

**Training Quality Committee
Meeting Summary for
November 5, 2007**

Attendees: Kim Ashley, Bev Briggs, Colette Brown, Kim Cardona, Pat Davis-Salier, Donalda Dodson, Pam Dunn, Dell Ford, Merrily Haas, Patsy Kohout, Tammy Marino, Heidi McGowan, Linda Nelson, Mary Nemmers, Dawn Norris, Sue Norton, Dianna Pickett, Teresa Stevenson, Kathy Suebert, Sonja Svenson, Sonia Thomas, Bobbie Weber.

Introductions

Dawn is facilitating the meeting in place of Dell Ford.

Minutes

Page 3 – Questions and Discussions – first paragraph – View and Reflect was originally designed for LEP providers (not family child care).

Page 4 – Directors Certificate Training Series – last sentence – project has had funding through ‘John and Betty Gray Early Childhood Initiative, local commissions on children and families, other funders, and some self-pay.’

Page 4 – Director’s Certificate Training Series – Rationale – ‘current training series’, not credential. Minutes accepted and approved as corrected.

Announcements

- **OregonASK** – received a \$45,000 grant from Spirit Mountain to collect data and do a statewide needs assessment for school-age providers.
- **OCCRRN** – received a \$45,000 from Spirit Mountain to work primarily with the two family child care networks funded through the Oregon Community Foundation. Work with the Individual Development Accounts (IDA) which are match savings accounts for child care providers.
- **OCCRRN** – received \$5000 Venture Grant to do planning with the Oregon Community Development Corporation to address the needs of migrant/seasonal employer child care needs.
- **OCCD** – Total of John and Betty Gray scholarship fund has been awarded for 2007-08. Will not receive additional funding until probably February 2008. Anyone who has currently been approved for a voucher will receive funding. Working with Oregon Community Foundation for additional funding and to work with partners on alternate sources for scholarships. Every year OCCD has had unexpended funds, but child care system now has more providers taking advantage of training opportunities. Mary asked if Patsy could bring a report to the next TQC on how the scholarships were used – the type of training.
- **OSU** - New faculty member, Stewart Trost – piloted a family child care training on obesity prevention. Developing a proposal for national funding – having people work on their own nutrition and model that behavior for the children in care. He has done focus groups with providers that have mixed age groups. If he moves forward, he will want partners and may want to call on people at this table. Kim suggested Department of Education, Healthy Kids Learn Better project (Lynne Reinoso may know who is doing this). Dianna – suggested that Stewart connect with Joan Ottinger at DHS/Health Division.

Old Business

- **Professional Development Data System** (database or data warehouse) (PDDDB) – committee essentially completed its work toward design in November 2006. Next steps were funding for the development of the technological pieces. Small workgroup met last week to restart the main project. Sonja and Andrew Bremner will develop a concept paper to solicit funding and incremental

steps for implementation. Linda Nelson will chair an ad hoc policy workgroup to work on confidentiality, security issues and data sharing. Another group is working on the technological aspects. Barbara Griffin and Mary will co-chair the PDDDB on a quarterly basis.

- **Work Plan** – has been updated with all subcommittees work/tasks for September 2007 to August 2008.

ACTION: Approved TQC Workplan as submitted with the addition of the Professional Development Data System changes.

- **Issue Brief: View and Reflect – Revisit**

This Issue Brief was approved at the September meeting. Several members of Training Gaps have discussed the final approval language which added an amendment that included a pre/post test. The problem with this amendment is that Training Gaps and TQC do not get involved in the process pieces of training implementation. Training Gaps members would like to remove that language to give the local CCR&Rs an opportunity to have flexibility with the evaluation piece. This only affects View and Reflect training offered by local CCR&Rs. The original purpose of the View and Reflect was to offer an alternative to LEP training given a policy change by the Child Care Division Licensing Manager in which required training for licensing is no longer waived for alternate languages.

ACTION: Amended Issue Brief language to delete the requirement for a pre/post test included with the View and Reflect. Motion passed. The Issue Brief stands as it was originally submitted by Training Gaps.

