

Consent Agenda

- Committee Reports
 - Equity Implementation Committee
 - Spark/QRIS Ad Hoc Advisory Committee
- Equity Implementation Committee Membership Recommendation
- Measuring Success Committee Chair Recommendation
- Conflict of Interest Policy

Early Learning Council EIC Committee Report: June 20, 2017

Committee Charge:

ELC Charge to Equity Implementation Committee

The Equity Implementation Committee is chartered to educate and provide leadership for the Early Learning Council (ELC) on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to implementing the [equity recommendations](#) for children and families furthest from opportunity, originally adopted by the Council on March 18, 2015. They are chartered to create an evidence-based, data driven plan relating to aligning early learning policy and practice with the equity lens, with a focus on culturally responsive practice, operating systems and data/resource allocation. The committee will assist the ELC in understanding equity issues from a data programmatic and social standpoint to support the ELC in:

1. Actualize issues of disparity in setting policy for the early learning system.
2. Recognize the value that diversity brings to the early learning environment and acknowledging the benefits of self-worth, empathy and success that it brings to all children.
3. Champion closure of development, opportunity and achievement gaps for young children and their families.

Committee Membership:

Eva Rippeteau, Chair; Cade Burnette; Carmen Ellis; Joyce Harris; Kelly Poe; Lennie Bjornsen; Lynne Saxton; Nicole Briggs; Carmen Urbina; Patricia Alvarado; Rashelle Chase; Richard Hines Norwood; Sadie Feibel Holmes; Sue Miller

Report:

The Equity Implementation committee (EIC) met on June 20th to discuss: Rules governing RF square footage requirements and staff qualifications and training and an overview of Heathy Families Oregon.

Key Issues Discussed & Uncovered:

Rules governing RF square footage requirements: (Presenters: Peter Blume and Kelli Walker)
Peter Blume and Kelli Walker presented background on the rules governing RF square footage requirements and staff qualifications.

The ELD developed four options that they took to the CCEC for consideration:

Option 1: No changes to current rule which have no square footage requirements indoors or outdoors.

Rational: Eliminate any financial impact to providers.

Option 2: There shall be a minimum of 35 square feet of indoor activity area per child. The space shall be available for use by children at all times. The following shall not be counted as



part of the 35 square feet per child requirement: heating units, storage areas; large permanent equipment; any space not useable by children.
Rational: Align with current CF/CC rules.

Option 3: There shall be a minimum of 25 square feet of indoor activity area per child. The space shall be available for use by children at all times. The following shall not be counted as part of the 25 square feet per child requirement: heating units, storage areas; large permanent equipment; any space not useable by children.

Rational: Provides for some very minimal square footage requirements, but still maintain a lower requirement than CF/CC.

Option 4: If the available space to children is 140 square feet or less, the maximum number of children in care at any one time is six.

Rational: 140 square feet is what is required for 4 children at a 35 square foot requirement. This allows for some limiting on number of children in care in extremely small spaces.

Peter and Kelli asked for EIC opinion on this topic. After some deliberation, EIC provided a series of comments and request that they would like CCEC to consider before they make this decision.

Comments:

- These requirements will disproportionately impact providers of Color, low income providers, and providers living in rural communities.
- The committee needs to look at the unintended consequences of families who are being pushed into smaller living spaces due to our housing crisis and the effects on providers.
- It is so important for children to have space to develop, and on the other hand, the quality of having providers is equally as important.
- Leaning toward Option 3 or 4 to limit impact to providers.
- Leaning toward Option 4 – I do not want to lose great providers for space.

Questions:

- How can we support providers to maximize the space that they currently have in their living space?
- What is currently being done to support providers with using the spaces that they have for their business?
- Do licensers have time to help with these requirements?
- Could this impact provider retention? If so, is there a benefit of creating space requirement rules?
- Do many trainings get cancelled due to lack of registration?
- What is the impact to our child care licensing staff having to measure homes? They cannot currently keep up with the current case load.

Kelli will submit our comments to CCEC for further review and discussion. The committee also requested a follow-up presentation after CCEC consider their comments and questions.



Rules governing Staff Qualifications:

The ELD developed four options that they took to the CCEC for consideration:

PDC and OCCD Recommendations for RF:

- Increase required training hours for the provider from ten to 20 hours per license period.
 - Two of the 20 hours must be in Guidance and Discipline.
 - Four of the 20 hours must be in Program Management during the first two years or evidence that they meet that requirement in ORO.

