

**Professional Development Committee
Meeting Summary
March 8, 2010**

Attendees: Melinda Benson, Bev Briggs, Colette Brown, Pam Dunn, Pam Everitt, Jeanette Ewald, Patsy Kohout, Stacy Liskey, Heidi McGowan, Linda Nelson, Dawn Norris, Rhonda Prodzinski, Sonja Svenson.

Acting Chair: Pam Deardorf **Time Keeper:** Pam Dunn **Task Master:** Merrily Haas

Meeting Summary Corrections/Edits: None

Announcements

- **Oregon Center for Career Development** – moved to their new office on March 5 about one block north of their old offices on the PSU campus. Will have an Open House some time in April.
 - **Infant/Toddler and Director Credential applications are on their website.** Have started their third credential – School Age. The first workgroup has met and is open for more membership, good representation from CCD, CCR&Rs, school-age practitioners, Oregon ASK. Lots of interest from Head Start regarding the Infant/Toddler Credential – HS would like the credential to meet CDA requirements for Head Start. Also are participating on a conference call on March 9 with the Oregon Tribes on professional development and the Oregon Registry.
- OACCD – spring conference (30th anniversary) will be Wednesday thru Friday of this week.
- OAEYC – will have an Open House for their new office on March 20.

OLD BUSINESS or Standing Agenda Items (suggested because of ongoing work)

EQUIPping Individuals – Status Updates

- **Oregon Registry Training and Education Database** – Dawn shared a timeline for TED. TED leads are Becky Vorpapel, CCR&R; Andrew Bremner, Center/PSU; Sheila Carter, DHS; Deb Trammell, CCD; and Sonja Svenson, Training Calendar. All day meeting scheduled March 23 all to go over all the policy changes that will occur with the implementation of TED. Need to take the time to make sure all systems are working together. Dawn complemented all the agencies involved in the process for the good work they are doing. TED Policy and Planning (originally scheduled for March 22) will work on the business case and new concept of a universal ID. We currently don't have a way to track providers across all systems and this ID concept will make that possible. TED Planning and Process was to meet on March 29, but that meeting will need to be changed. Discussion will include a comprehensive communication plan, field test plan for TED, and how all the agency policies will align. We are on track with the current schedule.

TED Timelines

2010

- | | |
|------|--|
| May | Comprehensive Communication Plan developed which will provide a schedule of training and dissemination of information to prepare all partners and end-users for the implementation of TED. |
| June | - alpha and beta testing completed
- system documentation developed |

- roles and responsibilities for partners are defined
- specific procedural guidelines are developed
- field test participants are identified and training materials developed

September Field test completed

December Database and Procedural Guidelines are final

2011

Jan – March Begin Phase I implementation

Linda – the field test for September, is that CCD licensing specialists? Dawn – it may be targeted with a few people from CCD, CCR&Rs, and other partners. Linda’s concern is that it is the busiest time for licensing specialists. Dawn – the field test will be completed in September, which means that most of the work will be done during the summer. Pam Dunn – seems ambitious Dawn – we are on track at this point. Pam Dunn – does that mean all the guidelines will be written? Dawn – there is a difference between alpha and beta testing – it is making sure that CCRIS and TED are ‘talking’ to each other. We are getting to a critical point with policies and procedures and an endpoint is being reached where the types and format of reports will be final. Add-ons will have to be in Phase II. **My Registry** is a glimpse of what the program will do.