- **Issue Brief: Director's Certificate Training Series**

Small group met last week to discuss the Issue Brief as a follow up to the discussion at the September TQC meeting. Under original recommendations for delivery, the first bullet stated that training would be conducted by OAEYC in collaboration with OACCD. Recommendation that the original policies be in place, but the training could be offered by another organization in collaboration with OACCD. Training is design to be delivered in collaboration with OACCD because the training is for child care center directors. Areas that don't have a OACCD chapter are not required to be a member or required to join. The collaboration with OACCD is intentional. This is this the only way to get this certificate. Bev added that OCCD is working on a Director's Credential that will be presented in May 2008. This certificate could be part of a credential; other trainings could be used to attain a Director's Credential once it has been developed.

Recommended Action: The Issue Brief be accepted to state that training be in collaboration with OACCD, but open to any training entity, not just OAEYC.

Discussion – Bobbie, if we are trying to keep this separate from a credential, why don't we just call it the Director's Training Series. Why do we add the word certificate? Bev – because that has been the name all along. Sonia – it is confusing to director's too. Bev – I think it will get clearer as we move along the credential process. As we get to the Director credential, there will be one component called training and education (at least one way). There will be other components included too. Bobbie – why are we still calling it a certificate. Colette – the words credential, certificate and training were knocked around in the original discussion. We ended up using the words certificate because a certain amounts of steps were followed. The certificate says you are trained in the bare basics of how to run a center – it is a step toward a credential. Tammy – the word certificate implies a very intentional set of courses. Director Training Series implies a random

group of trainings in any order. A certificate implies that a set of training in a particular order was received. Mary – this certificate was developed by the state? Merrily - No, local LCCFs provided funding and it was developed by OAEYC and OACCD. Mary – what if there are several trainer series that are developed over the next five years. The word Oregon implies that it is being blessed by the state. Merrily - that is why it is being brought to TQC. Bobbie – in the community college system there are certain rules around what is and is not a certificate. We need to be clear in the terms certificate and credential that we agree on the meaning and have a shared agreement on the language. The term certificate has a prescribed meaning; we should agree to get to shared language. When we say certificate or credential, we all agree on what that means. Community colleges offered an Early Childhood Education Certificate; not aware of a Director’s Certificate within the community college system. Mary – would it be possible to accept this Issue Brief as written with a statement that we will work on the title later? Sonja – what was the role of OCCD in the development of the certificate? Bev – we were contracted initially by the Multnomah County Commission on Children and Families to lead the development of the training. We went through a process to develop the curriculum, did a pilot cohort, did an evaluation, revised it, and it went through the Oregon Registry Review Team as a package and the title was accepted as a 60 hour training series. Sonja – so given that OCCD is considered an expert in the development of a certificate? Bev – this isn’t basic training, it is Set 2 and it has an option for credit through Portland State University.

ACTION: Motion was made that the Issue Brief approved and accepted with the change that the training be in collaboration with OACCD, but open to other training entities. Approved.

Additional discussion: Motion to amend that the title including ‘certificate’ be revisited at a later date. Linda – as someone that has attended a graduation ceremony for the Director’s Certificate Training Series, I want this to be recognized as more than a training series. I want to honor the accomplishment that people have achieved and how much it means to them. Mary – we could change ‘series’ to ‘program’ which will make it stronger. Donaldda – this may be a maturation issue – as these certificates are developed there may be other documents that will lead to a credential.

ACTION: Motion made to revisit the title of the Director’s Certificate Training Series at a later date once TQC members have agreed on the definition of certificate. Approved.

Sue – on the recommended action from the Issue Brief – still not clear on the statement. Does this mean this is the only state recognized option, including the policies? Merrily – this is state funding that goes to counties; it is officially one of the ways that funds can be used. Does not mean that it has to be directly funded by the state. Mary – so this is CCDF that comes from the state? Merrily – yes.

