

**Training Quality Committee  
Meeting Summary  
May 12, 2008**

**Attendees:** Kim Ashley, Beverly Briggs, Colette Brown, Kim Cardona, Lorine Day-Reynolds, Donalda Dodson, Pam Dunn, Barbara Griffin, Merrily Haas, Patsy Kohout, Tammy Marino, Gayle McMurria-Bachik, Linda Nelson, Dawn Norris, Sue Norton, Teresa Stevenson, Kathy Seubert, Sonja Svenson, Beth Unverzagt, Rosetta Wangerin, Bobbie Weber, Kim Williams.

**MEETING SUMMARY for March 10, 2008:**

Spelling corrections. Haas, not Hass; Seubert, not Suebert.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

- **In the Mix – school age training for family child care providers** – Seven modules have been developed. Training of Trainings this Thursday and Friday, May 15 and 16 with all slots filled.
- **John and Betty Gray Scholarship Program** – OCCD has been fully funded for another year, approximately \$205,000 to support professional development scholarships in Oregon. About \$125,000 goes directly to community colleges for scholarships.
- **Child Care Research Capacity Cooperative Agreement (CA)** – the announcement for the grant came out in March and initially the decision was made not to apply. A small group of stakeholders got together to talk about the vision for professional development and the decision was made to apply.

A vision document and logic model were developed at that meeting; the document alone is a good outcome even if Oregon is not funded. The vision document would be a good topic for further discussion. The professional development database is the key component and is the accountability tool asked for in the CA. Other funds will be for the evaluation of the subsidy program. Another component of Oregon's proposal is a study of the impact of child care subsidy policy changes.

Oregon has gone from the worst state in terms of subsidy meeting the market rate, to one of the most generous in the nation. Ellen Scott, University of Oregon, will do the qualitative study with parents who have received subsidies under both policies. The second year, a phone survey will be done with the same parents; repeat again in the third year.

- Rosetta – does Oregon have a good chance of being funded? Bobbie – only the 50 states and DC can apply. Oregon has been continuously funded by the Office of Child Care Research Policy since 1995 (several projects). However, Oregon has always delivered what was asked for and more. Funding for the current proposal could go either way. The added component of this proposal is that we are bringing several new partners to the table with additional funding from the private sector, Oregon Community Foundation. Plus, building the professional development database and hitting the research topics is exactly what they want. It is a three year agreement.

**OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION - Online training for school age care providers.**

OregonASK is looking how systems that serve ages 5 to 12 (and beyond) can blend professional development and training opportunities to serve more practitioners. Beth Unverzagt and Tammy Marino presented an online training system from Minnesota that they saw demonstrated at the National

Afterschool Alliance, Eager to Learn. Classes, costs, and curriculum content are all displayed. Distance learning seems to be a popular mode of training, particularly for rural areas. OregonASK would like to 'test drive' this mode of training for the next six months. Classes would be linked to the Oregon Registry and be the Sponsoring Organization for this training in Oregon. Given the lack of school age training in the state, they are trying to reach as many school age providers as possible with good training. Access to training is very difficult for after school programs in rural areas. Challenges are times/days, frequency, locations and training that isn't specifically for after school program or school age practitioners. If this model yields good results, OregonASK would like to develop their own training to be offered via this site. They would like to market this website and 'build their own' for Oregon practitioners. Oregon residents would have first preference for these classes and then opened up for general registration after a certain time period.

#### Discussion:

Beth – the question for TQC members, will practitioners use this site? Bobbie – has 21stCLCC required program staff to gain a certain amount of training hours? No, in fact, this round of grant funding is the first time that sites have been required to link to educational standards. We are moving in that direction. Rosetta – how do you incent people to attend this type of training? We are working on that aspect, this is a good partnership opportunity because Eager to Learn has the platform already developed. We will need to 'drive' Oregon practitioners to the site, push marketing strategy. Bev – how many total hours of training is currently offered? Tammy – I will find out and get that number back to you. Do they have their own certificates? Yes. Sue – when you asked school age trainers about how they get training, did you ask if they had Internet access? Yes, and it was across the spectrum.

