

# Minnesota QRIS and Building Quality Update

---

**MN Professional Development  
Advisory Council  
November 1, 2010**



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

# Building Quality: Making Good Things Better

## Legislation and Funding

- **2009 and 2010 legislation directs DHS to:**
  - Provide “statewide child care provider training, coaching, consultation, and supports to prepare for the voluntary Minnesota quality rating system.”
  - **Funding:**
    - \$1.2M in ARRA funding through the federal Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) for FY10-11 (July 2009 – June 2011)
    - \$500,000 in regular CCDF funds for FY11 (July 2010 – June 2011)
- **Called “Building Quality: Making Good Things Better”**

# Building Quality Initiative

## Approach to Planning

- **Uses Parent Aware QRIS standards as a framework to build a base of quality**
- **Invitational, non-threatening approach to providers**
- **Delivery through the CCR&R and professional development systems**
- **In FY10, built training capacity and readied CCR&R system**

# Building Quality Through:

Reaching Out

Provider  
Welcome/Triage

Building Quality  
Checklist

ERS Consultation

PD Advising

# Building Quality

## Statewide Rollout to Providers

- **Began July, 2010**
- **Checklist widely distributed**
- **200 providers selected to receive In-Depth Supports statewide**
  - **Mix of child care centers and family child care homes**
  - **Prioritizes providers serving at-risk children**
- **CCR&R intake through Building Quality phone line: (800) 284-3040**

# QRIS Planning in FY2010

- **Continuation of Parent Aware pilot**
  - **[www.parentawareratings.org](http://www.parentawareratings.org)**
- **Legislative direction to DHS and MDE to make recommendations for a statewide QRIS**

# Statewide QRIS Planning DHS/MDE Recommendations

- **2009 law directs DHS and MDE to make recommendations on:**
  - **Common standards for early childhood programs and indicators for a statewide QRIS**
  - **How to link early childhood funding to a QRIS**
  - **How to align state and federal administrative resources to support a QRIS**

# Statewide QRIS Planning

## Key FY2010 Milestones

- **July 2010 -- MELF funding for Parent Aware pilot ends, extension year begins with ARRA funding**
- **Nov 2010 – Final Parent Aware evaluation released by MELF**
- **Nov 2010 – Public comment sought on draft program standards and indicators**
- **Mar 2011 – DHS/MDE recommendations due to Legislature**
- **June 2011 – Parent Aware pilot funding ends**

# Statewide QRIS Planning DHS/MDE Recommendations

- **Focus of statewide QRIS:**
  - **Children are school ready**
  - **Based on Parent Aware pilot and common standards for children and programs**
- **Recommendations are due March 2011**

# Program Standards/QRIS Indicators Development

- **DHS/MDE workgroup drafting common program standards and QRIS indicators**
- **ECAC ARRA funding supports:**
  - **Expert review**
  - **Facilitation of a public comment process**
  - **Synthesis of feedback for final recommended standards and indicators**

Questions?

**Table 1. PD System activities and percentage participation by different race/ethnicity groups**

Race/Ethnicity	TEACH Recipients (FY2010)	REETAIN Recipients (FY2010)	CDA (Advisor Fees) Recipients (FY2010)	CDA (PD) Recipients (FY2010)	Grants for Professional Development (FY2010)	Practitioners Enrolled in Registry (cumulative total)	FCC Providers Served by ERS Consultants (FY2010)	Attendees to CCR&R Trainings (FY2010)	Approved Trainers (cumulative total)
	124	87	36	36	538	538	60	35,481	238
African Somali			28%	3%	< 1%	< 1%	4%	< 1%	2%
African Ethiopian			3%		< 1%	< 1%		< 1%	< 1%
African - other			3%	3%		1%		< 1%	< 1%
African American	8%		14%	11%	3%	9%	18%	1%	4%
American Indian	8%		6%	3%	2%	< 1%		< 1%	< 1%
Asian - Hmong				8%	2%	2%	5%	2%	1%
Asian - Lao						< 1%		< 1%	
Asian - Pacific Islander	3%								
Asian - Vietnamese					< 1%	< 1%		< 1%	
Asian - other								< 1%	< 1%
Cambodian									
Central or South American					< 1%	< 1%	2%	< 1%	2%
Chicano				6%	< 1%	< 1%		< 1%	< 1%
European Immigrant		1%			< 1%	< 1%		< 1%	< 1%
Hispanic/Latino	2%		17%	3%	< 1%	2%		< 1%	1%
Multi-Racial	< 1%	1%			< 1%	2%	2%	< 1%	< 1%
Other Race	< 1%							< 1%	1%
<b>Total Reported Race/Ethnic Diversity</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>15%</b>