NEW BUSINESS

- **Discussion – Quality Indicators – Accreditation**

Heidi – was have shared in the past about Quality Indicators (QI)– the seven researched-based measures of quality. Some issues have surfaced; is this the place to bring the issues, if not where should they go? A small team met early on in the process – Merrily Haas, Joann Contini, Colette Brown, Heidi, Bobbie, Kim Cardona, and look at models around the county. developed the list of accrediting organizations that would be accepted in the QI project: NAA, NAEYC, NAFCC, ASCI.

Core question? Should we accept Montessori and Head Start as viable accreditation systems? Given that question, yes, TQC is the discussion group. Also, should TQC oversee this area for the long term? Should it be the 'go to' body for all similar issues? TQC members agreed, yes.

Bobbie – very few facilities are accredited in Oregon and we don't want to make it so hard that it is insurmountable. On the other side – accreditation has very specific meaning.

- Head Start – it means funding standards have been met; programs can't keep their money if performance standards are not met. For professional or program standards, that isn't really accreditation.
- Montessori – for entities that can say they are Montessori school, accreditation is not clear. There are three Montessori models and accreditation isn't open to anyone outside of the Montessori model.

Discussion: Sonia – maybe we need a process for accepting new options as they arise. Merrily – that is what this list of nine things (criteria). Sonia – so the question is, do we accept this list as the process. Merrily – do Head Start performance standards meet those criteria? Heidi – plus, Head Start may meet all the criteria, but not be acceptable in some other area. Mary – QI is researched based. Bobbie – not all Head Start programs are high quality. They may meet performance standards, but may not meet quality standards. Bev – we are comparing closed to open accreditation processes – Head Start and Montessori may get accreditation through NAEYC or NAA or others, but other programs cannot get Head Start or Montessori accreditation. Linda – accredited centers also get complaints too. Merrily – accreditation is one of the options to get to the QI highest level, but not the only option.

Heidi – two things are heard – 1) open to any provider/center to apply that serves that age group and 2) based on research. Colette – why is it important to be open to everyone because ACSI is not. ELEA (Evangelical Lutheran Education Assoc.) accreditations are for specialized programs. If the accreditation follows the criteria, it should not matter if it is open as long as the check boxes are completed. Mary – is it as rigorous as the revised NAEYC? Not as rigorous, but does have rigor.

Mary – if we stuck with these criteria, would facilities bypass QI and go to NAEYC? No. Mary – we don't want standards so high they are unreachable. Bobbie – there are people that believe self-study is the key to changes in behavior not the stamp of approval from an accrediting body. Bev – unless we do an analysis across criteria from all accrediting bodies, we won't know which accreditation system has criteria higher than state licensing rules. Mary – also, the criteria will be the basis for state funding. Donaldalda – we want to strengthen the relationship between Head Start and child care; this is how we bridge together. As a Head Start program operator, I do recognize that we are also in the early childhood care and education business – I want to be seen as having a quality program – we are child care too.

Merrily – there is a national research base for NAEYC programs. Bobbie – the research base on accreditation is the weak. We don't have comparisons because the research is expensive. The research base on family child care is miniscule compared to the research base on centers. Not aware of any research done on non-English speaking facilities. We are struggling to be as inclusive as possible without selling out. Merrily – in the report that you gave at the Researcher's roundtable – accredited programs pay more to staff. If we have tiered reimbursement, then their reimbursement should be higher because their costs are higher. Accreditation takes time and money and facilities should be recognized for their time and investment.

Bev – this should go to a subcommittee; I don't think we can hash this out here. Someone should also be the keeper of the list of who gets in and not. This could be a very big task. Linda – when we talk about the accreditation piece, I might have ACSI accreditation versus Montessori – does that mark me downward. Heidi - No, you get a point for being accredited. Merrily – there are stages in the Montessori accrediting – different levels. Mary – there are nationally recognized accreditation organizations and there are many church-based accreditations plus YMCAs. Merrily – did research for Heidi and found that if an organization (NOT a person) wants to have accreditation recognized, would submit their documentation and it would be up to a committee to review. If a center wants it, would have to ask the accrediting organization to submit the information for the applying facility. Colette – was a member of the ELEA and discussed this with the center director – she was not interested. Don't know how she would feel if two or three different congregations want it.

