score ratios based on the attendance rather than enrollment.
- There was discussion about concerns on how the classes will receive points.
- The Workgroup did not come to a consensus on how the measure will be modified.

### **Screening Form Follow up**

- TWC staff reviewed the following topics:
  - Number of 2019 Child Care Licensing (CCL) standard 745 deficiencies cited in comparison to 2018
  - Licensing appeal process and disclaimer on the CCL website
    - Question was asked “How does a center waive the rights?” HHSC CCL replied: Form states that by signing the form you are acknowledging the inspection occurred. To waive your rights, you send an email, and/or it goes pass the 15 days window without requesting a review.

### **Terminology**

- TWC offered some options to change the following terminology within TRS, specifically on the Screening form: Deficiency, Critical, High/Med-High
- Consensus is to have Level 1 Violations and Level 2 Violations instead of critical and high medium high.