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM ANNUAL REPORT – INDICATORS\*

The indicator data are presented for state fiscal year 2010 (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010). For some indicators, data are also presented to show progress from the time the program began (SFY08). The 2010 data will serve as a baseline for future Annual Reports which will report changes from year to year. The categories for the indicators mirror the five components of the Professional Development System presented in the PD System logic models.

\*The indicators are just a portion of the comprehensive PD System Annual Report.

Funding Support Indicators	FY 2010
<b>TEACH and REETAIN</b>	
▶ TEACH scholarships awarded	124
▶ Proportion of TEACH scholarships awarded to underserved populations*	Ethnically Diverse: 23% Rural Community: 58%
▶ TEACH applications received	138
▶ REETAIN incentives awarded	87
▶ Proportion of REETAIN incentives awarded to underserved populations	Ethnically Diverse: 2% Rural Community: 63%
▶ REETAIN applications received	373
<b>Child Development Associate (CDA) Scholarships</b>	
▶ CDA scholarships (Advisor fees) awarded	36
▶ Proportion of CDA scholarships (Advisor fees) awarded to underserved populations*	Ethnically Diverse: 69% Rural Community: 8%
▶ CDA scholarship (Advisor fees) applications received	54
▶ CDA scholarships (Professional development) awarded	36
▶ Proportion of CDA scholarships (Professional development) awarded to underserved populations*	Ethnically Diverse: 36% Rural Community: 31%
▶ CDA scholarship (Professional development) applications received	50
<b>Grants for Professional Development</b>	
▶ Grants for professional development awarded	538
▶ Proportion of grants awarded to underserved populations	Ethnically Diverse: 10% Rural Community: 56%
▶ Grant applications for professional development grants received	1003

\*Note: For the purposes of this report, “underserved populations” is defined by two factors: race/ethnicity and location (rural). A person is considered to be from an underserved population if they are in any category for race/ethnicity other than “white” (labeled “ethnically diverse”) and/or if they are from an area outside of the 7-county metropolitan area (labeled “rural community”).

Quality Assurance	FY 2010	Cumulative Total
▶ Number of trainings offered on Parent Aware approved curricula and assessments through CCR&R	112	N/A*
▶ Number of practitioners served by ERS consultants	104	N/A

Quality Assurance	FY 2010	Cumulative Total
▶ Proportion of FCC providers from underserved populations served by ERS consultants (information not available for center-based providers)	Ethnically Diverse: 30%	N/A
▶ Number of Parent Aware participants who joined the Registry	197	286
▶ Proportion of Parent Aware participants from underserved populations who joined the Registry	Ethnically Diverse: 16% Rural Community: 27%	Ethnically Diverse: 17% Rural Community: 27%
▶ Number of practitioners enrolled in the PD Registry and certificates issued.	351	538
▶ Proportion of practitioners enrolled in the PD Registry from underserved populations	Ethnically Diverse: 18% Rural Community: 32%	Ethnically Diverse: 19% Rural Community: 29%
▶ Number of training sponsors listed on the PD Registry	31	66
▶ Trainers who received approval	168	238

\*N/A=Not available. The data element may not have been in place prior to FY2010, may not have been chosen as a priority variable for the FY2010 Annual Report, or was not available due to data system limitations.

