

NC DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EARLY EDUCATION

NORTH CAROLINA CHILD CARE COMMISSION

**Third Quarter Meeting
Monday, February 9, 2015**

Nature Research Center
William G. Ross Conference Center, 4th Floor
121 W. Jones Street
Raleigh, NC 27603

Commission Members Present

**Chairperson Glenda Weinert
Kevin Campbell, Vice Chairperson
Jonathan Brownlee, Sr., MD
Sue Creech
April Duvall
Zac Everhart
Melanie Gayle**

**Elizabeth Gilleland
Kay Lowrance
Charles F. McDowell, III
Laurie Morin
Janice Price
William Walton, III**

Commission Members with an Excused Absence

**Elliott Blades
Linda Vandevender
Kristen Weaver**

Division of Child Development and Early Education (DCDEE) Staff Present

**Dedra Alston, Administration/Policy
Tammy Barnes, Regulatory Services
Janice Fain, Administration/Policy
Tammy Freeman, IT
Laura Hewitt, Regulatory Services
Mary Pat Hicks, NC Pre-K
Rachel Kaplan, NC Pre-K**

**Rob Kindsvatter, Director
Heather Laffler, Administration/Policy
Andrea Lewis, Regulatory Services
Lorie Pugh, Regulatory Services
Sharon Spigner, NC Pre-K
Cindy Wheeler, NC Pre-K**

Attorney General's Office Staff

**Alexi Gruber, DCDEE Attorney
Jim Wellons, Commission Attorney**

Welcome-- Chairperson Glenda Weinert called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and reviewed housekeeping items. She expressed a thank you to the Commission for the extra effort of being here. She read the conflict of interest statement and asked whether there were any conflicts noted for today and the agenda presented.

Chairperson Weinert called for roll call which Ms. Dedra Alston performed. Members with excused absences were noted. Chairperson Weinert noted that the designated time for public comment at this meeting is at 1:00 p.m.

Chairperson Glenda Weinert reviewed the day's agenda.

Chairperson's Report

Chairperson Weinert asked if Commission members had any changes or amendments to the November 17, 2014 Commission Meeting Minutes? January 20, 2015 Rules Subcommittee minutes were also reviewed.

Commission Action: Ms. Janice Price moved to approve the November 17, 2014 meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Zac Everhart and carried unanimously.

Commission Action: Ms. Elizabeth Gilleland moved to approve the January 20, 2015 sub-committee meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jonathan Brownlee and carried unanimously.

Division of Child Development and Early Education Report—Mr. Rob Kindsvatter, Director

Mr. Rob Kindsvatter, DCDEE Director, provided an update to the Commission in the following areas. Key points from his presentation are noted below.

- 1) 2015 Legislative Session Update
- 2) Subsidized Child Care Policy Implementation
- 3) NC Pre-K Update
- 4) Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Reauthorization Update
- 5) Race to the Top Project Update

2015 Legislative Session

- Current session will be the biennial budget long session.
- DCDEE is currently working with the Office of State Budget and Management (OSBM) and Governor's Office to prepare for the proposed State Fiscal Year 15-16 budget.
- After the Governor's budget is presented to General Assembly, the State House and Senate will propose their budgets.
- All parties will work together to establish a State budget for SFY 15-16, with a projected deadline of July 1.

Subsidized Child Care Update

- Changes to income eligibility for child care subsidy and parent co-pays became effective October 1, 2014 or at the family's redetermination of eligibility.
- The income eligibility for children ages 0-5, and for children with documented special needs of all ages changed to 200% Federal Poverty Level (FPL).
- The income eligibility for children 6 and older ages changed to a maximum of 133% FPL.
- The family co-payment changed to 10% of gross family income, regardless of family size.
- Parent co-payments are no longer pro-rated copayment for part-time care.
- There is still no co-payment required for children receiving subsidy because of Child Welfare and Child Protective Services, and for children in foster care.
- The definition of "income unit" in child care subsidy policy changed to include following:

- A stepparent and stepparent's child, if applicable
- A nonparent relative caretaker and
- The caretaker's spouse and child, if applicable, when the parent of the child receiving child care subsidy does not live in the home with the child
- Effective January 1, 2105, there was an increase in subsidized child care Market Rates for 3-5 star rated centers and homes. The increase is based on the 2013 Child Care Market Rate Survey and reflects 25% of recommended rate adjustments.
- Through December 2014, expenditures for the subsidized child care program reflect a statewide spending coefficient of just under 100%. DCDEE completed 2 statewide reallocations to assist counties in managing caseloads and spending. It is likely that the recent subsidy policy changes will impact spending over remainder of SFY.

