

Quality Assurance Subcommittee

Pam Deardorff & Roni Pham, Co-Conveners

Meeting Notes for September 9th, 2013

Roth's Hospitality Center

1130 Wallace Rd. NW Salem, OR 97304

In Attendance

Autumn David, Berni Kirkpatrick, Michele Jaeger, Barbara Malloy, Leslie Moguil, Crystal Persi, Roni Pham, Pam Deardorff, Brittany Palmer, Lisa DeMoe, Dawn Woods, Robin Hill-Dunbar,

Introductions, Good News, Updates

Alison: Works with NAEYC and she also does most of her work with the Office of Child Care in the Professional Development Workforce & Initiative.

Leslie Moquil: The McVee grant that was applied for, it was received. OCDC and other providers are hoping to expand their reach to pregnant moms in a home-visiting model for research data.

Merrily: Oregon's AEYC Fall conference is scheduled for the 11th & 12th. They had a record entry in making sure everyone knew about it so it was very early this year.

Pam: Updated the group on the new staff members. Pam also mentioned that they have been piloting the Individual Public Access to ORO training education accounts. The pilot regions in the QRIS field test were included. If they received a commitment to quality, they received an email from Pam's shop inviting them to sign up online. They received an overwhelmingly positive response.

Crystal: A new Teen Parent Program, Dallas High School, received a startup to be a Teen Parent Program. There is also a new one opening in Ontario who received a grant. She is getting a lot of interested phone calls about the Teen Parent Program.

Dawn: There's a lot of hiring going on with the ELD including hiring a few people people to assist with the community engagement and HUB activities. The Office of Child Care recently attended the ODE All Staff Meeting. Dawn noted that Jada answers to the governor and is the head of the Early Learning Division. Lisa Harnisch has been brought into the OCC as the transitional manager. They also hired Kate Nass, who put together the Governor's Comprehensive Children's Budget, to be the Chief of Staff to help organize the division. There is a lot of divisional work of how to begin a new division.

Review Last Meeting Notes

The group reviewed the meeting notes from the previous Quality Assurance Meeting. There were no concerns or additions.

Review changes to the credential renewal documents

The group discussed the changes that were made to the Credential Renewal Documents. This was the final review of the changes, as it was to be presented to PDC later that afternoon.

Pam gave a summary of the renewal documents, and mentioned that these are a way to document an individual's professional experience in a portfolio format. It's an alternate to a degree that reaches a Step 7. The group discussed that the cost of renewing credentials was a concern. It was suggested that we review the cost down the road and made adjustments if needed. Pam agreed that that would be a possibility. It was also noted that as these requirements become more valuable, a higher renewal price

will be worth paying for. It was also mentioned that the first bullet in the Experience Requirement section was edited to make it clear that 800 hours are not required.

A request went out for any last comments. No comments or edits were received.

- **Action Item:** Down the road, the topic of the cost will be revisited.
- ✓ **Meeting Action:** The group approved the renewal documents, and gave the “OK” to take it to PDC.

Sponsoring Organization Quizzes

After the last meeting, the group was asked to take the Sponsoring Org Quizzes and document feedback.

The group discussed the overall knowledge that people have to understand the system. The Sponsoring Org Rep represents the Sponsoring Organization as a partner in our system. This influences the idea of having quality assurance around trainings and trainers. The goal for the group in this meeting was to take a brief look at what there is now and discuss the following items;

- Is there any outstanding knowledge that the people who take these quizzes need to have?
- Any additional knowledge that a person needs to have to better fill this role?
- What does a Sponsoring Org Rep need to know in order to represent the larger system and how do that affect their role?

It was suggested that the 2nd bullet on Module 1 be examined. Michele responded that that was a graphic that explained the system from a wider point of view. It needs to be updated.

- **Action Item:** Michelle to update the 2nd bullet on Module 1.

