

**Professional Development Committee
Meeting Summary
January 11, 2010**

Attendees: Melinda Benson, Bev Briggs, Colette Brown, Lilly Carillo, Donalda Dodson, Pam Dunn, Pam Everitt, Jeanette Ewald, Patsy Kohout, Jeanne Lemieux, Tammy Marino, Stacy Liskey, Linda Nelson, Dawn Norris, Sue Norton, Teresa Stevenson, Sonja Svenson, Shannon Vandehey, Christine Waters, Bobbie Weber.

Time Keeper: Sue Norton

Task Master: Linda Nelson

Meeting Summary Corrections/Edits: None

Announcements

- **Oregon Afterschool Conference** – huge success with 151 attendees (maximum capacity); about 100 on the waiting list. Looking at continuing conference partnership with Oregon Recreation and Parks Association for another fall conference.
- **Oregon Center for Career Development**
 - TOT for *My Program, My Quality* was done in November; training is on the calendar for providers starting in January 2010.
 - As of December 18, the Infant/Toddler and Director's credential went live. Information is on the OCCD website at: www.centerline.pdx.edu School Age credential is next to be developed; will be working with Oregon ASK and school age programs on the components.
 - In field testing, the Licensing Credential developed for the Child Care Division.
- **Oregon Center/OAEYC** – started planning a Family Child Care Management Training Series; focus group is working on the content. Hope to have the training out for Certified Family Child Care providers to get the same type of training that director's get through the Director Training Series. Cheryl Reece, former Commission for Child Care member, is part of this focus group and was the initiator of the training.
- **Oregon Community Development Corp** – Oregon got funding for approximately 150 more children for migrant Early Head Start. The rules are not yet in place for this funding. Some have entered the program in December and will have more in Jefferson and Polk counties the end of January.
- **Oregon Association of Child Care Directors** – Spring conference (30th anniversary) will be the first week/weekend of March 2010.
- **Commission for Child Care** – strategic planning session is January 22 at Roth's West Salem. Billie Young will facilitate the day which lasts from 9 to 2. Billie also facilitated the Child Care Affordability workgroup.
- **OAEYC** – Merrily shared the professional development calendar for OAEYC events. The Grand Articulation Summit is April 23 and the spring conference is April 23 & 24. OAEYC is also offering a Set 2 training in diversity.

OLD BUSINESS

EQUIP – Status Updates

- Training and Education Database – TED leads met on December 29. Deb Trammell is the lead for the Child Care Division; working on policies and procedures for licensing. Becky Vorpagel is working with the R&Rs regarding implications for the R&Rs. Sonja Svenson is leading the Training Calendar workgroup; information and recommendations from that group will go to the TED

Steering Committee. Andrew Bremner is working on the policies for OCCD. The first phase, getting all the data from licensing is set to happen in the spring of 2011.