NC Pre-K Update

- NC Pre-K SFY 15-16 allocations were released to contractors at the end of January.
- Allocations were same as initial SFY 14-15 allocations (less the \$5 million one-time expansion funds added in SFY 15-16).
- A total of 26,851 Pre-K slots were funded for SFY 14-15, an increase of 234 slots over SFY 13-14.

Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) Block Grant Reauthorization

- Reauthorization of the CCDBG (Child Care Development Block Grant) Act of 1990 occurred in November 2014. This will result in several changes to the requirements of DCDEE's primary federal fund source.
- Compliance with requirements in the new law will be established through submission and approval of the FY 2016-18 CCDF state plans (changed from biennial to triennial).
- There are changes to the minimum amount that states must spend on quality activities, which was previously set at 4% (plus appropriated set asides).
 - Reauthorization increases the minimum quality spending requirement to 9%, phased in over 5 years
 - FY 2016-7%
 - FY2017-7%
 - FY2018-8%
 - FY2019-8%
 - FY2020-9%
- Quality Set Aside for Infant and Toddlers: In addition to overall minimum quality spending, beginning in 2017, 3% of funds must be used for quality activities that relate to improving the quality of care for infants and toddlers.
- Criminal background checks:
 - States must have policies and procedures in place to conduct comprehensive criminal background checks for child care providers and staff. Implementation is required by September 30, 2017.
 - NC currently already completing most aspects, but will have to add some additional details.

- Monitoring and Licensing:
 - States must ensure that individuals who are hired as licensing inspectors (consultants) are qualified and receive training.
 - States must maintain a ratio of licensing inspectors to providers and facilities at a level sufficient to perform inspections on timely basis. Implementation is required by Nov 19, 2016.
 - States must conduct one pre-licensure visit and annual unannounced inspections. This applies to licensed and license-exempt CCDF providers.
- Results of monitoring and inspection
 - State must make public by electronic means (website) the results of monitoring and inspection reports by November 2017, including:
 - Major substantiated complaints
 - Number of deaths
 - Serious injuries
 - Instances of substantiated child abuse
- Child care subsidy changes
 - Priority must be given to children of families with very low incomes, including homeless children and children with special needs.
 - Foster parents must be added to the definition of “parent.”
 - States are required to increase partnership with state/public agencies, tribal organizations and faith and community based agencies to increase capacity, supply and quality of care.
 - States must develop and implement strategies to increase supply and quality of care for:
 - Children in underserved areas
 - Infants/toddlers
 - Children with disabilities
 - Children in care during non-traditional hours
 - States are required to implement a 12 month eligibility period for services.
 - States must implement transition plans to continue services for families up to 85% of State Median Income, as they leave the subsidized care program.
 - Job search are eligible activities for subsidized child care services.
 - Eligibility redetermination must not unduly disrupt employment.

Mr. Kindsvatter responded to questions from Commission members.

- Dr. Jonathan Brownlee asked for clarification about transition plan and 12-month eligibility. Mr. Kindsvatter answered that this is a new requirement for which the Division is currently seeking additional information.
- Ms. Janice Price asked about whether there is a specified age range regarding the “unduly disrupt employment” stipulation; Mr. Kindsvatter clarified that there is no specified age range.
- Mr. Billy Walton asked about the requirement that the website list substantiated complaints and whether unsubstantiated claims are required to be on website as well? Mr. Kindsvatter said that he does not have specific information on all the new requirements at this point.

- Chairperson Weinert asked whether there have been many complaints from the field regarding the subsidy policy change to include grandparents in the income unit. Mr. Kindsvatter responded that the Division has provided additional information to counties in response to how this change is to be implemented.

Continuation of Presentation:

- The reauthorization provides for implementation of a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQIRS).
 - Improve the quality of different types of providers/services
 - Evaluate quality and effectiveness of child care programs
 - Improve parents' understanding of early childhood system and ratings
 - Provide financial incentives for improved quality
- Another area of focus with reauthorization is supporting training/professional development of the child care workforce.
- States will be required to develop strategies to reduce expulsions in child care.
- States will need to address improving access to care (improving supply of quality care, improving access to vulnerable populations, etc.).
- States will have additional reporting about how CCDF is used to comply with the new requirements.