- **Oregon’s Registry Campaign** – Jeanette Ewald – CCR&Rs are getting information out to family and center-based care providers; have a sense of numbers from some of the R&Rs. Slow first quarter as we weren’t certain how the work would be done; not sure how to count the activities. Quarter 3 we expect to see an increase in numbers. There is huge increase in awareness of the Oregon Registry that it isn’t just training hours. Campaign has also helped R&Rs to focus training on areas where providers are lacking specific CKCs. Providers are also gaining a sense of professionalism. Interest from centers is increasing; are targeting at least half of the centers. In some areas, there still is a sense that the paperwork is complicated – perception is still out there – getting them over that perception is part of the follow up work R&Rs are doing with providers after the Starting Points training. Providers are calling local r&rs to complete their paperwork. R&Rs are doing follow up phone calls to providers to get their applications mailed in – lots of hand holding. Some feedback – local OAEYC did a Spanish Starting Points presentation and three providers in the class were eligible for Step 7. Education Awards are the prime motivator – if they weren’t there wouldn’t have the participation; contributing to providers completing the last step of getting in their application. Some R&Rs are doing clock hour presentations – Stacey worked with training committee to do a presentation that includes formal clock hours; will probably see more providers at training if clock hours can be earned. One center director actually gave prepaid stamped envelopes to their staff and was amazed at how that one little thing helped their staff get their applications in. Seems like everyone is excited but aren’t taking the last step to get the paperwork in – still that time factor perception to complete the paperwork. Pam Deardorf – my experience is that the years of experience and going through 50 certificates and agonizing about which CKC is covered is daunting. Jeanette – out of field degrees also make providers frustrated because of the extra work involved. If the in-field degree could cover a broader area would help that. Pam Dearforf – conversely, what we are hearing from Head Start people is that they want to tighten up the degrees in field –so there are different perspectives.
- **Education Awards (EA)** – As of December 31, 2009, Center/PSU issued 1,028 awards of \$431,000. Have additional ARRA dollars and \$200,000 from The Oregon Community Foundation

in the EA fund. The milestone with the highest number of awards is Milestone 3. One issue has arisen regarding the eligibility requirement 'must be currently working with children' and some staff have recently been laid off – just a few people in this bind and they will become eligible as soon as they are rehired. Also have heard from licensed-exempt folks that don't agree with the \$50 – think it is too low. Have had to add things to the application for evaluation purposes; was done at the request of Shannon Williams, EQUIP evaluator. Have a survey out to all the OR applicants asking if the EAs are making a change in professional attitudes. Linda – do have some facilities that would like to be licensed, but cannot be licensed because of zoning restrictions. Example: in Corvallis, city fees are more than \$6,000. Heidi – this issue should be brought to the Commission for Child Care as it is a statewide concern. Linda – we have a preschool that doesn't want to make waves about fees because they don't want the city to close them.

- **Director Series Training** – we have now completed four of six weekend seminars; already getting questions on the next cohort. Will be a topic of presentation at the OACCD conference – some of the original cohort group is doing the presentation. That original group morphed into a local AEYC affiliate. BEv said something – get that.
- **Infant/Toddler Mental Health Certificate** – deadline for application to the graduate program was extended to February 28; scholarship applications are due April 1. Currently have four scholarship applications. Will be working with Julie Purvis at PSU/graduate school to coordinate the program and scholarships. Merrily – if someone applies to the program but doesn't get the scholarship, what happens? Pam – that is a Julie question; my suggestion is to apply to both.
- **Scholarships** – Center/PSU is putting in a renewal for the John and Betty Gray Scholarship Program with The Oregon Community Foundation. Merrily – these scholarships make a huge difference for providers in the state – many are using them to move up the Oregon Registry.