Core Knowledge and Qualifications and Credentials	FY 2010	Cumulative Total
▶ Average Career Lattice step achieved	Step 8	Step 8

Outreach and Access	FY 2010	Cumulative Total
▶ Number of practitioners who attended CCR&R trainings	35,481	N/A
▶ Proportion of practitioners from underserved populations who attended CCR&R trainings	Ethnically Diverse: 7%	N/A
▶ Number of trainings in languages other than English	101	N/A
▶ Number of ERS consultations in languages other than English	0	N/A
▶ Number of approved trainers who provided trainings in languages other than English	20	23
▶ Number of trainers from underserved populations who received approval	Ethnically Diverse: 16% Rural Community: 44%	Ethnically Diverse: 15% Rural Community: 41%
▶ Number of Practitioner Learning and Training (PLAT) surveys completed	10,152	N/A
▶ Number of individuals accessing the Individual Training Needs Assessment (ITNA)	532	N/A
▶ Number of individuals completing the ITNA	63	N/A
▶ Number of individuals accessing Professional Development plans	10,404	N/A

## Understanding the Frame of Reference and Shifts in Theory of Change

November 01, 2010

### Introduction

The members of the PDAC were guided in an assessment and insight discussion regarding the recent experiences of change in professional development and related areas. The process involved several steps:

1. The PDAC members were provided an orientation to Frame of Reference and Theory of Change
  - a. Frame of Reference is the viewpoint constructed of what one believes is the right way to work, relate and believe. One's Frame of Reference provides powerful influence on how one views and experiences the world
    - i. Example: if pulled over by the MN Highway patrol, does one assume they are speeding at the level tracked or innocent?
  - b. Frames of Reference are not static but constantly changing
  - c. In large systems of many groups the ability to describe the Frame of Reference leads to greater consensus, energy and movement
2. The PDAC organized into small groups to develop 5 key elements of Frame of Reference of both providers and State agencies for three different years; 2000, 2005 and 2010
3. The small groups posted their key elements and then were guided in a discussion of the experienced Theory of Action based upon the input
4. Finally the group engaged in a discussion of what might be created in 2015 in alignment with the past ten years of change.

The PDAC utilized the Whole System View FrameWork in its discussions and learning

- When organizations go through a series of changes over time, one or two aspects (ovals in the FrameWork) of change occur at once, but rarely all three aspects at the same time. It is typical that systems change the definition of Work and the Organizational structures to do so in a first wave of change and engage in the Cultural and relational changes in a second wave of change, usually followed by a redefinition of Work and so on.

### Key Learning Points:

- A. The Child Care System in MN and its professional development elements have moved through several levels of change in Frames of Reference (experience, structure, culture) and Theory of Change.
- B. The system is more adept to change than it may believe, yet recognizing that change has impacted most everyone at a professional and personal level
- C. The MN agencies have been engaging in shifts on Theory of Change in advance of the Providers and Grantees since 2000 which is a fundamental shift from prior assumptions and relationships.
- D. The most fundamental shift may be coming from 2010 – 2015 as the focus of change shifts from the adult provider to the individual child's care, learning and development.

**Professional Development Advisory Council (PDAC)**  
**Understanding the Frame of Reference and Shifts in Theory of Change**

November 01, 2010

<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>
<p><b>Provider's Theory of Change Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local connections, services and autonomy</li> <li>• Professional development focus of keep kids safe, # of hours for licensing, providers success</li> <li>• Individual provider income</li> <li>• Basic, foundation of fundamentals of child care is enough</li> </ul>	<p><b>Provider's Theory of Change Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systemic structural changes</li> <li>• Reacting to others</li> <li>• Decrease in resources and funding</li> <li>• Waiting for the next wave</li> <li>• Resilient</li> <li>• Decrease in support to do well</li> </ul>	<p><b>Provider's Theory of Change Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adults profession which is shifting, clarifying, broadening</li> <li>• External credentials</li> <li>• Decrease in relational aspects</li> </ul>	<p><b>Provider's Theory of Change Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kids as the central focus</li> <li>• Supportive, child-focus in a community and cultural context through partnership as a core capacity as process</li> <li>• Addressing compensation across the system in part through QRIS incentives</li> </ul>
<p><b>Provider's Frame of Reference</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building Cultural Connections</li> <li>• Licensing understandable and clear</li> <li>• Child Care Assistance focused on child support</li> <li>• Quality is individually motivated</li> <li>• One-stop shopping for many services</li> <li>• Head Start required degreed teachers /NRS instituted</li> <li>• 19 regions, not uniform</li> <li>• ITTI</li> <li>• Accreditation only way to define quality</li> <li>• Advocacy agencies began i.e. Ready 4 K</li> </ul>	<p><b>Provider's Frame of Reference</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TEACH</li> <li>• More series training</li> <li>• More on-line training i.e. Eager To Learn</li> <li>• Confusion regarding why and what</li> <li>• FFN receiving CCAP and support</li> <li>• Resources lost</li> <li>• Focus on early literacy / assessment as basis for curriculum</li> <li>• Not By Chance training – overall quality</li> <li>• R&amp;Rs started merging / collaborative lost money</li> <li>• Increase in FFN, decrease in providers</li> </ul>	<p><b>Provider's Frame of Reference</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearer communications</li> <li>• One cultural competency trainer</li> <li>• Licensing is more complex</li> <li>• Internet and social media</li> <li>• Registry</li> <li>• PITC</li> <li>• Field is very professionalized but funding has not increased</li> <li>• Degrees are required yet other fields / degrees are not recognized and some communities may be left out</li> <li>• Individualized training / more intentional</li> <li>• Increase in technical assistance</li> <li>• Increase of depression in providers</li> <li>• Increased expectations and quality</li> <li>• Impact of readiness, special needs</li> <li>• Impact of economy</li> </ul>	<p><b>Provider's Frame of Reference</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in reflective and relational practices</li> <li>• Unfunded awareness</li> <li>• QRIS: uniform, expected, desired, flexible. Producing real outcomes</li> <li>• Increase in FFN across the state</li> <li>• Infants and toddlers focus returning</li> <li>• Whole child approach</li> </ul>