Mr. Kindsvatter distributed copies of the detailed CCDF Reauthorization changes to the Commission. Ms. Janice Price praised DCDEE regarding the improved timeliness of criminal record checks, particularly as she has experienced at the facility where she works. Ms. Sue Creech asked whether the Division will be able to add and train staff in order to fulfill all of these new requirements. Mr. Kindsvatter replied that there is potential opportunity to do so when drafting the CCDF State Plan on how the state will meet the CCDF requirements. He noted the Division would be requesting input for the CCDF State Plan.

Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RttT-ELC) Project Updates—Ms. Mary Lee Porterfield

Ms. Porterfield noted the RttT-ELC grant was a historic collaboration between the federal Health and Human Services and the Department of Education. North Carolina's application was highly ranked in the first round of this grant opportunity, and our state was awarded \$70 million for the period of 2012-2015. Of that amount, \$26 million funded 11 projects (25 activities) that are administered through DCDEE.

Examples of RttT projects administered through DCDEE include:

- Supports for programs/teachers
- CEU based courses
- TEACH scholarships
- A Directors' leadership institute
- Activities to support entering the QRIS and Support for programs to obtain three or more stars
- Community College Projects, such as NAEYC accreditation and an Innovation Fund
- Transformation Zone activities, including expanding high quality Infant-Toddler slots

- Healthy Social Behavior Project
- A QRIS Validation Study, required by the grant, which is being finalized to test.
 - Research questions: Does QRIS meaningfully differentiate levels of quality? Are those levels of quality related to child outcomes?
 - NC Specific study features: Map sample programs to committee model; develop ideal QRIS to test
 - Created and mapped programs onto QRIS models using the conceptual framework for QRIS that the QRIS Advisory Committee recommended
 - Planning Spring/Summer 2015 implementation of test model with sample programs
 - Planned data collection: Fall 2015-Spring 2016
- New program Quality measure - NC is working with Delaware and Illinois to design a tool to measure program quality that can be used in a QRIS, and that better reflects the aspects of quality that impact children's experiences than current measures.
 - Make meaningful distinctions among programs capturing a range or continuum of program quality; strengths based approach
 - Integrate aspects of program quality not emphasized by any single measures
 - Coordinating with QRIS validation study
 - Pilot study starting fall 2015 and concluding late spring or early summer 2016

Ms. Porterfield responded to questions from Commission members. Ms. Sue Creech requested a hard copy of the chart of the Conceptual Framework for the revised QRIS. Vice Chairperson Kevin Campbell asked about how the new tool impacts the QRIS validation study. Ms. Porterfield responded that because the scoring is not finalized, it cannot be included in the test model; however, there will be a process of mapping recommendations, although right now they are separate processes. Vice Chairperson Campbell asked if the measurement tool will be adapted for all states or just for NC. Ms. Porterfield replied that the framework is for NC; however, the hope is that the measure will be able to be used in any state. Vice Chairperson Campbell asked whether there are any evaluation measures for the child, such as Kindergarten readiness. Ms. Porterfield responded that the focus is on the instructional practices; how the teachers are using the information about the children to inform strategies to help the children.

Vice Chairperson Campbell noted that the model may be too complicated. Ms. Elizabeth Gilleland asked how far along the tool is in development. Ms. Porterfield replied that it is in draft and is not in a form to be currently shared with the public. Ms. Gilleland asked whether there was a development assessment piece with children and families included and Ms. Porterfield replied that this was embedded in the family engagement.

Ms. Price asked whether the goal is to replace the current tool or enhance it. Ms. Porterfield responded that the development of this tool is a separate issue from the advisory committee goals. Ms. Porterfield concluded her portion of the presentation by stating that she will send the Commission a hard copy of the framework, the model when it is ready, and the link to the website for the RttT-ELC projects.

Meeting break at 10:35 a.m., reconvened at 10:55 a.m.

Chairperson Weinert clarified a statement made at the beginning of the meeting that comments would not be accepted during the public comment period regarding the NC ADD Rulemaking Petition. Because the NC ADD Rulemaking Petition fiscal note is part of the agenda, anyone wishing to speak on that issue is asked to wait until that time, when they will be allowed to make public comment.

Mr. Kindsvatter also made an addition to his earlier Director's update that there has been a reorganization in the staff structure at the Division. Tammy Barnes' title is now Assistant Director for Regulatory Services; Janice Fain is Assistant Director for Administration; and Jennifer Johnson is Assistant Director for Programs and Education Services.