EQUIPping Facilities

- **Quality Indicators (QI)** – Dawn - most of QI is outside of the professional development system but it does touch it as part of one of the indicators. Need to discuss where the data is going to live; how to get it to OSU in the format needed to generate the QI reports. Meeting convened with all the programmers, CCR&R, CCD and OSU staff. Part of the conversation is the overlap of work – most of the information that is currently being used will eventually be housed in TED or CCRIS; two anchors – TED for individual level and CCRIS for the facility level. Because changes have to be made in CCRIS as TED is implemented, those changes can also incorporate the data needs for QI.
- **Oregon Programs of Quality (OPQ)** – in the conceptualization process, Tom Olsen came to TQC to discuss the development of OPQ. Dell and Rosetta were designated the leads of a workgroup to develop OPQ. It became clear that an ad hoc workgroup could not do the actual work of developing standards and criteria. CCD contracted with Western Oregon University to do this work with the OPQ workgroup as advisory. OPQ has now been targeted as a strategy to connect Head Start and child care, which makes it much more complex. As a result, Dawn was designated by the EQUIP Steering Committee as the OPQ project manager. Heidi – one of the opportunities to develop OPQ is through the Early Childhood Matters Advisory Committee. Offered through the National Governor's Association and Governor's office, there is a Request for Proposal for which Oregon can compete for technical assistance on how to implement OPQ and use it as a model strategy to align EHS, HS with child care. The Governor's office submitted a grant last month and should know results by the end of the March – the technical assistance will be around policy alignment. OPQ is bigger than EHS and HS community placements – a multiple-pronged project for the child care system. CCD is going to offer a job rotation within the division to get assistance with all the projects that are being implemented. This will allow Dawn to focus on OPQ and TED over the next 16 months.

Focused Discussion – Relationship-based Professional Development

Dawn (facilitated discussion) – a small workgroup has been meeting since last fall to discuss development, implementation, and outcomes for RBPD (Document hand out). It became apparent during the November 30 discussion that the approaches (consultation, mentoring, technical assistance, coaching) and skills needed to do this type of work would also need to be discussed. These are hard conversation because terminology across programs is different and fine-tuning to get into alignment is hard work. In the end, the group agreed to use NCCIC definitions, agreed on the core values, agreed on developing the model as packages for funding purposes. Example: if Ford Family Foundation wants to fund mentoring then we know what that ‘package’ of mentoring includes.

Workgroup struggled with: 1) hard to stay focused within just the context of professional development; 2) people come to the table with clear ideas of what the approaches (i.e. definitions) mean to them, 3) what are the essential skills need to deliver this type of professional development? Dawn – there is nothing new in the first page, but the core values are important for Oregon. Need discussion on these values – is everything included, have we missed the mark, what is best for the overall system?

Heidi – what was the thinking around using existing resources in the system? Dawn – we needed to look at where the capacity is within the system – what parts can already be used. Pam Deardorf – we should say build on existing resources. Heidi – or build upon existing infrastructure because ideally we want greater resources. Pam Dunn – knowing how we really work with providers on a day to day basis, those definitions appear to make those ideas separate. We really flow in and out of those concepts; interesting to somehow to make each of them unique. Actual implementation may not work that way. It is a blended process – not in those boxes. Dawn – you have nailed a large part of the conversation around the concepts. Linda – especially for licensing folks too. Patsy – even with the Oregon Registry, one minute we talk about filling out the application and that moves to what are your goals, which is career counseling. Dawn – this is our struggle; what are the specific skills that are needed to move providers to behavior change. Pam dunn – whether you see it is as professional development or developing the professional.

Heidi – what we are looking at is what Bobbie meant with the literature review – the end goal is behavior change based on a model that is intensive, continuous or ongoing, individualized, inclusive and focused. Cannot get hung up in the definitions. Merrily – like using the infrastructure, but all of those activities come through many parts of the system. May come through professional organizations – not only one way and only one source. Heidi – when I think of infrastructure, I think of the whole system. Merrily – we need to have providers think about continuous improvement not just gaining clock hours – how can they access a support framework and get connected within the professional field. Heidi – there is professional development and there is RBPD; we need to get clear on what RBPD is. If we don’t have it, how much does it cost to expand it? We do have funders who will fund it, but we need to be clear on what it is. Pam Dunn – we really do need to get clear because I don’t understand the difference. Pam Deardorf – When you say RBPD training model it is a whole package which includes follow up. Our charge is to identify a training model that incorporates one of the definitions. Jeanette – I remember a meeting a couple times ago that we talked about a grid of training. Dawn – yes, from that work we identified *First Connections* to build in ‘that piece’ whatever we call it. I come away thinking I knew what it is, but then we starting talking and the clarity disappeared. Merrily – I identify most of our ECE classes as very much a coaching model – competency based, you need to demonstrate to me that you can do the work. Heidi – is the instructor doing an onsite evaluation and following up six months later – probably not. We can’t sell it or fund it if we are not clear. We may need to ask Bobbie