After school programs using the California Internet-based program are paying their staff to do the training online, have it tracked, and then turn in their certificates. Eager to Learn also has courses in Spanish – and open to translating their curriculums into other languages, such as Russian. Sue – did you find anything comparable in Oregon to this? Beth – there is some training at Community Colleges, but not online. There might be a place to create this in Oregon, but would not be worth it if people won't/aren't using it. That is why we want to 'test drive' this before we make a monetary commitment to building it in Oregon. Bobbie – community education isn't often connected to community college – depends on the college. Beth – we will find our way through all the partners involved to get to the best mode of training. We are just testing it out without a ton of monetary investment from Oregon. If it works, then we can work on connections to the CCR&Rs, community colleges, and community education and other training providers. Linda – is the scheduled chat room becoming a common piece of online training. Merrily – it is much more common in for credit training – like the fact that these classes are much longer. The brochure describes the courses as school age, but the course descriptions don't mention school age practices. Beth – the hard part we struggle with is that many school age providers do not see themselves as part of the child system. Our challenge is to get them to see themselves as part of the landscape of after school that is an alternative to formal child care. We really appreciate the discussions at the Commission for Child Care on exempt care, which includes much of the after school world. Sue – when Lane County passed a levy for school age programs, the program operators were very particular about the training they wanted their staff to receive. Much of it was around 40 Development Assets. Sue – do after school programs know about the Oregon Registry. Tammy – there are pockets that are very well informed, others don't know anything about it. Those that do know are very enthusiastic about it. However, more practitioners don't know than do know at this point in time. School age child care providers are the most knowledgeable.

Beth and Tammy also saw a demonstration of EZ Reports, a software program that allows individual data entry for collection purposes for 21stCLCC programs. There are currently two sites in Oregon that are using the program and really like it. The Department of Education is going to purchase this software for their 21stCLCC sites.

OregonASK is also sponsoring a Curriculum Fair in June that will showcase school age curriculums being used by local programs and curriculums from other states. Opportunity for school age programs to share what is working in their programs and network with other school age practitioners.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

- Training Certificates – Sonja asked that this topic be brought back to the group because she missed the discussion from the March meeting. It was decided at that time to not require the mode of training on training certificates.  
Questions: Is this just for sponsoring organizations or for all trainers? Would it be possible to put a check list on the certificate? What modes do we want to list? Merrily – when looking at space on certificates all they say is that the provider attended the training, date and location. The certificates are pretty crowded. OCCD got bogged down in how we require the mode when the system is voluntary. What happens if the mode isn't on the certificate? What about trainers that aren't part of the system and don't know that the mode needs to be on there? Dawn – suggest we develop some common language and put that on the certificates – CCD won't prescribe. Sue – what if the provider took responsibility for the mode of training – they write on the certificate the mode. Merrily – the words on certificates are not mandated, so they vary by who offers the training. The person that holds the certificate is going to have to provide that info. Pam – we came to the conclusion that the problem certificates come from outside the CCR&R system, and it's the ones outside our system that are causing the problems. Teresa – not all the CCR&Rs use the same format for their certificates. Bev – but as sponsoring organizations, they are required to put certain information on the them. Mary – could we get recommendations from the Center/PSU on how it should be recorded on the certificate? Barbara – perhaps we could just put it on the certificate if it is an exception? Bobbie – problem with that is for data entry, we are asking the data entry person to make a judgment call. Sue – would college courses need to have the mode of training? No, this is for community-based training. Pam – thinks the problem is with the trainer, not the training organizations. Teresa - sponsoring organizations are required to put the same information on all certificates.

**ACTION:** Motion made and seconded that mode of training be put on certificates. Discussion: Motion amended to 'recommend' mode of training be put on all training certificates. Issue will continue to be reviewed at the Professional Development Standards committee, which includes a recommendation that providers be responsible for mode of training on the certificates they turn in with their application and renewals.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

- ISSUE BRIEF: Mentor Standards  
Discussion: Bobbie – really hard to understand the changes if you haven't been involved in the Mentor Program. What changes are being made, what did the Committee struggle with in

discussion? Bev gave a brief history of the Statewide Mentor Program and the development of the Mentor Standards and the Mentor Program Standards. The Professional Development Standards Committee is responsible for the Mentor Standards, OCCRRN is responsible for the Mentor Program Standards. There have been many, many changes in the Mentor Program since 2004. Trying to bring the Mentor Standards in alignment with the current Mentor Program Standards.