From the recommendations listed above, ELD develop this proposal:

- Completed a minimum of fifteen hours of training during the two years preceding the renewal date . The training must be related to the core knowledge categories in the Oregon Registry.
 - At least two hours must be on Guidance and Discipline
 - During the first licensing period, at least four hours need to be in program management.
 - At least eight of the 15 hours must be in child development or early childhood education.

Peter and Kelli asked for EIC opinion on this topic. After some deliberation, EIC provided a series of comments and request that the they would like CCEC to consider before they make this decision.

Comments:

- These requirements will disproportionately impact providers of Color, low income providers, and
- The State should first invest in the training first, before putting a rule in place. Without a system in place to support providers that speak languages other than English and low income providers, these providers will have a harder time accessing this system.

Questions:

- Has there been an analysis on the cost of these new requirements on providers and the early learning system to provide trainings?
- How can we support providers to maximize the space that they currently have in their living space?
- Do many trainings get cancelled due to lack of registration? What are some of these root causes?
- How do we optimize the trainings we do have?
- How are we supporting providers and children such as, African, Somali, and other immigrant groups, that do not speak the languages discussed here?
- How do we fill up the trainings that we do have? Are there any incentives? What are the barriers to providers participating in these trainings?

Kelli will submit our comments to CCEC for further review and discussion.



Healthy Families Oregon Overview and Accreditation Process: (Presenter: Erin Deahn)

Erin Deahn presented to the EIC an overview of Healthy Families Oregon and a review of their accreditation process. In her presentation she provided:

- A history of Healthy Families Oregon from 1993 to present day.
- A map of all the county regions.
- An overview of Healthy Families America model.
- An overview of the number of families served in the state of Oregon.

Central Administration in Oregon:

Discussed the 5 year reaccreditation cycle

- April – Central Admin site visit
- July & Aug – 8 local programs receive site visits
- Reaccreditation, process continues in 2022
- Site visits are done to half our sites

Equity

- Contracts includes ELD's equity deliverables: Goals identified have been added to HFO program goal plans.
- Service Delivery Priorities: Each region is required to have target populations in order to support the prioritization of services.
- HFA – Cultural Sensitivity Review: The Cultural Sensitivity Review is performed every two years.

Major Body of work for the upcoming Biennium:

- Reaccreditation
- Database Development
- 2017-2019 Contracts
- 2018-2022 Strategic Plan

Bodies of work to bring back to EIC for review and feedback:

- Strategic Plan
- Cultural Sensitivity Review

EIC meeting structure recommendations: The EIC heard an update on current committee meeting structure. The committee reviewed heard suggestions shifted the time of the EIC meeting and adding 15 additional minutes to each meeting. After deliberation, the committee decided to accept shifting the

EARLY LEARNING COUNCIL

Kate Brown, Governor



start time of the meeting to 9:30am and adding additional 15 minutes to each meeting. The additional 15 minutes per meeting will be added starting in July of 2017. The new meeting start time will begin in September 2017.

Upcoming Key Decisions:

- Finalization of the Committee work plan.
- Project updates:
 - Infant-Toddler Self-Assessment (BB)
- Review and provide feedback on:
 - Relief Nursery rules (CCEC)
 - Spark revisions (Spark Ad Hoc)
 - Professional development alignment with ELD & OHA
 - Child Care Rules: staff qualifications & training (CCEC)

Staffed by:

ELD - Lillian M. Green, ELD Equity Director



Early Learning Council Spark Ad Hoc Committee Report

06-17-2017

Committee Charge: Advise the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to revising the Spark/QRIS standards, processes and supports.

Committee Membership: Chair Donalda Dodson, Renea Wood, Autumn David, Kristin Klotter, Lisa Grotting, Pam Greenough Corrie, Sabrina Ersland, Mina Smith, Chelsea Reinhart, Betty Steel, Robin Hill-Dunbar, Maria Fernandez, Eva Manderson, Susan Hamann, Cheryle Myers, Cristina Montes, Marina Merrill, and Kali Thorne Ladd

Report:

The Spark Ad Hoc committee met on June 16 to discuss the second draft of the proposed Spark standards, as well as review the concept for the Spark rating system.

A new tool was shared to support tying the discussion and recommendations back to policy level decisions. This tool lists out the Early Learning Council's guiding principles as well as the goals for Spark with room for comments and noting if it was met.

In the month of July the second draft will be shared with the Equity Implementation Committee, the Child Care and Education Committee, as well as Best Beginnings. Feedback from these committees will be shared at the July committee meeting.