to come back and explain what she meant from her paper. Pam Deardorf – we have looked at the paper, it is clear, and we need to decide for Oregon. Jeanette – child care networks are a way to do this, but it is costly and time intensive. We are beginning to convene meetings on how many other networks are out there. How are they run? We are going to bring that information to the training committee meeting to discuss – can bring that information to this meeting. Dawn – the challenge is the approach – look at the grid – when we talk about RBPD and Bobbie’s literature review – they do lay them out as different components – there is nothing clear and neat. People are familiar with the *TRAC* curriculum – it is RBPD, but has a strong coaching component. The chart is to identify the differences in approaches. Are we doing too much and should we just focus strictly on the training component? Should we just tie this to a particular training? Example: a provider calls about biting, the help is technical assistance, not professional development. Heidi – It gets confusing because the three are intertwined (coaching, mentoring, consultation). What do we already have that is working? Jeanette – *Promoting First Relationships* is being used in the health consultation model and incorporates some of this – there are site visits – and ongoing supports. Merrily – we have looked at the grid but need to get away from it; bothers me because some of our strongest training is in groups, not one on one, nothing we have is pure coaching or pure mentoring. If we have follow-up for accountability, a blended approach can work. Patsy – have you had a chance to talk to Billie Young and NCCIC to see what models are developing in other states? This thinking has already occurred in other states. Dawn – yes, we have already received plenty of information from Billie and Valerie Krajec; if you look at the NCCIC materials, all states do it all differently. Should we focus on what RBPD means for training specifically? Should we look at the four different definitions and come up with core components of what RBPD means and focus on just the training? The RBPD group meets on March 25 in Wilsonville and anyone is welcome to attend. Pam Dunn – bring us examples of RBPD and get grounded in what we are talking about. For those of us that do a lot of training, it would help us to know what we would have to do to modify existing training. Dawn – we aren’t going to modify all training to RBPD – we are going to select four, maybe five curriculums and focus on those.

Discussion - Professional Development Committee – Leads

Roles and Responsibilities of leads and members of PDC – Dawn shared the revised document. Would like to finalize and posted on CCD website. Governance statement example: revamping PDC went to CCECC, not that they had additional input, but wanted to ensure that everyone in the system was aware of the changes. Agreed on consensus decision-making and will only vote when we have to make a decision to move forward. CCECC is the final decision-making body.

- Responsibilities - PDC and subcommittee leads and staff will ensure that all the notes are done timely and posted on the CCD website. Members will read the meeting notes, attend meetings prepared, represent their constituency, and solicit input/feedback from their constituency as needed.

Dawn – when you send this out, get clarification, but I would consider this document to be done. Bev – there are many people not here, should we wait until everyone is here? Dawn – we should use our constituency groups to ensure there are no objections, but we need to move forward. As we present information, it is a good reminder of member responsibilities.

- Communication plan – on the CCD website will be adding another layer under CCECC so that everyone can get to PDC notes, subcommittee notes, and any ad hoc workgroups. Want to make sure that we address the need for more information. The link is: www.childcareinoregon.org

CCD will make a concentrated effort to get meeting notes posted as soon as they are available. Pam Deardorf – it should be our commitment to be ‘green’ and cut down on the amount of paper and notebooks – with the CCD website we can keep an electronic folder of information.