## Understanding the Frame of Reference and Shifts in Theory of Change

November 01, 2010

2000	2005	2010	2015
<p>State Agency's Theory of Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grantors</li> <li>• Little role</li> <li>• Little cultural awareness yet increasing</li> <li>• Smaller grants to many grantees</li> <li>• PD: Forum, presentations, lunch and chocolate provided</li> <li>• Benevolent hosts and money source</li> </ul>	<p>State Agency's Theory of Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data-informed decision making</li> <li>• Designer of system and change in advance of providers and grantees</li> <li>• Increase in knowledge and research</li> </ul>	<p>State Agency's Theory of Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in legal, ethical and politically safe</li> <li>• More driven by fear of public misperceptions</li> <li>• Committed to improve and coordinate emerging from lower levels inside the agencies</li> <li>• Climate can appear to be mean spirited, scarcity of resources</li> </ul>	<p>State Agency's Theory of Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kids as the central focus</li> <li>• Supportive, child-focus in a community and cultural context through partnership as a core capacity as process</li> <li>• Addressing compensation across the system in part through QRIS incentives</li> </ul>
<p>State Agency's Frame of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on building capacity at the local level rather than PD</li> <li>• More local control</li> <li>• Much funding from LCTS in communities with a focus on EC</li> <li>• Childcare and Early Ed together through CFL</li> <li>• Discord in agency leadership</li> <li>• No Better Time</li> <li>• Huge cuts in 2003</li> <li>• Knowledge base expanding in areas of stress and brain development</li> <li>• Indicators of progress (2)</li> </ul>	<p>State Agency's Frame of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality more important and defined</li> <li>• School readiness = literacy</li> <li>• Heightened awareness of importance of ECE</li> <li>• MELF</li> <li>• Increase training and increase in specific training</li> <li>• Collaborative funding no longer available</li> <li>• Stricter funding requirements for child welfare CM</li> <li>• Training based on Core Competencies</li> <li>• MNSTREAMS, TEACH</li> <li>• ETL</li> </ul>	<p>State Agency's Frame of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussing, designing and implementing a new form of professional development</li> <li>• Looking at uniting early childhood focus through the Office of Early Learning</li> <li>• School readiness includes broader definition</li> <li>• QRIS</li> <li>• Kindergarten study</li> <li>• More targeted funding</li> <li>• TACSEI</li> <li>• Constant collaboration and competition between agencies</li> </ul>	<p>State Agency's Frame of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in reflective and relational practices</li> <li>• Unfunded awareness</li> <li>• QRIS: uniform, expected, desired, flexible. Producing real outcomes</li> <li>• Increase in FFN across the state</li> <li>• Infants and toddlers focus returning</li> <li>• Whole child approach</li> </ul>

## Whole System View

Part of the FrameWorks Series

Used For Assessment of:

- Situations "In the Moment"
- Relationships of Issues and Data
  - Opportunities
  - Conflicts