Key Issues Discussed & Uncovered:

Feedback on the 2nd (6/9/17) Spark Standards draft:

The committee shared positive feedback regarding:

- The format, committee members felt that it was clearer and easier to follow.
- The Domain and Standards Framework that builds out the domains for the standards across all tier (star rating) levels
- The way the new draft divides out the specific considerations according to various groups (including Mixed Age/School age/Family Child Care/etc.); members felt this was very valuable and demonstrates how various groups interact with the system

Committee recommendations on the 2nd Spark Standards draft:

1. Make it more evident that each standard level requires standards from the level that comes before it (e.g.; to achieve a 4 star level requires that the standards for 3 and 4 star level have both been met); It was unclear if each standard builds off the previous.
2. Find a way to include/acknowledge all staff who have contact with children; keeping in mind that
 - a. we do not want barriers to equity
 - b. percentages did not work previously
 - c. we do not want the system to be too complex (to be involved in or to document/complete)

EARLY LEARNING COUNCIL

Kate Brown, Governor



- d. we would need to better define how much contact time (and consequently which roles) are considered support staff (or staff who have contact/work directly with children)

The committee acknowledged the challenge of both being inclusive and also not penalizing programs who may have more complex staffing models, have staff who have received less formal education, or support career opportunities within their community which means they “grow their own”.

Ideas offered on how to operationalize this included having a separate table (or grouping) for educator and support staff. The support staff table could potentially require all support staff at a certain step level or other common requirement; and could exclude staff in their first year of employment (so as to address equity and give them time to receive trainings and achieve the requisite level).

3. More work needs to be done on Alignment of Systems (specifically with Professional Development), and Spark needs to articulate the connections to (such as what is evaluated by) to the Oregon Registry Online.
 - o It was noted that when components of the Professional Development system are used as possible evidence for Educator Qualifications it is important to acknowledge that there are equity issues with Set 2 and Set 3 trainings such as; access to trainings in rural communities, languages in which trainings are available, how school age fits into this system, and how established trainings in different systems (e.g. Head Start and public schools) align.
 - o Ideas to explore include combining the professional development with the professional development planning component (give points based on completion of developed plan/following that plan; to support equity and access leave it open as to who completes the professional development planning with a staff member), and requiring equity training as part of the professional development received and ensure options are available across the state.
 - o Requested that recommendations are shared with the Professional Development system to focus trainings on how to incorporate information into practice and to focus on areas such as teacher/child interactions which have been acknowledged as important in the Spark system.
4. The committee also noted that the parent and family voice needs to be included in our thoughts and as part of the ongoing conversation evaluating this system; we need to make sure that the standards incorporate the perspectives of parents and the experiences of the children.

Feedback on the concept for the Spark rating system.

The committee liked the use of minimum ratings for each category. They felt this:

- reflected that ALL categories are important,
- helps participants more clearly see all of the tiers and where they can go,
- aligns well with the Spark goal to provide an opportunity for programs to shine,
- connects to the ELC principle #3 that encourages a culture of continuous improvement.



The question was presented to the committee if certain domains should be weighted to count more than other domains.

There was a lot of discussion around this as some were concerned that weighing the domains might send a message that some domains are more important than others while the committee felt all the domains were important. The majority felt that adding weight to certain domains was important to consider and which domains should have added weight resulted in further discussion.

In the end it was determined that this would be the recommendation from the committee: The domains should be weighted, however how they are weighted

- needs to be based on evidence,
- shouldn't be too complex (for participants to understand or utilize), and
- would need some testing (samples examined to make sure it wouldn't skew results).

The initial consensus of the group (heavily subjected to the above criteria) was that the highest weighted would be Learning & Development/Positive Relationships followed by Inclusion of Children, Families, and Cultures. Educator Qualifications would be neutral with a lower weight for Environment, and Children's Safety and Program Stability.

Another suggested way to incorporate giving certain domains higher weights was to only weigh the minimum requirement for each domain or to add weight through the incorporation of scores from the Teacher/Child Interaction measure (currently Class).

Upcoming Key Decisions:

Incorporate feedback from other ELC committees to make final recommendations for the version of the Spark standards that will go before the Early Learning Council.

