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| MEETING NOTES | | |
| **Date:**  September 20, 2018 | **L2Q Advisory Team Meeting** | **Place:**  Kansas Association of School Boards, 1420 SW Arrowhead Rd, Topeka, KS 66604 |
| **Present:** Kelly Meigs, Karen Beckerman, Rachel Anno, Jevan Bremby, Isabel Johnson, Dawn Flores, Leadell Ediger, Nichelle Adams, Patty Peschel, Nis Wilbur, Deb Crowl, Christi Smith, Lisa Jeanneret, Kelli Roehr | | |
| **Absent:** Jackie Counts, Lori Steelman, Kelly Cain-Swart, Tiffani Blevins, Amy Blosser, Corinne Carr, Heather Schrotberger, Heather Staab, Hope Adame, Lori Steelman, Sandra Kimmons, Staci Ogle | | |
| TOPIC | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
| **DCF Updates** | **New Advisory Group Member**  Karen introduced Lisa Jeanneret, who is the new Child Care Provider Program Manager. She previously served as a director of a YWCA. She has a degree in early childhood, as well as a Bachelor’s and Master’s in Business Administration.  **CCDF Plan**  Karen gave an update regarding the CCDF 2019-2021 state plan:  The plan was submitted Aug 30 and is currently in Region 7 review. Once approved, it will be sent to the Federal office.  Leadell asked whether Kansas had requested any waivers. Karen shared the state has applied for the background check waiver but explained that there will still be a $48 KBI/FBI processing fee.  DCF will soon be releasing a list of fingerprinting services available throughout the state and the cost at each site. Additionally, DCF is considering providing fingerprinting services at the regional DCF offices.  **State Peer Learning**  Hawaii will be visiting Region 7 (Iowa and Kansas) to share best practices and ideas. | **Kelly** will add Dawn and Christi to the Advisory Group email list. |
| **QRIS National Meeting** | **CCA**  Christi was inspired by how different communities are working to tailor their QRIS to their population. She also attended sessions that centered on the financial aspect of building and sustaining a QRIS and how cost relates to quality.  **LTI**  Dawn primarily attended sessions that focused on how to make data meaningful and more friendly. One session suggested using language like “Neat to Know,” instead of “Need to Know.”  She also learned some states have been conducting focus groups with QRIS and non-QRIS providers to help inform their continuous quality improvement. Some have even surveyed parents to capture their opinions/perspective on observational tools like the ERS.  Dawn also attended a session in which Thelma Harms, one of the developers of the ERS, posed a series of questions to presenters. She shared that it was interesting to hear the intent behind the tool directly from one of the developers.  **DCF**  Kelly attended sessions focused on igniting leadership. Throughout the conference, she was encouraged to learn many states are starting to revise their systems to incorporate many features that L2Q already incorporates, such as use of the term “consultant” (instead of “specialist”) and streamlined quality indicators.  Kelly also shared that Char, her national TA person, is helping Alaska and Kansas submit a joint session for next year’s BUILD conference.  Rachel attended the QRIS 101 learning session and, having worked in government, found the open-endedness of QRISs intriguing.  **KU-CPPR**  Isabel shared the recommendation she heard repeatedly during the BUILD conference that states are recognizing that limited financial resources mean they must decide whether to prioritize quality assurance or quality improvement, but rarely are able to sustain both. Additionally, many states are working to revise their quality indicators to focus on fewer, more meaningful indicators (The Few and the Powerful).  Jevan shared the conference had a clear focus on equity in early childhood systems and gained an even greater appreciation for the role a provider plays in the community. He shared one presenter used an image of people with bicycles to explain the difference equality--every person receives the same bicycle--and equity--every person receives a bicycle that suits their needs.  He was excited to hear how states are embedding an equity lens within their systems to support providers in supporting the individual, unique needs of every family and child they serve. |  |
| **Learning Community Updates** | **Site Visits**  Kelly and Rachel have been visiting programs and giving Smartsheet trainings and Learning Community meetings. Kelly shared photos from programs in Learning Community B (Topeka and Wyandotte – Top-Dot) and Learning Community E (Best of the West).  Rachel and Kelly will be visiting Greenbush and the remaining Learning Communities (A, C, and D) in the next few months. |  |
| **PAS Training** | **Program Administrative Scale Training**  All 13 participants passed the five-day intensive reliability training.  L2Q Community Consultants and the ITSN specialists will now seek certification, which enables them to train and lead workshops on using the tool.  **Online Training Evaluation**  Dawn gave a quick report of the BAS/PAS Online Training Evaluation results:  According to the survey results, providers felt the information was valuable, but the technology was frustrating. Ultimately, the goals of the training were met, but the team may consider developing an L2Q BAS/PAS training for providers in the future to remove the possibility of the same technical difficulties.  Christi expressed belief that much of the difficulty was related to timing as McCormick was updating their website when L2Q providers were working through the training. Unfortunately, many of the links had not been updated. She does not anticipate technical issues on that scale moving forward. |  |
