

State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care

First Meeting

January 13, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.

**Council Attendance:** Berry, Michael; Brady, Denise; Brown, LaShonda; Capello, Mary; Cody, Deborah; Day, Gina; De Hoyos O’Conner, Ana; Enriquez, Blanca; Gasko, John; Goodman, Dottie; Cardenas Hagan, Elsa; Hobbs-Lopez, Angela; Ott, Bobby; Rasco, Sasha; Shiver, Elaine; Wedel, Kim; White, Quincy; Whitcamp, John

**Facilitators and Staff Attendance:** Bates, Jim; Clardy, Mark; Elizondo-Limas, Lillie; Gomez-Chennisi, Catherine; Kaplon, Amanda; Rountree, Cory; Walters, Dan

1. Welcome and Opening – Dr. John Gasko
2. Introduction of Members – Mr. Dan Walters
3. Review Agenda and Expectations – Mr. Dan Walters
4. Federal Legislation Background – Ms. LaShonda Brown
  - a. The Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 (Head Start Act 2007)
    - i. Overall responsibility to facilitate the development or enhancement of high quality systems for ECEC to improve school readiness (birth to school entry)
    - ii. Wide range of programs and services
  - b. The Responsibilities of The State Advisory Council
    - i. Conduct a periodic statewide needs assessment concerning the quality and availability of early childhood education and development programs and services for children from birth to school entry;
    - ii. Identify opportunities for, and barriers to, collaboration and coordination among Federally-funded and State-funded child development, child care, and early childhood education programs and services, including collaboration and coordination among State agencies responsible for administering such programs;
    - iii. Develop recommendations for increasing the overall participation of children in existing Federal, State, and local child care and early childhood education programs, including outreach to underrepresented and special populations;

- iv. Develop recommendations regarding the establishment of a unified data collection system for public early childhood education and development programs and services throughout the State;
  - v. Develop recommendations regarding statewide professional development and career advancement plans for early childhood educators in the State;
  - vi. Assess the capacity and effectiveness of 2- and 4-year public and private institutions of higher education in the State toward supporting the development of early childhood educators;
  - vii. Make recommendations for improvements in State early learning standards and undertake efforts to develop high-quality comprehensive early learning standards, as appropriate.
- c. Funding Eligibility
- i. 30% Federal Grant - \$11,274,474 (one time three year grant)
  - ii. In order to receive funding: 70% Matching Funds are needed (can be in-kind or cash) - \$37,581,580
  - iii. Must be state funds
5. The Compelling Case, Urgency, and Framework – Dr. John Gasko
- a. A Sense of Urgency
    - i. Demography and a spectrum of demands and needs
    - ii. Parallel structures, rules, and priorities
    - iii. Federal timeline
    - iv. Focus on parents and children
    - v. Mixed-age populations
    - vi. Need for innovation
  - b. Workforce Development and Professional Development
    - i. Develop recommendations on statewide professional development and career advancement plans for early childhood educators
    - ii. Assess the capacity and effectiveness on institutes of higher education supporting the development of early childhood educators
    - iii. Support professional development, recruitment, and retention initiatives for early childhood educators
  - c. Data and Quality Rating Systems
    - i. Develop recommendations on the development of a unified data collection system for public early childhood and development programs and services
    - ii. Facilitate and enhance existing high-quality initiatives
  - d. Collaborations and Standards

- i. Identify opportunities for, and barriers to, collaboration and coordination
    - ii. Make recommendations for improvements in state early learning standards
    - iii. Enhance existing early childhood education programs
    - iv. Develop recommendations on increasing participation in early childhood education
  - e. Parental Outreach and Communications
    - i. Conduct periodic needs assessments on the quality and availability of early childhood education from birth to school entry
    - ii. Develop recommendations for outreach to underrepresented and special populations
    - iii. Promote school preparedness for children from birth to school entry
  - f. Operational and Process Framework
    - i. Goal is to get to know one another and be introduced to our workgroups
    - ii. Start thinking about solutions, strategies, and goals
    - iii. Timeline and discussions are not set in stone, today is about forming the foundation to begin
- 6. Exploring the Grant Framework – Mr. Dan Walters
  - a. Timeline
    - i. November 2009 – Governor named council
    - ii. January 13, 2010 – First meeting held
      - 1. Create understand of task
      - 2. Create working framework
      - 3. Create working relationships and plans
    - iii. April 7, 2010 – Second Meeting
      - 1. Workgroups present recommendations
      - 2. Discuss strengths, areas of improvement, and budget priorities
    - iv. May 19, 2010 – Third Meeting
      - 1. Prepare draft work plan
      - 2. Discuss revisions
      - 3. Agree to approach and budget
    - v. July 1, 2010 – Submit Grant Application
    - vi. August 1, 2010 – Federal Grant Officially Due
  - b. Introduce change management concept
    - i. How organizations respond to change (Silos Example)
    - ii. Café Etiquette: Conversational ground rules/principles in order to de-silo
    - iii. Table Host Responsibilities
- 7. Table Seating: Operational Framework – All Council Members