Continue to support the

Staffed by: Shawna Rodrigues, Early Learning Division
Meredith Russell, Program Development Lead, Early Learning Division
Dawn Woods, Child Care Director, Early Learning Division



Equity Implementation Committee Membership Recommendations

Equity Implementation Committee

The Equity Implementation Committee is chartered to educate and provide leadership for the Early Learning Council (ELC) on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to implementing the [equity recommendations](#) for children and families furthest from opportunity, originally adopted by the Council on March 18, 2015. They are chartered to create an evidence-based, data driven plan relating to aligning early learning policy and practice with the equity lens, with a focus on culturally responsive practice, operating systems and data/resource allocation. The committee will assist the ELC in understanding equity issues from a data programmatic and social standpoint to support the ELC in:

1. Actualize issues of disparity in setting policy for the early learning system.
2. Recognize the value that diversity brings to the early learning environment and acknowledging the benefits of self-worth, empathy and success that it brings to all children.
3. Champion closure of development, opportunity and achievement gaps for young children and their families.

The following expertise will be sought to fill seats on the Committee:

Three (3) seats: Parents of children between the ages of 0 and 6.

Three (3) seats: Leadership of culturally specific organizations that serve populations of children and families experiencing disparities in early education or health.

One (1) seat: A researcher with expertise in early learning and/or equity and inclusion.

Two (2) seats: Early learning providers who work with populations of children who typically experience disparities early in life.

Two (2) seats: A representative from the health sector and a representative from human services.

One (1) seat: A representative of the tribal Government-to-Government Education Cluster.

Two (2) seats: K-12 professionals.

Three (3) seats: Representatives of the Early Learning Council.

Membership Recommendations

The following applicants are recommended for membership on the Equity Implementation Committee of the Early Learning Council.

Early learning provider who works with typically underserved populations:

Kate Jordan-Downs, Director of Education Programs, KinderCare Education

Measuring Success Committee Membership Recommendations

Measuring Success Committee

The Measuring Success Committee is chartered to advise the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to measuring the success of the early learning system and ensuring equitable outcomes for all children, including but not limited to the Early Learning Hubs.

The following expertise will be sought to fill seats on the Measuring Success Committee

- Early Learning Council members (2-3)
- Hub leadership (2-3)
- Hub operational staff (1-2)
- Individuals from local early learning programs that partner with Hubs (2)
- Individuals with expertise in early learning data (including EI/ECSE) and early learning programs (2)
- Individual with expertise in health data and health system (1)
- Individual with expertise in human services data and state human services system (1)
- Individual with expertise in k12 education data and system (1)
- Individuals with expertise in program evaluation and/or design and implementation of performance metrics (2)

Membership Recommendations

The following applicant is recommended for Measuring Success Committee Chair beginning September 2017:

Early Learning Council member

Holly Mar, Early Learning Council – Measuring Success Committee Member

Oregon Conflict of Interest Policy

Actual Conflict of Interest ORS 244.020(1)

Any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which **would** be to the private financial benefit or detriment of the person or the person's relative or any business with which the person or a relative of the person is associated.

The financial effect of the action would occur with certainty.

Potential Conflict of Interest ORS 244.020(12)

Any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which **could** be to the private financial benefit or detriment of the person or the person's relative, or a business with which the person or the person's relative is associated.

The financial effect of the action would be uncertain.

Conflict of Interest Exceptions ORS 244.020(12)(a)-(c)

Exceptions to the Conflict of Interest policy would occur if the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of the following:

- a) An interest or membership in a particular business, industry, occupation or other class required by law as a prerequisite to the holding by the person of the office or position.
- b) Any action in the person's official capacity which would affect to the same degree a class consisting of all inhabitants of the state, or a smaller class consisting of an industry, occupation or other group including one of which or in which the person, or the person's relative or business with which the person or the person's relative is associated, is a member or is engaged (i.e. all inhabitants of the state, or an industry, occupation or other identifiable group).
- c) Membership in or membership on the board of directors of a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation.

Determining Conflicts of Interest

To determine whether a conflict exists, first ask:

"Can the result of my official action, decision or recommendation financially affect myself, a relative, or a business with which either are associated?"

If YES, next ask:

"Do any of the exceptions apply?"

If NO, determine whether you are met with an Actual or Potential Conflict of Interest:

"Is the resulting financial effect certain or uncertain to occur?"

Action When Conflicts of Interest Arise ORS 244.120(2)

Both Actual and Potential Conflicts require:

- Public announcement, on each occasion, before taking action on the matter.
- If an **Actual** Conflict of Interest, refrain from participating in discussion, debate or voting on the issue out of which the actual conflict arises.
 - **Exception:** If the vote is necessary to meet quorum needed to take official action, the public official with an actual conflict may vote, but must still refrain from any discussion or debate on the issue.