| **L2Q Survey Group Engagement** | **Survey Group Engagement**  To help guide the development of surveys for the L2Q Survey Group, Kelly posed a question to the group:  ***If you could ask all providers in Kansas a question, what would it be?***  Some of the suggested questions included:   * If you could add one thing to improve quality in your program? * What can we do to support you in being successful? * What does high-quality child care mean/look like to you? * What makes a day successful for you? * Why do you do what you do? * What do you need to be successful? * What are the biggest barriers to being where you want to be? * What are the barriers to creating relationships in the community?   The group suggested the team include both specific and open-ended questions and track where the responses are coming from in the state.  Nis shared that some providers may think the surveys signal upcoming changes to the pilot and adjust their behavior accordingly. The team will be wary of this when crafting the survey language, potentially prefacing each survey with an explanation. |  |
| **Portfolio Review Process Feedback** | **Appreciative Inquiry**  Kelly gave an overview of the L2Q Portfolio Review Process and how Appreciative Inquiry is embedded throughout the process.  L2Q is using the evidence gathered from Pilot portfolios to determine the baseline level of quality upon which all future portfolios will be judged against. All Pilot portfolios will be reviewed as long as they meet the minimum portfolio criteria.  L2Q has replaced the Rating of QRIS with Recognition.  Appreciative Inquiry is a strengths-based approach to organizational improvement. Appreciative Evaluation focuses on quality improvement by studying successes and barriers to success. This method is consistent with L2Q’s mission to recognize and build upon the strengths in each program, avoiding all-or-nothing ratings in favor of continuous quality improvement. This approach also acknowledges that what works for one program may not work for another.  L2Q Team has developed a Best Practices Guide as a resource for reviewers to identify and highlight strengths within each program and provide encouraging feedback to providers.  Kelly presented Appreciative Inquiry’s 5-D Process (Define, Discover, Dream, Design, Destiny), 8 Assumptions, and thought-provoking statements and how they have been adapted to L2Q.  These frameworks will drive and inform the entire portfolio review process.  The thought-provoking questions help reviewers craft detailed, individualized, strengths-based feedback.  Nis suggestedL2Q Assumption 3 be changed from “*No program is the same.*” to “*Each program is unique.*” to maintain consistent positive language.  **Activity**  The AG divided into pairs to review sample evidence and develop thought-provoking statements.  **Feedback included:**   * Some of the evidence, such as “Action Items” seems very open-ended and non-specific.      * + Christi explained the pilot is working to capture what level of detail is realistic and necessary in the quality indicators. That information is being collected throughout the pilot.   + The group discussed whether the addition of “Minutes” to the evidence criteria would be necessary. BAS and PAS require very detailed evidence, including meeting minutes. Though the group agreed that few providers currently take minutes at meetings and many do not have staff, thus making minutes an extra burden. * Patty suggested adding citations to each individual best practices could help reviewers give detailed, specific, actionable feedback. * Reviewers may not be able to tell whether the criteria such as PL 1.1. “Action Items” is applicable to the program. * Patty asked whether the benchmarks reflect minimum criteria or best practice. It was also noted that PL 1.1 criteria does not speak to team-building activities, which are referenced in the benchmark.   + L2Q Program Staff will review and discuss the intent of benchmarks. * Dawn suggested reviewing the first portfolio as a group to develop consistency across reviewers. * Nikki commented that reviewers need to be careful in highlighting the strengths so that the feedback does not inadvertently modify provider behavior, with providers feeling obligated or pressured to continue incorporating activities that may no longer be needed.   + Jevan agreed, suggesting reviewers focus their feedback to the underlying spirit of the activities, rather than the activities themselves could minimize that possibility.   **What’s working?**  Kelly asked what was helpful in reviewing the evidence.  **Responses included:**   * Minimum qualifications being next to the Best Practices was very helpful (formatting) * The guiding questions made it easier to craft feedback. | Assumption 3 will be changed to “Each program is unique.”  L2Q Program Staff will review and discuss the intent of benchmarks. |
| **Social Media Success Stories** | **Facebook Page**  Kelly shared screenshots from the private L2Q Facebook group.  She noted the level of engagement with providers sharing resources and asking each other questions. One provider posted a poll asking the group a question about fingerprinting cost. Providers have also been sharing their evidence to get feedback and suggestion.  CCs will be introducing a daily theme to help build engagement with polls.  Christi noted that the Facebook group has helped providers feel heard and acknowledged when they have concerns or frustrations. This was also a sentiment expressed by providers following orientation.  Kelly shared that Nikki will be hosting an upcoming lunch and learn on child care subsidy and there have been talks of an informational tour to help providers put a face (or faces) to DCF names. |  |
| **Partner Reports**  **and**  **Final Discussion** | Kelly shared a promotional video created at orientation.  The next Advisory Group meeting will be March 2019. |  |
| **Next Meeting:**  March 2019 |  | **Minutes taken by:** Jevan Bremby |