Sub-Committee Rules Meeting Report—Mr. Jim Wellons

Mr. Jim Wellons made a report and submitted minutes from the Commission's rules subcommittee for review. This subcommittee was created at the previous regular Commission meeting to discuss the use of the terms 'provider', 'owner', 'licensee', and 'operator' in the Child Care Rules.

Per review and discussion of this meeting, Mr. Wellons stated that "Licensee" and "Operator" are the terms that are most likely the best options for use in the Rules. If the choice is to use operator, that would be consistent with statute; any rule that obligates a person with primary responsibility..."operator shall..."operator shall not" Example: Rule .0204; "operator" would be the appropriate term.

Ms. Elizabeth Gilleland raised the issue of the term "owner" being complicated when it is applied to a facility operated by a nonprofit organization. She would like clarification on how "owner" would apply in this instance. Mr. Wellons replied that "owner" would apply in the instances in which there are in fact owners. Regarding nonprofits, "owner" might be applicable in a case where there is a change in ownership (or responsible party) and a need for a new license. There are two levels of ownership; a facility is owned by a non-profit but a non-profit is not owned.

Ms. Laurie Morin stated that the Commission might also want to consider the use of the word "teacher" and instances where it might be more appropriate to use "early educator" vs. "teacher." Chairperson Glenda Weinert commented that the Commission will revisit this issue if necessary as they proceed through the Review of Rules process.

See & Hear Rules Discussion for FCCH—Ms. Laurie Morin

Background:

*On November 17, 2014, Ms. Laurie Morin proposed a change in the 'See & Hear' Rules in Family child care homes—in order for children to be allowed to participate in age-appropriate activities when there are different age groups represented; proposing a hear **or** see rule for school age care in family child care homes. Ms. Tammy Barnes stated that the Division does not oppose this change if language for centers in 10A NCAC 09 .1718(a)(4) Requirements for Daily Operations is replicated.*

Commission Action: *Ms. Laurie Morin motioned that language would be replicated for family child care homes for see or hear for school age children. Ms. Kay Lowrance seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.*

At the Special Rules meeting held on November 18, 2014, Chairperson Glenda Weinert raised a question about the previous day's motion concerning "see or hear" and whether the motion was adopted as it was intended.

Commission Action: *Ms. Linda Vandevender moved to reconsider the vote taken on November 17, 2014 regarding Rule .1718(a)(4) pertaining to supervision in a child care home. Mr. Zac Everhart seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous.*

For the record: The original motion was made by Ms. Laurie Morin and seconded by Ms. Kay Lowrance; neither of which were present at this meeting.

As a result of this discussion, it was determined that further discussion of the proposed motion should take place at the next regular (non-Rules Review) meeting of the Commission on February 9, 2015.

Present meeting:

Ms. Laurie Morin was asked to clarify the intent of her original motion regarding school age children in family child care homes. Mr. Wellons suggested that Ms. Morin and DCDEE staff suggest rule language to the Commission in a revised motion that would achieve the intended goal and attach the edits to the motion to amend.

The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 11:35 a.m., reconvened at 12:44 p.m.

Ms. Laurie Morin & Ms. Alexi Gruber presented proposed rule language changes to the Commission:

The following changes in the Rule will accompany the motion:

10A NCAC 09 .1718 Requirements for Daily Operations

- (a) The operator shall provide the following on a daily basis for all children in care:
 - (4) Children shall be adequately supervised at all times. Adequate supervision shall mean that:
 - (A) For pre-school aged children, staff must be positioned in the indoor and outdoor environment to maximize their ability to hear and see the children at all times and render immediate assistance; or
 - (B) For school aged children, staff must be positioned in the indoor and outdoor environment to maximize their ability to hear or see the children at all times

and render immediate assistance. Staff must interact with the children while moving about the indoor or outdoor area; and

- (C) For children of all ages:
 - (i) Staff must know where each child is located and be aware of children's activities at all times;
 - (ii) Staff must provide supervision appropriate to the individual age, needs and capabilities of each child; and
 - (iii) All of the conditions in this Paragraph shall apply except when emergencies necessitate that direct supervision is impossible for brief periods of time. Documentation of emergencies shall be maintained and available for review by Division representatives upon request.
- (5) Nothing contained in this Rule shall be construed to preclude a "qualified person with a disability," as defined by G.S. 168A-3(9), or a "qualified individual with a disability," as defined by the Americans With Disabilities Act at 42 U.S.C. 12111(8), from working in a licensed child care facility.
- (6) For children who are sleeping or napping, the staff are not required to visually supervise them, but shall be able to hear and respond quickly to them. Children shall not sleep or nap in a room with a closed door between the children and the supervising staff. The staff shall be on the same level of the home where children are sleeping or napping.