Roni noted that depending on the revisions of the Core Body of Knowledge, a large portion of this will be altered. The group may need to wait for the revisions to be complete, and then revisit these modules. In general, however, a sponsoring org rep will need to know and understand the Core Body of Knowledge. The details may need to wait.

Roni asked if there was a way to broaden this out to include more application of the conten, to make it more real, and help the individual understand how the pieces tie together, why we use these steps, and why it is important to understand. Upon the topic of error documentation for this process, Michele noted that they have been collecting feedback that includes the errors and issues discussed.

In general, the group agreed that the content within the modules was great. The format, however, was to be addressed. The group made the following suggestions concerning format and delivery:

- ❖ Just taking a quiz does not show knowledge or true understanding of the material. The materials should be used as more of an ongoing resource that can be referred to.
- ❖ The group suggested that the trainings be interactive. For example, if a person is practicing doing a certificate and they make a mistake, a pop-up window will appear and inform them of what they did wrong. The pop-up message could contain the consequence of that error.

- ❖ The group noted that having a list of errors within the application of the training program can drive the information that the individual is accountable for. This can be very valuable because it removes one layer of a questioning, “Why do I have to know this?” It’s important for them to know it because it is a commonly made error and the consequence of that error.
- ❖ It was also suggested that in the training, the individual be provided with a sample certificate activity in which they must identify the five things that are wrong on a certificate. This will help them become aware of mistakes that are commonly made.
- ❖ Using ORO could lessen the number of mistakes once it is available to other levels of access.

Michele asked for feedback of the content within the first four modules and whether or not that content prepares an individual for their role as a Sponsoring Org Rep. The group offered the following suggestions;

- ❖ The content is great, but recognized the struggle that comes with making the tests work to meet the module requirements.
- ❖ We do need to add ORO in with the Professional Development Statements.
- ❖ It would be a good to virtually walk someone through the PD statements and transferring those onto the worksheet. An individual would have to actually preform the process as part of the quiz as a knowledge check.
- ❖ One group member asked if this orientation could be used for broader audiences, for example, Professional Development advisors. A suggestion from the group for this was to create the five or six modules and a certain few would be appropriate for advisors. Different modules could work for different areas for various training for various people.

Michele then asked the group to consider the director credential and renewal. Would the credential certificate renew any of this? The group gave the following feedback:

- ❖ One credential should be focused on in-depth knowledge and understanding of the system. This way, a director can better advise their staff and trainers so they can put the pieces together as to where they should refer to.
- ❖ Some directors are doing their own certificates. They are not familiar with the language.
- ❖ Having a class for directors surrounding this issue would be helpful. Be sure that Family Child Care Providers are included in this class because their role is growing.
- ❖ Create something more user-friendly that speaks to a wide variety of learning styles. Could there be a module that was a requirement for renewal? If so, every three years a director or provider would need to show renewal of their registry understanding and their knowledge of Professional Development.
- ❖ When thinking about how a director can support professional development, there could be solutions such as coaching, mentoring and identifying resources. Directors and providers can connect the dots for people.
- **Action Item:** Michele will need a sub work group at some point to work on this.
 - The initial step of the work group is to define who we are talking about, and what they need to know.

- **Action Item:** Update names on the quizzes, including The Office of Child Care and Central Coordination of Child Care Resource & Referral.

It was suggested to put an “ask” out to see if there is a sponsoring org group who would be interested in being in this sub work group.

- **Action Item:** The group is to consider who can become a Sponsoring Org. A definition of a Sponsoring Org Rep needs to be determined. The goal is that a Sponsoring Org Rep partners with the system and ensures the system.
- **Action Item:** It was also mentioned that there could be a renewal process with Sponsoring Org Reps, in which someone could just refresh the information.

Core Body of Knowledge Review

Pam reviewed the Core Body of Knowledge Revision. The point of the discussion was to give the group an update of where they are at and what they have accomplished, and also to do an activity that revolves around the Core Body of Knowledge.

