

## QRIS MEETING NOTES

<b>Date:</b> Monday 9/19/2016 10:00 am- 3:00 pm	<b>QRIS Advisory Group Meeting</b>	<b>Place:</b> KASB 1420 Arrowhead Rd Topeka, KS 66604
<b>Present:</b> Kelly Meigs, Carrie Hastings, Lori Steelman, Amy Blosser, Nis Wilbur, Deb Crowl, Leadell Ediger, Jackie Counts, Patty Peschel, Amy Smith, Sandra Yoder, Patty Mitts, Karen Beckerman, Heather Schrotberger, Barbara Dayal		
<b>Absent:</b> Jene Haas, Staci Ogle, Sarah Walters		
TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Kansas Quality Network Logo and Website	<p>Karen Beckerman shared a quick presentation on DCF's vision for the Kansas Quality Network (KQN) and the website they are building for it in accordance with CCDF Reauthorization requirements. The group shared ideas for items to link to the website, in addition to standard DCF information. It was suggested that the QRIS team look at examples from other states to gain new ideas for content. The group also suggested adding links to the following topics: KIDOS and other screening information, WIC, breastfeeding, 211 United Way resources, CCR&amp;Rs, mental health, special needs, homelessness, health and dental clinics and special events, KELS, child care advocacy groups, and child care professional organizations.</p>	DCF will consider adding links to the following topics on the KQN website: KIDOS and other screening information, WIC, breastfeeding, 211 United Way resources, CCR&Rs, mental health, special needs, homelessness, health and dental clinics and special events, KELS, child care advocacy groups, and child care professional organizations.
DCF Info Tours Overview	<p>Patty Mitts shared a quick recap of the information she presented on DCF's recent statewide child care tours. The group discussed new professional development requirements for DCF caregivers based on CCDF reauthorization.</p> <p>Kelly shared a presentation on the survey data collected electronically on tour as well as a few of her own presentation slides. It was asked if the survey question on ongoing training could include which providers are taking courses from colleges. It was also suggested that if any other data is collected online that it be broken down between center and home based providers.</p> <p>The group discussed the challenges of DCF reaching caregivers in languages other than English. Spanish translation was noticeably lacking in Garden City and there are likely other languages that materials should be translated to across the state.</p> <p>These survey questions will be reformatted and sent to providers who weren't able to participate online.</p>	

Work Group Updates	<p><b>Quality Indicators:</b> Kelly informed the group of all the items that were recently approved through DCF's concurrence process, including the quality indicators. Group members received copies of the quality indicators and were asked to share feedback on any glaring mistakes or typing errors with the understanding that any other feedback would be postponed for consideration at a later date.</p> <p><b>Rubric:</b> The group also received a sample of the Links to Quality rubric, outlining items required of participants submitting their portfolio for review in the field test. Group members recommended a change in numbering to make the rubric more clear and easy to understand. It was also suggested that the rubric not include the phrase "Copy of" in the evidence so that participants are not confused about whether they need to provide physical or electronic versions of their portfolio evidence.</p> <p>The QRIS evaluation and review plan should involve data collection around how long it takes providers to complete their portfolios and how those numbers may influence the time frames we impose on participants through QRIS policies. CACFP participation requires uploading of documents, which can be very tricky and time consuming with potential for technology errors to get in the way. It may be best to keep evidence pieces to upload at a bare minimum for each quality indicator.</p> <p>It was suggested that there may be multiple alternatives for providers to create their portfolios, including an online option as well as perhaps a flash drive portfolio. Kelly mentioned that creating a Links to Quality flash drive, similar to the KELS toolkit, with templates and instructions for participants would also be helpful.</p> <p><b>Application and Workflow:</b> Kelly presented drafts a workflow of the field test application process as well as the home-based and center-based applications themselves. The application for centers includes a chart for program enrollment with age range dates that need to be corrected (See p. 49 of regulations book for correct numbers). Also, centers only participate in one food program, so it is unnecessary to list the name. In the demographics section, it may be difficult to capture whether or not caregivers are serving certain populations, especially if they have children with special needs in their care who receive specialized services elsewhere. It may also be a good idea to include a question about the caregivers' language so that DCF can provide translation services and other supports as needed.</p>	<p>Group members will provide any feedback they may have on the quality indicators via email.</p> <p>Sandra and Amy will incorporate feedback into the documents presented.</p>
--------------------	---	---

	<p>The demographics section may be a bit confusing for providers. It would be helpful to add definitions of “homelessness” and “KanCare” to help providers who may not know exact definitions. Data could also be collected on children of veterans, children of active duty military, children of incarcerated parents, children of teen parents. To complete the application, it would be wise to cross reference demographic data points with the data requirements of DCF’s QPR.</p> <p><b>QRIS Handbook Components:</b> The group reviewed an outline of contents to be compiled in the Links to Quality participant handbook. The group discussed whether the entire self-assessment needed to be added to the handbook versus just an explanation of this document for providers. Items that a provider might like to print rather than complete solely online, such as the handbook, may be added to the KQN website for participants to print on their own as needed.</p> <p><b>Field Test Participation Agreement:</b> The group reiterated the ease of using KDHE language and using the term “facility” in place of program. The group also discussed the item regarding a QRIS conference, perhaps retitled as a professional development event so that it may count for KDHE clock hours. This event could also be tied to incentives and annually educating caregivers and generating interest in Links to Quality participation. This event could potentially be added as a session to another conference. The QRIS team should keep in mind the cost associated with the conference and how Links to Quality specific trainings and events may be offered to a wider audience. A more specific vision for a Links to Quality conference will need to be outlined for item 3 of the agreement.</p> <p>An item should be added to inform field test participants that their score in the test would not be legitimate in the statewide rollout. The QRIS team could develop a transitional scoring plan of some sort to reward providers for their work in the field test while recognizing any changes to the system post-field test.</p>	
<b>Next Meeting:</b> Monday 12/19/16	<b>Agenda Items:</b>	<b>Facilitated by:</b> Kelly Meigs <b>Minutes by:</b> Sandra Yoder, Amy Smith