Bobbie - The problem with Head Start is not accreditation – they wouldn't even know how to have a conversation on this. Should a TQC committee takes this on on an ongoing basis; submitting organizations will submit information based on the nine questions. Donalda – think this is bigger than just accreditation. I would like to get better collaboration between Head Start and child care. How do we work better together to support families? What do other states do? Some states do have an accrediting body – NCCIC has the list. Merrily – there are only two states that require accreditation to get to the highest reimbursement level. Mary – if this goes to a workgroup, needs to have a set of principles. They have to meet all nine of the criteria. Linda – sounds like we have four accrediting bodies that are accepted. If there is a constituent group that wants that extra point, then they would have to submit documentation. Bobbie – Head Start is still a problem, they have performance standards, not accreditation.

Bev – because we are into process, can we turn this over to a smaller group – something that the Evaluation Committee take on? What creates a quality indicator? Donalda – number 5 implies that if you don't have an accreditation process, then you don't qualify. Bobbie – how do you deal with the fact that Head Start standards aren't accreditation? Head Start goes to NAEYC to get accreditation, they don't get accreditation from the federal government.

Mary – this issue is a lot of work and I don't personally feel qualified to do this sort of thing – what about Bev's suggestion? This isn't professional development standards, this is about program standards – would be involved, but this isn't professional development.

Dawn – where do Bobbie and Heidi think it should go? Mary – has the QI steering committee discussed this? Bobbie - Oh yes, we are stuck. Heidi – this is a policy discussion, where do we want the line drawn in Oregon on this issue? I believe this should be under TQC umbrella ongoing. Recommendation for a one-time meeting is good; decide philosophically where do we stand as a state? Mary – a workgroup meet one time to discuss this issue? Bobbie – we felt that QI was not the right group – this eventually should get to CCECC. The rigorous discussion should happen at TQC. Linda – will be part of the workgroup.

ACTION: Ad hoc workgroup formed. Linda, Bev, Bobbie, Merrily, Sonia Thomas (NAFCC observer), Mary, Heidi, Beth, Tammy or Beth (representing OregonASK), Donalda, Colette, someone from Head Start Collaboration office (Dell or Gayle). Key Discussion Question: What accreditation systems should be used in the QI project and how programs get on or off the list?

- **What is the Evaluation Committee?**

Donalda and Mary are co-chairs but the committee has never met and really do not know what it is about. Bobbie – when we created our workplan document, we wanted a column added for each workgroup to evaluate their work. Larry Shadbolt suggested that we have a committee that evaluated how each group was doing in their work. Duke also wanted to ensure that diversity was included in the work of each group. The workplan was developed to address the concern that people would not stay on task. Donalda – didn't want to pull people together because I didn't know what to ask them to do. One of the things I did think about was the children's Wraparound Initiative; was cultural diversity imbedded in all work done – still think that is important. Bobbie – do you think the committee should ensure this is included? Donalda – no, I think we should provide the tools to ensure that cultural diversity is imbedded, not that we need a committee to do that. Merrily- the original group around diversity was creating guiding principles, a checklist that all committees and all workgroups could use. Mary – if every workgroup can report out on how they are integrating cultural diversity at the May or June meeting that may cover this work.

ACTION – Motion made to dissolve the Evaluation Committee and set a time in the May or June 2008 meeting to report out on the inclusion of cultural diversity in each workgroup's plan and overall accomplishments. Use the guidelines developed back in 2003. Discussion – Sonja will find the notes from the original discussion that formed the committee. Linda – one thing we did last year on the School Age Report was to make sure that school age was included in all our work – same principle. Motion passed.