- Education Awards – Pam shared a one-page snapshot of the awards that have been approved and processed, not necessarily what has been paid out. The first checks to current Registry members went out in early June 2009. The next batch of checks went out to both current and new Registry applicants. A total of 1,028 awards have gone out for a total of \$345,000. The EQUIP Steering Committee asked about trends based on current data. What shows is that getting new providers onto the Oregon Registry is working; a 421 percent increase over numbers from one year ago. OCCD is processing approximately 250 applications per quarter without the Oregon Registry Campaign not yet in full swing.
 - Rosetta – what are the CCR&Rs hearing in the field. Pam Dunn – there are a few centers that are not interested in the Oregon Registry or the awards. Linda – have found that some of my Certified Center programs are not interested – they don't understand that it is an award not a requirement for higher education. Bobbie – when you say the centers aren't interested, does that mean they don't want a presentation? Originally, we were giving presentations that were open to the public, now we are focusing on centers where no staff have shown up. Those few do not seem interested in having an onsite presentation. Shannon – the directors are interested, but in some cases the facility owners do not want to allow work release time to attend. Jean – for programs that we fund, we are requiring that staff be on the Registry. Colette – we require that staff get on the Registry but we can't allow work release time. We do make opportunities outside of their work time to attend. About 70 percent of her staff are either on the Registry or have applied. Pam Deardorf – until centers see the value, there may be some that don't want to participate.
 - Pam Deardorf – when you look at the data on the handout, we are seeing a huge increase in the number of applications from 68 in (month) of 2008 to 428 in (same month). Patsy – it is the collaboration of Oregon's Registry Campaign and the work of the center that is making this successful. I hear from providers at conferences that they are hearing tons of information in the field. Lilly - we have been working with OCCD because there are lots of opportunities for Head Start staff to get on the Registry. We are focusing on programs that operate less than six hours of day; may not be certified, but can get on the Registry. When Head Start programs understand that they can get more funding and training opportunities if they become a certified facility, they get that being on the Oregon Registry is important.
- **Director Series Training** – 2009-10 cohort has already met for two session; we have 21 in the current cohort. ARRA funds are paying for about 75 percent of the cost and helps providers that have lodging and mileage needs. Three of the participants are from teen parent programs. Eight come from for profit programs and the remainder are from non-profits that are both large and small – all ages.
- **Infant/Toddler Mental Health Certificate** – Shannon Vandehey has had many providers asking about the scholarship. Pam Deardorf – some of the confusion is about the fact that applicants must already have a Bachelor's Degree and Step 10 on the Oregon Registry. They must be admitted to the graduate program and then apply for the scholarship program. Julie Purvis, coordinator of the graduate program, is also on the scholarship application review team for the scholarship. She emphasized that questions should be directly to Pam Deardorf at OCCD for consistency in answering the questions on both the graduate program and the application process. Pam Dunn - it is conceivable that someone might apply to the program, get accepted, and not apply for the scholarship? Yes, but we are coordinating with the PSU graduate school.
- **Relationship-based Professional Development** – Dawn – a small group met on What is RBPD? and decided to adopt NCCIC definitions. From there, created some core values of what RBPD means and started a concept paper on what it means in Oregon. Two smaller groups are discussing

the approach of how to do RBPD and how to form relationships. Meeting February 11 as a whole group to report back and discuss next steps. Once the concept paper is completed will have a better sense of conceptually how this could look in Oregon. Donaldda – I thought this was an excellent meeting and could see from the meeting how it could work for both child care and Head Start in Oregon.

ISSUE Briefs

- **Training Session Standards Revisions to Include Age Groups** – the Prof Development Standards recommends that training standards be revised to include the age group categories. Work that will be done to make this happen will be implemented by OCCD. Much of it is housekeeping, the biggest work will be contacting independent trainers and sponsoring organizations to ensure that their approved session certificates include the age group categories. Linda – we can clarify the actual age groups to reflect whatever TED will be collecting – make sure there is alignment of ages groups across programs. Merrily – want to make sure that it also aligns with the training calendar, certificates, and any other documents that have age groups listed. Jeanette – has Becky been involved in these discussions because we want to make sure that the R&R database and training calendar align too. Dawn – Becky is aware of the age groups. Jeanette – there is a longer term implication for this, just want to make sure. Dawn – yes, we are aware that dates must align across all databases.
- **Trainer Renewal Standards** – asking that renewal standards for the Oregon Registry Trainer Program be modified. There are places that have been hard to implement. Recommended changes (get from the IB):
 - Refresher has never been defined. What we didn't anticipate that we would not be able to conduct refreshers of all curriculums. For master trainers, has never been defined for them. Stepping back – shouldn't all trainers show they are continuing their professional development. Second page – separate the concepts and regardless of their status, show us that every three years they have maintained a level of professional development through continuing education, either in their subject area or to increase skill levels. Give OCCD documentation of what they have done to continue their professional development. Evaluation has also been hard to implement because we don't have a way to know about the evaluation of trainers. There has not been a way to collect that information from the R&Rs, sponsoring orgs, or independent trainers. Jeanette – we used to do that for R&Rs trainers – we stop do all the evaluations and now only do spot checking. Bev – we are recommending that we not implement the standards because we do not want trainers to send us their evaluations as we don't have a process to deal with them. We do want to do this in the future when we have a process in place to collect the information. We want to move forward now to renew trainers within the system.
 - Rosetta – we know that the average 4.0 score was to insure quality of participants, but how do we handle complaints? The R&Rs handle complaints within their own system. Bev – we do have a process for complaints against sponsoring orgs or independent trainers and the emails come directly to me. Pam Dunn - are we really going to tell people that they cannot continue to train if they don't have their six hours of continuing professional development? What if someone only trains BBSED, but haven't done the six hours of professional development? Yes, our standards say that is the requirement. Rosetta – we developed that standard to ensure that trainers were maintaining a level of professional development. Bobbie – here is the problem for me, are we going to ask professionals like those at OSU to meet these standards? Bev – no, because they are not in-system trainers. Linda – example, I am a Brain Development trainer, but I haven't looked at those materials for at least six years.