- i. Discussions Include
  - 1. Prioritize the Need
  - 2. What approaches will work best?
  - 3. How much will it cost?
- ii. Round #1
- iii. Round #2
- iv. Report Out – Table Hosts
  - 1. Workforce Development and Professional Development – Ms. LaShonda Brown
    - a. Career ladder
    - b. Core competencies to be more integrative
    - c. Making sure special populations are addressed
    - d. Training grounds and access to funding for education/continuing education
    - e. Huge need for specific professional development for infants and toddlers
    - f. Discussion on the need to expand on the EC through 4 to EC through 6
    - g. Career paths for professionals and a more integrated approach
    - h. Mentoring and coaching and sharing those programs with other sectors
    - i. Need to have core competencies for teaching staff, as well as directors and administrators; and what can we develop for parents
    - j. Database for documenting professional development
    - k. Dialogue between 2 year and 4 year institutions
    - l. Relationship with training and transfer credit eligibility with colleges and universities
  - 2. Data and Quality Rating Systems – Mr. John Whitcamp
    - a. Data frustration because there are so many different places that captures information, but it does not get shared (systems do not talk to each other)
    - b. Lots of limitations in regards to the data, several programs don't have data collected; not enough sharing of all of this information to be put to usage

- c. Most data collected is based on children between the ages of 3 to 5 year olds, we need more data collected for the ages between birth and age 3
  - d. Most collection is around regulated programs (kindergarten, pre-kindergarten, etc.); there is not a lot of data collected for other programs such as regulated child care, home based programs, Head Start, etc.; we need to expand on data collection to less regulated and other regulated programs
  - e. Need to have the systems “talk” to each other
  - f. Even vital statistics in Texas is 4 years behind
  - g. Many barriers to collecting data, including security and a big barrier is HIPAA regulations that is protecting privacy
  - h. Need to build a quality rating system to aid in the collection of data
  - i. Without the data systems sharing with each other we cannot talk about developing universal/statewide data systems until that is happening
3. Collaborations and Standards – Mrs. Mary Capello
- a. Standards should be first
  - b. There is a need to identify and document all of the standards at both the federal, state, and community levels, not just the local levels
  - c. Need to define and communicate specifics of standards: What is mandatory, the right thing, or best practice?
  - d. Need to then identify the commonalities, conflicts, differences between all of these standards for programs
  - e. Identify opportunities for possibly amending standards, achieving and maintaining consistency and quality, but still looking at the uniformity in language without compromising quality, safety, or health of the children
  - f. Need for implementing strategies to better the communication of standards and increasing efficiency and effectiveness
  - g. Need to eliminate any duplications of oversight where applicable and appropriate

- h. Need to access the barriers for collaboration at national, state, and local levels; they are not talking to one another; how can we improve on communication?
- i. Need to consider incentives to public schools, child care and to other programs

4. Parental Outreach and Communications – Dr. John Gasko

- a. Need to get information out there
- b. Respect parent's choice
- c. What is available out there for parents?
- d. There are gaps in services being offered: How can we help them navigate; what is available versus quality?
- e. Eligibility issues for parents, how do we deal with that?
- f. Addressing delivery barriers (geography and technology and access)
- g. How to spread what we identify and create linkages
- h. How to incentivize collaborations and parents (ex: address transportation and supply give away of specific items, not just gift cards)
- i. Build on mixed delivery/mixed services, coordinated resources and approaches; how do we create these? We need to focus on Texas
- j. Integrate the many existing assessments that are out there and collecting that information
- k. Child Find has a strong lever for action; how can we replicate that?
- l. Mixed delivery round ups: How do we know that they are being done well?
- m. Build on local councils and bringing the ages 0-3 into perspective to them
- n. Refining availability to specific needs groups and programs
- o. Fundraising - Identify the most effective groups
- p. Give money to existing Texas groups that are already working to keep doing what they are doing
- q. Legislation/legal engagement to assist: How do we communicate with significant public entities that can work with Legislators to help Legislators to travel around the state to understand the real need?