Vice Chairperson Kevin Campbell asked if after the motion carries, whether it would still have to go through the rules review process. Mr. Wellons affirmed that this is the case.

Commission Action: **Ms. Laurie Morin motioned that the presented changes be made in the language for family child care homes. Janice Price seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.**

Fiscal Note Update (NC ADD Rulemaking Petition)—Ms. Janice Fain

Ms. Janice Fain presented information to the Commission regarding the fiscal note for a proposed rule change in the required hours/months of operation for Developmental Day child care facilities. DCDEE has been notified that the NC Office of State Budget and Management (OSBM) has made the determination not to certify the fiscal note that was submitted regarding this rule change. The fiscal note was approved as valid, but not certified by OSBM and therefore proposed rule text cannot be published.

Background:

DCDEE received a rulemaking petition from the NC Association of Directors of Developmental Day Centers (NC ADD) requesting that a requirement be added to Rule 10A NCAC 09 .2902 to state the hours/months of operation for development day centers (DDC). "Developmental Day services shall be available for preschool children for a minimum of eight hours per day, five days per week, and twelve months per year." Developmental Day Funds from the NC Department of Public Instruction (DPI) are provided for 10 months of services.

The requested change would result in potential fiscal impact in three areas:

- Impact to Local Education Agencies that currently operate DDCs less than 12 months
- Impact to children and their parents who are currently attending LEA operated DDC programs
- Impact to community based DDCs that already operate for 12 months.

In 2009, the Rulemaking authority for certified DD centers was moved from the Commission for Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities and Substance Abuse Services to the NC Child Care Commission and rules were required to be published and adopted regarding DDC operation at that time.

At 1:00 pm discussion of the fiscal note was suspended to allow for Public Comment per the meeting agenda.

Public Comment-

Ms. Lorie Barnes, Executive Director NCAEYC

- Ms. Barnes thanked the Child Care Commission for their work. She asked the Commission to consider the following questions as they make decisions: how does this impact children; how does it impact families; and how will it impact early child care professionals?

Ms. Linda Piper, NC Child Care Association

- Ms. Piper noted there hasn't been a lot of changes regarding SEEK; however, there are still counties involved in the pilot and she hears that they are frustrated because of spending so much time complying with a requirement and taking away from more important matters.
- Ms. Piper also expressed concern with what appears on the DCDEE website in terms of substantiated and unsubstantiated complaints at a child care center; she feels there have been situations where unsubstantiated complaints were detrimental to reputations of center.

Mr. Preston Peck, Toxic Free NC

- Mr. Peck provided information to the Commission regarding Toxic Free NC policy initiatives, and the School Children's Health Act to protect children from pesticide exposure. He explained that NC Toxic Free feels this is needed in child care facilities as well as in public schools and other settings.

Fiscal Note Update (NC ADD Rulemaking Petition), continued — Ms. Janice Fain

OSBM has determined that the cost is prohibitive to change the rule as proposed by the petitioner to require LEAs to operate DDCs for 12 months. The greatest area of fiscal impact is the potential loss of DPI Developmental Day funds within LEAs where there are no community-based DDCs and where the LEA based DDCs could not meet the new requirement. Ms. Fain discussed potential alternatives to the proposed rule change that may address the concerns voiced by the petitioner regarding the impact to community based DDCs:

- 1) The Commission could choose not to grant the petition because of the potential fiscal impact to LEAs and due to uncertainty of whether community based DDCs are already at enrollment capacity.
- 2) DPI could include additional guidance in their application on awarding DDC funds to suggest that the IEP team give preference to the community based DDC placement first, unless certain circumstances apply.
- 3) A possible compromise is for the Commission to grant the petitioner's request, but place a stipulation in the rule that if a county does not have a Community based DD program, the LEA can continue to operate its DD program for the 10 months they are funded. The disadvantage of this compromise would be that children would only get 10 months of service in these cases.

Public Comment related to NC ADD Petition Fiscal Note

Ms. Janet Sellers

- Ms. Sellers noted the history of DDC laws needs to be considered. DDC money was set aside for existing community-based programs so they could not be usurped by LEAs and put out of business per Federal Bill 1975--94-142; 99-457. She stated that public schools would still have to provide services to these children even if they lose DD money; she feels it is disingenuous to say that children would not be getting services if disallowed DD funds in public schools.