Bev – in that case, we want to know if they want to reactivate for that training and what have they done to maintain their current level of expertise? Linda – for Health and Safety, at least having a current FA/CPR card which would be required. Christine – if I attended a BBSED TOT but have never taught a class, but I am no longer active in the Trainer registry, would I not be allowed to teach it? Bev – you would have to show how you maintained your professional development in that area. Merrily – just to make sure, a community trainer that can teach standardized curriculums would need to get two hours each year for three years. Sue – so they sign an agreement when they apply for the Trainer Registry that says they will do at least six hours of prov dev? Yes. Lilly – this is no different that if you are a teacher, a child care provider, or have a CDA – you must keep up your professional development to maintain your status. Pam Deardorf - do community college faculty have professional development standards? Yes, we have inservice days, but not all faculty are required to attend. Depends on what you mean by required. Our DHS person that does RRCAN doesn't attend because DHS has their own training. Pam Deardorf – but DHS inservice does count toward their six hours. Bobbie – worried about how we document and set up a ton of paperwork for someone that may not be warranted. Bev – just went to NAEYC and was given a blank certificate – I put in my name and listed all the sessions that I attended. It is OCCD's responsibility to ensure it gets document in the trainer registry. Teresa – doesn't this go into TED? Bobbie – yes, we could but do we want to spend scare resources to do that paperwork? Rosetta – want to get us back on track for this issue brief. Bobbie – requiring people to do six hours of refresher courses is part of this, if we take this action we are adding a recordkeeping system for trainers. It is a time consuming task to check 700 trainers. Pam Dear – this is what the partners said they wanted in place to ensure quality trainers, if partners don't want us to do this then we need to know that. Rosetta – is it part of their contract with CCD? (No) So what are we requiring of them? Bobbie – what Pam is asking is how we can ensure the concept of professional development without creating a recordkeeping system. It is a lot of work. Rosetta – but the renewal was required and that is recordkeeping. Pam Dunn- this is like passing a law and not funding it – we need to explore other ways to do this so it doesn't drain resources. Merrily – we have a system where we keep a ton of trainers, many of whom are no longer active, and we want to keep their information current. We could ask them to document their professional development activity when they update their record, it could be a check off box. Teresa – they are asking us if we want to do this, not how we record it.

- Bev – when TED goes up we will know this information – but we need to know when people renew if they have done professional development; many will weed themselves out if they don't want to be in the system as an active trainer. Sue – as someone who hires trainers, we need to be able to tell them that they need to renew their skills/knowledge every three years. Rosetta – sounds like we have two additional questions – do we want to postpone this discussion and have the group go back and discuss. Bev – we have trainers that want to renew right now. We can wait two months, but eventually we will have to send out letters telling them the new requirements. Linda – if all we are doing is asking them to send back a postcard, that isn't a quality standard. Pam Dunn - the ones that teach are teaching what they want to and are constantly reading on their areas of expertise. Not sure if setting up this system will get us what we want – although there may be a few deadbeats out there that just stay on the Registry. Jeanette - trainers stay good with doing training – it makes sense that they should be able to document that they are still training. Colette – I don't want my staff to get training from someone that isn't good – I want some sort of system that ensures we have trainers that have met a standard. Bobbie – should build on the consensus that we want quality trainers and that we have standards. The next piece is how you document and is

focused on a cost effective meaningful way to document that a trainer is competent. Won't have to start the whole conversation over but come up with creative ways to do this. Bev – we won't have 700 renewals at once and we have thought this through. Melinda – they have worked the issues and I don't think it is this group's job to tell them how to do their job. If we aren't renewing trainers now because of standards that can't be implemented and they have worked it out, then I think we should go with their recommendations.