8. Workgroups – All Council Members

- a. Tasks
  - i. Deliverables for Meeting #2, April 7<sup>th</sup> (follow the Operational Framework)
  - ii. How and when we will work as a workgroup?
  - iii. Who will be responsible for what?
  - iv. What is our workgroup timeline?
  - v. Timeline Report for Workgroups are due no later than March 24<sup>th</sup>
- b. Report Out – Table Hosts
  - i. Workforce Development and Professional Development – Ms. LaShonda Brown
    - 1. Meet in person on February 8, 2010
    - 2. Will bring together background information
    - 3. Weekly touching base via email
  - ii. Data and Quality Rating Systems – Mr. John Whitcamp
    - 1. Do an analysis of the State School Ready System and compare to Texas Rising Star
    - 2. Web seminar from here to 24<sup>th</sup>
    - 3. Take a look at data systems out there and see what is there
  - iii. Collaborations and Standards Development – Mrs. Mary Capello
    - 1. Put information/feedback together on PowerPoint
    - 2. Focus on the agencies to prioritize
    - 3. Prioritize
    - 4. Hiring a consultant to gather/review/compile information and to conduct analysis
    - 5. Invite other agents
    - 6. Will meet in Austin at TEA (to be announced)
  - iv. Parental Outreach and Communications – Dr. John Gasko
    - 1. Make sure that we are meeting the needs of the grant
    - 2. Start with a budget and summarizing feedback
    - 3. Look at goals/activities
- 9. Public Testimony – Mr. Dan Walters and Public Attendees
  - a. Comments/Input
    - i. Mrs. Kara Johnson: TECEC:
      - 1. Keep the Texas Plan document in mind when meeting
      - 2. Keep in mind the Early Learning Challenge Fund, could bring millions of additional dollars to Texas to build a collaborative system

3. The coalitions would love to have incentives for communities to show that they are going above and beyond because they really are doing well
  4. Some states are tracking their infants and toddlers through immunization data identifiers
  5. Prenatal through 16 Council (better connotation)
- ii. Mrs. Jackie Taylor: TAEYC
1. If looking at trends across what other states are doing in terms of quality rating and improvement systems, actually not under data systems so look into researching that; it is not quality rating
  2. Five components to quality rating and improvement systems; go to the National Childcare Information Center (CIC) search quality QRF or QRIS. “It will pull up a whole bunch of wonderful information on quality rating improvement systems...”
  3. Encourages us to look up what other state quality rating and improvement systems look like; “Some of the best are state of Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Ohio, and Illinois...”
  4. Dr. John Gasko: “In terms of other models, can you point us to any state that truly has a mixed delivery QRIS for all sectors of participating child care?”  
Mrs. Jackie Taylor: “Well, all of them...” (All of the sectors of child care at the state level come together for data collection)
  5. Dr. John Gasko: “What incentives are public schools getting?”  
Mrs. Jackie Taylor: “Again, in most states, quality rating and systems are voluntary, they are not mandatory. If the school district has a public Pre-Kindergarten program they wish to participate, they would give the same incentives as what other programs would get. If there are scholarships available and teacher aids that need scholarships, they would be able to apply for that. There are wage supplements that are implemented into the system, and Tier 3 reimbursement rates, there would be ways to get with that...”

- b. Additional Information: <<http://www.childrenslearninginstitute.org/our-programs/programs-overview/state-advisory-council/>

## 10. Council Wrap-Up – Mr. Dan Walters and Dr. John Gasko

- a. Summary Statement
- b. Cross Working Group Interactions
  - i. What worked today?



1. Council
    - a. Preparation and scheduling
    - b. Facilitators
    - c. Background and framework was very efficient and effective
    - d. All members being present was very helpful
  2. Public
    - a. Invitations to be here
    - b. Efficiency
    - c. Networking
    - d. Forum
- ii. What can we change to improve the next meeting?
1. Council
    - a. More time needed
    - b. Tables set up so that all members can be seen (members want to be able to see all of the other members)
    - c. See more key agencies
  2. Public
    - a. Information and handouts to be shared and available prior to the meeting on the website
    - b. Better sound system (wireless microphones/microphones)
- c. Commitment to Grant Submission
- d. Closing Questions
- i. Dr. Gasko will look into getting state rates for those that do not work for state agencies.
  - ii. Will a contact list be given so that we may communicate with one another?
  - iii. Next Meetings: April 7<sup>th</sup> and May 19<sup>th</sup>
  - iv. More concerns expressed about the 10 to 2:00 time frame. John addressed that the closer we get to April 7<sup>th</sup>, the meeting time will be decided