Ms. Melissa Langford, Vice President NC ADD, Director of DDC Orange County Children's Learning Center Hillsborough, parent of special needs child

- Ms. Langford spoke to need for consistency for children with special needs and best practices for children.

Ms. Nancy Haddock, Executive Director Child Development Center of Wilmington

- Ms. Haddock noted the Commission's jurisdiction is defining what a DD center is; she felt it is within the Commission's authority to determine that a DD center is not a public school classroom.

Ms. Wendy Partin, Executive Director White Plains Children's Center

- Ms. Partin expressed further community support for the NC ADD petition.

Ms. Tracy Riddle, DPI Section Chief for Special Programs and Data Collection

- Ms. Riddle noted the counties where there are no community based DDCs. She explained the reason that most LEA based DDCs cannot meet the proposed requirement to operate for 12 months is because they are tied to the school's schedule of operation and do not provide child care for the remaining months.

Chairperson Glenda Weinert thanked the speakers for their comments and brought the conversation back to alternative #3 granting the petitioner's request with the stipulation that if a county does not have a community based DD program, the LEA can continue operating for 10 months. She asked Ms. Fain what the process is to take back that alternative to OSBM for review. Ms. Fain responded that DCDEE staff would create a revised draft of fiscal note reflecting this revised rule language and resubmit the fiscal note to OSBM.

Commission Action: **Ms. Sue Creech motioned that the Commission ask DCDEE staff to submit a fiscal note reflecting alternative number 3 to OSBM. Ms. April Duvall seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.**

Chairperson Glenda Weinert expressed gratitude to DCDEE Staff, DPI, and NC ADD for each group's work and information.

Meeting break at 2:55 p.m., reconvened at 3:02 p.m.

Curriculum Appeals Process—Ms. Alexi Gruber

Chairperson Weinert began by asking Mr. Jim Wellons if he had any recommendations for the Commission regarding the curriculum appeals process. Mr. Wellons referenced the DCDEE Curriculum Review Revised Appeal Draft 2 document and stated that there is reference to a "curriculum review team", which does not exist at the present time. The Commission needs to determine who they want to task with the responsibility of reviewing curricula which are not approved, and a method of reviewing those curricula that have been denied and are requesting to be reconsidered.

Commission Action: **Ms. Janice Price moved that a letter be sent to the three publishers whose curricula were not-approved previously. This letter should state that publishers have 120 days to resubmit their curriculum for review. The existing Child Care Commission curriculum review subcommittee will evaluate the curricula based on the same criteria as was used for the approved criteria. Ms. Laurie Morin seconded the motions, which was approved unanimously.**

Two publishers have submitted letters asking for review of their curricula - Kiddie Academy and The Learning Experience. The Learning Experience did not meet the definition of a curriculum because its publisher only submitted activities, so this curriculum was never reviewed, but could be reviewed on appeal.

Ms. Alexi Gruber informed the Commission that there is no curriculum review committee in place at this point, however DCDEE would be happy to provide administrative support to the Commission in this endeavor. When the original process was developed, there was a committee in place; but now that there is no longer a committee, so reviewing the curricula for appeal is not an appropriate task for DCDEE.

Vice Chairperson Kevin Campbell proposed drafting a letter to the legislature proposing that the Early Learning Standards be adopted into legislation. Ms. Elizabeth Gilleland asked that this be put on the agenda for the next quarterly meeting.

Chairperson Glenda Weinert referred again to the DCDEE Curriculum Review Revised Appeal document and stated that item #9 needed to be revised “Two members of the curriculum review team who were not the persons who completed the original review would review the letters and look at the curriculum materials to re-evaluate the extent to which the original, additional or revised curriculum materials address criteria that were determined to be partially met or unmet. Only criteria that were partially met or not met will be evaluated in the review process.”

Commission Action:

Kay Lowrance moved to amend the draft of DCDEE Curriculum Review Revised Appeal Draft 2 to approve the appeals process with an amendment to item #9. “The establishment of a curriculum review committee consisting of three Child Care Commission members and one DCDEE staff will be established for appeal or review, whichever is applicable. Only curricula materials that were previously submitted for review and denied may submit for appeal in writing. Ms. Melanie Gayle seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

The three Commission members who will comprise the review committee: Chairperson Glenda Weinert, Ms. Elizabeth Gilleland, and Ms. Kay Lowrance. Ms. Laura Hewitt will be the DCDEE representative.

Chairperson Glenda Weinert adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

The Child Care Commission will hold a special rules meeting on March 16, 2015 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.