- Rosetta – go with their recommendations – would like it to go forth as written. **Passed 8 votes to 3.** Jeanne – we would like to know exactly how this will be implemented and that when we look on the website we will know who is current and active trainers. Linda – when TED is up and running, why wouldn't I simply go in and have TED keep that information. Pam Dunn – so TED will keep that information? Yes. Sue – seems like we had decided at a prior meeting that we discuss Issue Briefs at one meeting and then vote on it at the next – would recommend that we revisit that again because most of us need to think about it. Pam Deardorf – this has been at the subcommittee level since the fall of 2008, so it isn't new and has gone through a ton of discussion. Dawn – this will be part of roles and responsibilities of subcommittees later on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

- Bobbie – overview of the NCCIC and Oregon tree graphics. Pam, Dawn and I have been working on a document that puts the tree into a narrative. Saw a document that Kentucky did that brings more visibility to the professional development system. Because of our collaborative nature, much of our work is invisible and it is very easy for someone in another system to say we don't have a professional development system and start doing it not knowing that we already have something in place. We need a document that makes it easy for anyone coming outside of the system to see what we have in place. The audiences for whom we were putting this together are PDC, CCECC, new Family Matters Council (Early Childhood Council), all our community college partners, funders of professional development, people who work in the field, and the new CCD administrator. There is a first, very rough draft and we are still collecting pieces that are missing. It is still the tree but in a slightly different order, so it builds on specific pieces of information. As resources we used Sarah Lemoine's workforce document, NCCIC book, and our state's work. At the last meeting of our small group we put all the partners in an appendix.

Next, we will continue to gather information to fill holes in the first draft. We will have readers who commit to doing the substantive reading to ensure we have touched all aspects. Dawn – we did the work on the tree, this document fleshes out what we mean, and the final product will include both documents. Dawn will email out the tree to everyone again for reference. Donalda – it would be good to have the tribes look at the tree and narrative document because they do have training needs. Lilly – can connect at the national level with professional development within the Head Start system. We took Oregon's tree to the last discussion and they were amazed at what Oregon was doing. They understood the foundation because all the pieces were there, even the parts that were touching our system.

- **PDC Guidelines Overview (draft)**
Rosetta – a small group of subcommittee leads met to refine the documents from the September 2009 meeting and move toward an overall workplan for the Professional Development Committee. The small group met again in December to flesh out purpose statements for each of the subcommittees and start work on next steps. Governance – PDC is the decision-making body for professional development and moves those decisions to the CCECC. PDC is at the same level of all the advisory

committees under CCECC. If a decision will significantly impact another component of the childhood care and education system, then recommendations go to CCECC for discussion and decision-making with that body.

- **Professional Development Committee – Roles and Responsibilities.**

Consensus decision-making – need to honor the work of the subcommittees where much of the ‘hashing out’ has been done. Can’t have consensus without the whole group - the whole PDC committee needs to be involved. But, this means that issues that have already been discussed and a decision made will be rediscussed or ‘rehashed’ at PDC – that isn’t an efficient or effective way of moving forward on issues. Rosetta – so everyone is okay with the general working guidelines on decisions by consensus? Dawn – we have a roles and responsibilities list on the back of the guidelines page. That may help with the decision-making process. Rosetta – I often hear that we don’t have time to discuss Issue Briefs, but information does go out in time for people to read. Melinda – that goes to trusting the subcommittee to discuss and make recommendations. Bev – reflecting back on the discussion about not knowing that this was discussed, maybe having the agendas out early enough so that people are interested in that topic can attend the discussion. Sue – there has to be room for the conversation; I can’t be a part of every workgroup or subcommittee.

Dawn – when something comes to the PDC, there often isn’t the time to completely rediscuss the issue, just give an overview or update. Also, every partner needs to ensure they are represented at the subcommittee level and send information back to their particular constituency. So, do we trust the work of the subcommittee and only ask clarification questions at this level? Bobbie – I don’t want to imply that we don’t trust the work of the workgroup or subcommittee, I just want to bring another viewpoint. We need to have an agreement that when we ask questions that it isn’t an attack on the subgroup or workgroup – I don’t think we are clear on that.