OPEN DIALOGUE FORUM

- **On-site Support for Professional Development**

Certificate documentation: Merrily – we have had discussions at Training Gaps and prior discussions at Professional Development Standards. Seeking guidance on what committee should this go to – what questions should be asked. Currently certificates that are issued have nothing about the mode of training received – just the hours, and other required info. Now that we are looking at distance education – should we have some requirement that the format of training delivered should be on the certificate. Bobbie - What will we use that information for? Is there a reason other than our own curiosity. Mary – what is the purpose, implicit is that there is a value judgment – one type of training is more important than another. Bobbie – so we are talking about the piece of paper – yes – so how is the information used? Bev – OCCD only sees proposals for training for set 2 and 3. Sue – will it denote that one type of training is better than another.

Patsy – right now, when a certificate goes to review, we don't look at the mode of training – we look at the criteria that we have established on what is needed on the certificate. Training from other states does not have a mode – as a reviewer, if we have questions, we go to a website to check that it is a viable training. Mary – don't see why this is important unless it is for information gathering on the types of training accessed. Unease that it is expressing a value judgment. Sonia – we have included lots of information, it would add to the workload of training coordinators. Patsy – as it relates to the child care system, we can't tell if it is an online or a classroom credit. Sonja – investment of training dollars – where are the trends if more and more training is being delivered online. Teresa – it is a way to see trends – where are people getting their training. Mary – we have a lot of anecdotal information from CCR&Rs on those trends. Dawn – one question for me – there are some trainings that are fairly minimal in requirements. Without seeing what type of training was received, we can't monitor where the training is being received. Merrily – we are creating the professional development database and a field could be added to document the type of training.

Bobbie – so you want to see the trends down the road of what is classroom, online, or other? Dawn – eventually, do we want to see a standard where at least four hours of training must be classroom? Sonia – we can review a snapshot in time of the certificates. Merrily – we have done a snapshot and we can't tell how the training was received. Sue – we have no standard for training overall; classroom training does not always guarantee quality. Mary – we need to make compelling opportunities for providers to get training, rather than proscribing the way they get the training. Kim - what you are getting at is View and Reflect. Dawn – no – but there are some pretty easy ways to get your training, like purchasing a certificate.

Bobbie – I think we have two issues together – fraud is one thing and if there is an organization that is doing it that should be dealt with on its merits. That is different than type of delivery system. We have research that says training of a single kind does not produce the results we want. But we don't have research that says, well they got it all online so they are less competent with children. Third problem – what do we do about organizations that aren't ethical – is that a CCD issue? If there is an organization that is perpetrating fraud, what is CCD's responsibility? Sonja – we need to look at trends because of investment of dollars – we know online training is much less expensive than classroom. If that's the case, where do we want to invest training dollars. Bev – we do have a process to address organizations that are part of the system; we do not have processes for organizations that aren't part of the system. No resolution to this discussion. **(NOTE: This issue was discussed at the Child Care Division Management Team meeting on December 20. There was a consensus agreement that the partners of the Training Quality Committee should 1) document substantiated training fraud, 2) make recommendations in writing to the Child Care Division on suspension of certificates received from the entity engaging in fraud, and 3) if it is a sponsoring organization, notify the Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education. The Child Care Division Management Team highly recommends that modes of training be listed on all training certificates received by providers.)**

- **Co-Chair for Training Quality Committee**

Kim – there are two people that don't have committees anymore, perhaps they could take it on? Sue – makes sense for it to be someone that attends CCECC. Rotate the chair responsibilities? Rosetta would be the co-chair and rotate the co-chair responsibility.

ACTION: Rotate co-chair responsibilities. January 2008 – Mary Nemmers; March 2008 – Sue Norton; May 2008 – Donald Dodson. Sonja will work with Rosetta and the assigned co-chair on agenda items for the next TQC meeting.

- **On-site work to support professional development (mentoring, technical assistance, coaching):**

Bobbie – think this is maturation issue for the field of child care – has to do with the language we use for the on-site assistance we provide to child care providers. Mentoring and coaching seemed undefined. We haven't found definitions that differentiate mentoring, coaching and technical assistance. There is a variation in these approaches, but we don't differentiate. NACCRA has been doing some work in this areas. Abby Thorman is coming up with some definitions. Linda – NARA has a clear one for me that I use for technical assistance – anything that helps me bring a facility into compliance. The military paid for an addition to NACCRAWare that has these definitions.