It's a Race to the Top Activity to look at the Core Knowledge Categories, and align them with NAEYC's national standards. This is also part of the broader cross-sector work that we're doing in our state. The Core Body of Knowledge currently works for everyone, but it is now time to determine if revisions need to be made.

After doing the in-depth review, the following items required further discussion:

- NAEYC Professional Preparation Standards. Those are for workforce professionals who work with children in the development age range birth to age 8. While doing the in-depth review, that issue arose for more discussion.
- #3 on the pink sheets that were distributed prior to the meeting. Are there changes to be made across the Oregon Core Body of Knowledge Categories? The NAEYC Professional Preparation Standards have 6 standards. In contrast, the Core Body of Knowledge has 10 categories. The actual content that are in the categories are very well aligned with the NAEYC standards. The issue is that there are more content areas in the CBK.

Allison gave a review and update on the NAEYC Professional Preparation Standards.

- When the PDW says “Cross Sector” that means childcare, head start, and early grades. The essentials in an aligned early childhood development system is where young children get their care and education.
- She referenced to the graphic on page four of the handout. She explained that it moves up into Cross-sector work.
- Oregon is a good position to do cross-sector work.
- She wanted to emphasize that the reason that the OCC is funding this work in our state is the potential for cross-sector alignment and training reciprocity. This means that training and related credentials are more portable across those three sectors and across state lines.

Allison reviewed the background and goals of NAEYC and the NAEYC Standards on the emphasis on early development. She referenced the handouts that she gave to the group.

The categories that the Oregon CBK has that the NAEYC standards don't have are Diversity, Health Safety & Nutrition, Program Management, Special Needs, and Understanding & Guiding Behavior. Under the NAEYC standards, those are interwoven within the standards. For example, Diversity is addressed under every standard. The NAEYC work group found that that was stronger in NAEYC Standards. If you went with the NAEYC standards those categories would not be lost – just interwoven into the other standards.

Dawn added comments, including;

- When discussing Race to the Top and the Early Learning Division moving forward, there is a huge emphasis on the importance of cross sector thinking with childcare and head start. Thinking about it in K-3 and being a part of the Department of Education, there needs to be a shared language between early childhood and K-3 system. Knowledge, assumptions and beliefs in this area need to be addressed.
- Professional Development is very much supported in the Early Learning Division. Moving forward, it's important to think with broader caps on. This is a great opportunity to make sure that the workforce knows what they need to know as we move across the series. We care what happens in kindergarten and 1st, 2nd, 3rd grades. This is our opportunity to think about it all from a broader lens.

Alison added that it's important to ask, "Who are you writing these standards for? Which national standards are relevant?" NAEYC is birth through age 8, so you will need to look in additional places for 9-12 year-olds.

Group Activity

The group split into two groups. One group discussed the audience for this and who the intended focus for the profession is. The other group discussed the changes that are to be made across the Core Knowledge Categories. Each group was to bring back recommendations on how to move forward. 15 minutes was allowed for this activity.

The top two recommendations from the group discussing the revisions to the CBK were:

- ❖ Start with a wider lens for the whole Professional Development alignment.
- ❖ Discussed adding to professional development for trainers of how to embed Diversity and Special Needs into all Core Knowledge Categories.
- ❖ Recommend practicum sites that include Inclusive Settings
- ❖ Start with the best practice of what we think is right, and then adjust from there.

The top two recommendations from the group who considered the audience and focus were:

- ❖ Recommend the birth to age 8, and then age 9 to 13 (The first recommendation listed). This shows a continuous approach to quality child care up through quality k-3 education rather than separating it out in the 2nd recommendation.
- ❖ The same knowledge categories be extended to 9-13 with different language that is specific to that age group.
- ❖ Consideration for the family home care service. It's easier to have a conversation from birth to 8, and the resources and continuity are there.
- ❖ The language of the importance of the age groups of 0-3, 3-5, and 6-8. There is the before and after school language, but there is also the language of the K-3 teacher which reaches the 9-13 age range. How can all of those entities see themselves as a whole and link to those core categories