Colette – sometimes the subcommittee may only see a small component and when it is brought here it is part of a much bigger picture. Patsy – maybe as we move forward we can build in a way to bridge the information gap; when information moves from the workgroup or subcommittee to PDC there are no surprises. Helps us build consensus. Dawn – any professional development system in any state is complex and has no clear lines - it isn’t clean. So, the conversations to flesh it out are important. We do need to build lines of communication from each of the subcommittees and structure the meetings so that the meetings of PDC are the final discussion and work is completed.

Rosetta – in the updates from the subcommittees perhaps the issues that had difficult discussions or lack of consensus can be brought to PDC with the understanding that a recommendation and final decision may need to be discussed and finalized by the whole PDC. Build at least 15 minutes into the agenda so the subcommittee can bring those issues forward for discussion. Dawn – communication is always a struggle, so the subcommittee leads really need to be aware of how they share information and bring issues forward. Linda – for the member list and interested parties list, isn’t that everyone here. Dawn – no, there are people that want the information but cannot or don’t want to attend the PDC. Bev – maybe all the meetings notes need to be posted on a central website, like the CCD websites, where people can access them. Jeanette - the network has just created a policy where leads are required to keep and post meeting notes to tell briefly about the meetings. We could make it public rather than members only. These are just one page summary form and if they want to know more they can go to the facilitator or staff person responsible for notes. Jeanne – we could have links to the CCD website for the official notes. Teresa – we could send out a reminder to all committees to the CCECC that the notes are posted. Agree that CCD will be the central repository of CCECC, committees, and subcommittee notes.

Training/Quality Committee Revamp

- **Transition Plan** – some workgroups are going away and new ones are forming. Idea was to send out to all the old workgroup lists the new subcommittees, workplans, and invitation to join the one that meets their needs. An email will go out this week from each of the subcommittee leads to the various email lists from the old subcommittees and workgroups. Information to the CCR&Rs can go out to the directors with the request that local R&Rs be represented on all three new subcommittees.
- **Roles and responsibilities of committee members** – Dawn, much of what is on this page was covered in our prior discussion. She shared the two-page document from the NCCIC professional development notebook. PDC subcommittees:
 - Qualifications, Degrees and Pathways Subcommittee; February 8, 1 to 4, OAEYC, Gladstone. This is just for the initial meeting and a more permanent meeting place will be determined by the mix of subcommittee members. Have already started to work on the purpose statement and a draft workplan. High level – look at training to meet licensing needs; multiple articulated pathways for professional development for the workforce. Making recommendations to adjustments for pre-service licensing needs. Will also provide advice on development of credentials, looking at articulation issues in the field (certificates and credentials with community colleges and universities), monitoring and advisory for the Oregon Registry. Not working on TED issues, but make sure that training connects with TED. Need representation from CDD licensing, R&R, child care workforce, community college, school age practitioners, TED database development, and Head Start.
 - Access and Outreach Subcommittee; February 9, OCCRRN, 1 to 3
Loose workplan will wait until the committee meets. Have two goals currently and will flesh those out with the committee members.
 - Quality Assurance Committee; February 22, Chemeketa CC, 9 to 11; Child Development Center. Have reworked the purpose statement and will have snacks and cookies. Deal with policies on standards, evaluations, ad hoc specialist workgroups as standardized curricula are reviewed. Subject matter experts will be invited to work as needed – these ad hoc groups are probably six months or less in duration. Will be drawing on child care reps, school age providers and specialists, child care research partnership for evaluations, DHS, public health.

Future Workplan Items – will be assigned to the appropriate subcommittee. We don't have a standing co-chair to assist Rosetta. Pam Deardorf volunteered as Chair for the March meeting. Merrily is Task Master and Pam Dunn is Time Keeper.

Future tasks:

Task Master

May 10 Pam Deardorf
June 14 Colette Brown
Sept 13 Donalda Dodson
Nov 8 Stacy Liskey

Time Keeper

May 10 Jeanne Lemieux
June 14 Pam Everitt
Sept 13 Bobbie Weber
Nov 8 Patsy Kohout

Future Meeting dates – 2010

March 8, May 10, June 14, September 13, November 8