Kim went through each numbered item in the Issue Brief to explain changes. Question: Do mentors understand they cannot be alone with children in the facility? Yes, because all CCR&R staff are mandatory reporters. Kathy – what if there is a tracking system to report what activities occurred with mentors. Rosetta – if a mentor isn't meeting reasonable expectations, their contract would not be renewed. Kim – to monitor something that isn't in an R&Rs contract is not possible. Pam – each CCR&R is interested in quality standards and we check with them to ensure they are doing the work required of them. Linda – I can't pull up in my mind the NAEYC standards about ongoing training, but NARA does have them – that the mentor will accept the conditions of those codes. Kathy – is the approach that Pam uses done in all the CCR&Rs? No, as some are CCR&R staff. Sue – it is easier if the mentor is a CCR&R staffperson. Colette – what if there was an agreement with the mentor that annual training will be reviewed.

Bev – would like to summarize the conversation regarding removing the 20 hours of education, heard Kim say over and over again that it was also part of the Network mentor program coordinators job to ensure that continuing education occurred; that specific training for mentors occurred at the annual conference. Rosetta – were there any current mentors that participated in the development of these standards? No, we surveyed CCR&R directors, but we do feel that according to the survey done, these are acceptable to current mentors in the program. Rosetta – do we need a time period for mentors to transition to the new standards? Not sure if that is necessary because the changes are not that difficult. Kim – there does need to be some transition time with getting the language into the new contracts with the CCR&Rs. Pam – I would make sure that RRCAN training has been taken within the last five years.

Bev – one piece that isn't here and was in the old standards is a section on mentees. Wasn't much there, had to be currently working in the field and have a plan of work on professional goals. Those two conditions seem to be a given so why take up the paper space.

**ACTION:** Motion made and seconded to accept the Issue Brief as presented. Information will be gathered over the next year by the OCCRRN on how much training Mentors are doing.

**ACTION:** Add as agenda item for **MAY 2009** – Information on Mentor Training that was gathered will be reported by the Professional Development Standards Committee.

- **ISSUE BRIEF: Oregon Registry Director Credential**

Patsy went over the documents provided by OCCD as the basis for the discussion. There are two components: planning tool and the issue brief. Components are what was presented back in January 2008. OCCD researched other states to find out what elements they had in similar components. Also worked with Billie Young from NCCIC who was very impressed with the work that Oregon is doing in professional development. There are states who have credentials that are

completely college based. In Oregon, we have options for people to achieve the components, both through community based and college credit courses.

For Director's Credential, looking at a Step 9 or higher on the Oregon Registry. Linda commented that she is pleased the standards are very high. Patsy – we looked at the NAEYC, NAFCC, NAA and other credentials. Donalda – concerned that Head Start staff may not have the hands on, extensive early childhood experience required in this credential. Bev – the Directors Training Series steering committee felt very strongly about the standards proposed. Wanted the standards to be at the associate's degree or Step 9 or higher. Gayle – the 100 hours will eliminate many Head Start programs because of the experience requirement. Head Start has been working for many years to be more professional in terms of management, when they hire they focus on educational requirements rather than experience. Merrily – the committee discussed extensively those requirements. This credential is not required for employment in Oregon, it is voluntary. 100 hours is not a very high minimum for experience. Bobbie – what be the harm in allowing an exception clause. Don't feel good about creating something that excludes a group in the field. There is a system of early care and education and Head Start is a part of it. Merrily – there is nothing that excludes them from participating. Bobbie – they have told us their philosophy of hiring is not to focus on hands on experience.

Donalda – it has to do with the director aspect, we have an emphasis on fiscal and management components, that is what we look for in our directors - not our program managers. Linda – many times knowledge is gained from being in a classroom, there is something about being in the trenches and knowing what it is like. I support the experience requirement. Bev – do you say that you will hire someone that doesn't have experience in the field but has a degree? Would this credential even be important to that person? Dawn – site directors that I know, this would fit people that are not directors but a head teacher. This would not be attractive to someone who is an overall site director. Gayle – but it says director. Merrily – also, again this is voluntary. Colette – I am called the managing director where I work, I think Dawn is right that this would appeal to someone that is not the Director of a Head Start program. Rosetta – suggest that Donalda take this back and test it out with Head Start staff and teachers. Could we move this to June after further discussion can occur with the field. Donalda – with all the words about coordination and collaboration, I want to be able to say to Head Start staff that they are included. Want to be able to keep pushing us toward being a part of the system, not be excluded. Need to continue to be the apostle for the child care system. Pam – could it say that 100 hours are recommended. Bobbie – or could say 'is expected.' Merrily – a 100 hours is only five hours a week visiting classrooms. In 20 weeks, you would have the 100 hours. We need to make this certificate about quality. Dawn – I think it is about the terminology and who this credential is for – who is the target audience? One of the goals is to tie to NAEYC, if we don't have the high standards that goal isn't met. Gayle – I think that we could define it as something that may or may not appeal to program directors. Kim – they may not appeal to folks that are fiscal or HR focused – they are not interested in this. Sue – could the 100 hours be lab school or practicum? Bev – as far as what this looks like on paper, we can certainly look at that. Linda – I would define practicum as that. I have a facility management plan that I capture, I want the person who works with the teachers and orders supplies for them. They may not see themselves as the director but they are the person that would fit this credential. Bobbie – think we should look at the targeted audience again. Kathy – if you are looking at the director of a child care center, that group of people really do need the management and organizational skills this credential is targeted