Sonja – why is this important? Bobbie – being more precise has implications for the future. Mary – for the statewide mentoring program, we do run into definition problems. Would throw in another word, consultation. Linda – NARA considers consultation to be beyond technical assistance. Dawn

– what are next steps? Bobbie – find out what NACCRAware has as definitions – most generic language I found was on-site work to support professional development, which includes mentoring, coaching, technical assistance and consultation. We all work within our own systems with different language and definitions – need some consistency. Merrily – important to define what these things are and the appropriate group that provides ‘mentoring’, ‘technical assistance’, ‘coaching’ – look at the definitions. Mary – years ago Kitty Lake convened a group to define the differences between technical assistance offered by CCR&Rs and technical assistance offered by CCD staff. Bobbie – let’s look at all the definitions and come up with a common set – even if we just get clear on the different forms.

Merrily – there are different roles in mentoring and coaching – we can identify gaps in what is being provided to providers and facilities. Bobbie – like mentoring, in some areas it is a specific curriculum, but that isn’t how we use the term in our system. Linda – we are getting really deep into process and need to stop at this point – decide the next steps. Dawn – there is someone in the school age arena that defines coaching and mentoring – will get that information. Mary – could we develop a document. Bobbie – I am talking about one-on-one on-site professional development of the child care workforce. Sonia – what do you mean by professional development? Bobbie – the knowledge and skills to work with young children – more concrete.

ACTION: Sonja will compile a document with the various definitions of mentoring, coaching, technical assistance, consultation for discussion at the January 2008 meeting. Will include the environment in which the term is used and the source of the information.

STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

- Articulation – Not much new other than the fourth of three subcommittees met on Oct 19. The community colleges quarterly conf call is November 26. Through an RFP process, OAEYC was awarded a contract to continue the coordination work that was contracted to Carolyn McVicker.
- Family, Friends, and Neighbors – very busy over last couple of months – tool kits are on their way from Michigan to the CCR&Rs. Orientation training on the FFN training, funded by DHS, was delivered by Rhonda Prodzinski at the R&R Fall Conference. Original goal was to connect FFN caregivers to the larger child care system.
- Professional Development Standards – in the process of tweaking the Core Knowledge Categories – looking for gaps – working with trainers and review teams. Getting input on what focus area might need to be added. Draft document for the November 18 meeting has been developed. Will bring it to the January 2008 meeting, then to the Child Care Division to be translated it into Spanish.
- Professional Development Data System – prior report.
- Training Gaps – will put in our workplan ‘opens cans of worms’; we like that our workgroup brings issues to TQC. Discussion on adding resource page to the statewide training calendar. Will be moving Training Calendar workgroup meetings to off months from Training Gaps (as needed). Post cards marketing the training Calendar are being distributed to other partners in the child care system (and beyond).
- Training Review Coordination – has been revived; Kim Ashley and Bev are working on this. Will work on In the Mix curriculum (school age), BBSED for school age, revision of CCHS. Will make

a report at January 2008 meeting. Will do a report on CCHS at the May meeting. Sue – is part of this review the content or does it also include the format – yes, it could also include format. Bev – good example is First by Five which went to Training Review because the old format wasn't working – was revised to First Connections.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR JANUARY 2008

Quality Indicators – recommendation – Heidi or Bobbie

Core Body of Knowledge – report – Bev

In the Mix, BBSED for School Age – discussion

A Brief History of Time - Sonja

Scholarships – OCCD report on what type and to whom – Patsy or Barbara

Mentoring, Coaching, Technical Assistance, Consultation report - Sonja

ASCFME – invite them again on training issues – JaNell called Bobbie because they are thinking of legislatively supporting CARES. May want to come and talk about their legislative proposal.

SEIU – make sure they are invited to TQC when there is an agenda item on family, friends and neighbor training.