Qualifications, Credentials, and Pathways – Merrily Haas and Pam Deardorf

- Had a large turnout for the first meeting on February Y. Three goals are:
 - Examine licensing standards for preservice and in-service training; took the ideas from the workgroup and developed sequential activities.
 - Provide a professional development framework that engages adult learners; includes credential work; aligning Infant/Toddler Credential with Head Start CDA standards.
 - Online training – distance education – more options
- Looking for more portals and opportunities for school age providers
- Activities around the OREGON registry – evaluation of the Oregon Registry
- Activities around articulation from community-based training to community colleges and further to four year degree entities. ECE degree equivalency – some will be done at the Great Articulation Summit on Friday, April 23 in Springfield.
- Representation includes OAEYC, several comm. Colleges, OCCD, CCR&R, PSU, Head Start, Network, OACCD, CCD, MSFW HS, OregonASK, Dept of Ed, DHS/ERDC, Colette. We are checking on reps for tribal HS. Missing is rep from another university (academic programs) and family child care provider.
- **Next meeting: March 15, 2010 9:30 to noon at OAEYC office.**– workplan will be closer to completion. Call-in capacity is available.

Access and Outreach Subcommittee - Melinda Benson and Stacy Liskey

- Small group currently; looking for more representation. Need someone from CCD (Peter Blume was suggested), community colleges, commission on children and families, someone with marketing and public relations skills.

Workplan: Our overall goal is to get the word out about training opportunities. Some of the RBPD may come to this group. Workplan still in flux.

- two specific goals currently;
 - Increase ...
 - Provide guidance and direction on
- Training gaps work is also important and we talked a great deal about language access; need to find representatives from non-english speaking constituencies. Patsy- many of the CCR&Rs deal with multiple languages. Jeanette – we now have mandatory orientations for the DHS subsidy clients – language will be an issue.
- **Next meeting: April 13, 10-12, Location to be determined** (meet 2nd tuesday of non-PDC months). Will to float meeting locations based on membership.

Quality Assurance Committee – Linda Nelson and Bev Briggs

- Minutes from last meeting were handed out (are currently posted on CCD website).
- Have both an active and information only list serve.
- Workplan is a very dynamic, living document. Very large body of work being carried over from the old Professional Development Standards subcommittee; included ideas from members for future or ongoing work.
- Concern: very interested in meeting rooms that have access to phones for conference calls or video conferencing. Would also like to have funds to pay mileage for people that would like to attend but they don't work for a state agency.

- Next meetings: March 22 and April 26, 9 to 11, Salem Child Development Center, Chemeketa CC. (meeting on fourth Monday of the month). Interested in increasing the information list serve to get out meeting minutes and other information.

Sonja will continue to staff the main PDC meeting and CCD program staff will attend all three subcommittee meetings.

PDC Workplan Items for Discussion or Delegation

- Co-Chair designation: We need a permanent co-chair with Rosetta as she is retired; a backup person is needed. We have not had someone in this position since Dell Ford stepped down. Melinda – this is a big question and we need a larger group to make a decision; many of the R&R staff are at NACCRRRA this week. Pam Deardorf volunteered to be co-chair until a permanent replacement can be found. Bev – maybe we need co-facilitators, not co-chairs. We don't need a state agency person as a co-facilitator; it can be anyone who regularly attends PDC and might be interested.

ACTION: Issue referred to the PDC leads for discussion.

- Increased training requirements for RFCC –

ACTION: Referred to Qualifications, Credentials and Pathways

- Distance education training criteria – analysis and standards development

ACTION: Referred to Quality Assurance

- How do we evaluate in the system trainers and training sessions? This refers to all in the system training, not just CCR&R training. In the system means: Oregon Registry certified trainers, sponsoring organizations.

ACTION: Referred to Quality Assurance.

Dawn and Sonja participated in a March 5 federal conference call on Infant/Toddler initiatives and use of ARRA funds. The notes from the call will be posted on the CCD website; significant implications for OPQ and Oregon's Infant/Toddler Credential.

Future Meeting dates – 2010

May 10, June 14 (if needed), September 13, November 8