to. If I have the experience and a degree in management, I find a job at a child care center, but I don't have all the kid stuff, this isn't going to appeal to me even though I am a director. Bev – we are saying for this credential, we want directors to know about kids too. Bobbie – still like Dawn's idea that we put in the description the targeted audience. 'this credential is designed for the person that performs this function within a child care setting.' Imbed it in the credential language, so every part of the system could see themselves as a part of the credential; even if a manager doesn't have the word director in their title. An executive director is not going to do this, it isn't meaningful for them. Donalda – it is bridging the gap between early childhood care and education, Head Start sees themselves as education first, then childhood care. Would like to build the bridge. If we could really come up with a good definition of director and who this is targeted for that would help. Patsy – there is no doubt in our minds that we would develop something that someone felt excluded from; you have brought up some good issues. We want to make sure the process is as inclusive as possible to the broadest community. Propose that we take as much time as we can to get through this or move it to the June meeting. We have technical assistance available to us through NCCIC – peer to peer relations – that we can tap into. Rosetta – agree that we need to move this to the June meeting and forward to the August CCECC. Bev – sounds like the main question is a way to define the target for this credential so when Head Start staff read it they can see themselves in it. Bev – this is not time sensitive, but the longer we wait the longer it will be until we roll it out. Any of this can also wait until September, if necessary, along with the Infant/Toddler Credential.

**ACTION:** Moved to the June 9 meeting. Questions and concerns should be mailed to OCCD staff. OCCD staff will meet in the interim with Donalda and Kim Williams. OCCD will draft language regarding the target audience.

Sue requested that Issue Briefs be sent out with plenty of time to read and absorb. Perhaps discuss at one meeting and make final decisions at the next meeting? Rosetta - yes, we will try to follow that format.

- ISSUE BRIEF: Oregon Registry Infant/Toddler Professional Credential  
Moved to June 9 meeting.

## **WORKGROUP UPDATES**

- Articulation – held the second articulation summit on April 26 in Pendleton in conjunction with their ECE conference. Discussed lots of issues with providers, CCR&R staff, community college staff, and CCD compliance specialists. Patsy was there representing the OCCD. Will have one more community college conference call before the summer break. Lane Community College is in the process of accepting Step 7 of the Oregon Registry for college credit toward the Two Year ECE degree (which has an online component).
- Continuous Improvement – no report. Need to develop a purpose statement and plan or work. Will need to contact Dell and make a decision on whether this is a committee that needs to move forward.
- Family, Friends, and Neighbors – not sure of the numbers on providers that have attended orientations or received tool kits, but will have those numbers after the meeting this coming Wednesday.

- Professional Development Standards – already reported and presented two issue briefs. A third issue brief will be presented at the June 9 meeting.
- Professional Development Database – already reported on the Cooperative Agreement that proposes to fund the PD Database. Oregon will be notified in August if they are a successful applicant.
- Training Gaps – we didn't meet this month; 'on time and under budget.' Will meet again in June.
- Training Review Coordination – really busy with In the Mix school age training and reported on it earlier.

Who carries recommendations from the TQC? Chair can delegate to someone that normally attends CCECC on a regular basis.

### **June 9 Agenda**

ISSUE BRIEF: Directors Credential – continue discussion

ISSUE BRIEF: Infant/Toddler Credential – initial discussion

Professional Development Vision Statement/Logic Model developed in April 2008 – Open Forum discussion item (the professional development vision regardless of whether Oregon is funded by DHHS or not) 1- 2 page brief

Popular Education (possible)

### **September Agenda**

Introduction of discussion on Pre-School Credential and School Age Credential

UDSA database project – Lynne Reinoso