

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

NORTH CAROLINA CHILD CARE COMMISSION

Third Quarter Meeting

Monday, March 7, 2016

Dix Grill

1101 Cafeteria Drive

Employee Center

Raleigh, NC 27603

Commission Members Present

Glenda Weinert, Chairperson

Kevin Campbell, Vice Chairperson

Elliott Blades

Jonathan Brownlee, Sr., MD

Zac Everhart

Elizabeth Gilleland

Lisa Humphreys

Kay Lowrance

Laurie Morin

Linda Vandevender

William Walton, III

Commission Members with and Excused Absence

April Duvall

Melanie Gayle

Charles F. McDowell, III

Kristen Weaver

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

Pam Shue, Director

Janice Fain, Administration/Policy

Dedra Alston, Administration/Policy

Heather Laffler, Administration/Policy

Tammy Barnes, Regulatory Services

Andrea Lewis, Regulatory Services

Lorie Pugh, Regulatory Services

Melodie Ford, Regulatory Services

Laura Hewitt, Regulatory Services

Melissa Stevenson, Regulatory Services

Terry McCauley, Regulatory Services

Cindy Wheeler, NC Pre-K

Mary Pat Hicks, NC Pre-K

Rachel Kaplan, NC Pre-K

Attorney General's Office Staff

Bethany Burgon, Commission Attorney

Alexi Gruber, DCDEE Attorney

Welcome—Chairperson Glenda Weinert called the meeting to order at **9:00 a.m.** and reviewed housekeeping items. She expressed appreciation to the Commission for members' attendance and to Division staff for all of their efforts, stating her opinion that the Commission could achieve its work without Division efforts. She welcomed everyone and discussed the meeting agenda.

She read the conflicts of interest statement and asked whether there were any conflicts noted for today? Ms. Morin stated that she has a potential conflict with a specific topic and will abstain from voting on the Family Child Care rule approval. Ms. Humphreys also stated that she has a potential conflict of interest, with an issue related to school age track out care that may be brought before the Commission, and will maintain awareness of this. Chairperson Weinert stated that when subjects that might have potential conflict are addressed in meetings, all members should note their potential conflict and abstain from voting to affect the issue in question.

Chairperson Weinert welcomed Ms. Lisa Humphreys to the Commission for her first meeting, and asked her to introduce herself. All Commission members introduced themselves to her as well.

Chairperson Weinert welcomed new DCDEE Director Dr. Pamela Shue.

Chairperson Weinert asked for the Commission roll call, which Ms. Dedra Alston performed. Chairperson Weinert listed the Commission members who were absent from this meeting who requested and received excused absences. They are Ms. April Duvall, Ms. Melanie Gayle, Rev. Charles F. McDowell III, and Ms. Kristen Weaver.

Chairperson Weinert read into the record the Evaluation of Statement of Economic Interest letter received from the State Ethics Commission concerning Ms. Lisa Humphreys. Ms. Humphreys was cleared to serve with the potential for conflict, but with no actual conflict presented.

Swearing In—Lisa Humphreys

Ms. Dedra Alston performed the swearing in of Ms. Lisa Humphreys as a member of the NC Child Care Commission.

Approval of November 16, 2015 Special Rules Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Weinert asked if Commission members had any changes or amendments to minutes as circulated.

Commission Action:

Vice Chairperson Kevin Campbell moved to approve the November 16, 2015 Special Rules meeting minutes as presented. Mr. William Walton seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of November 17, 2015 Second Quarter Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Weinert asked if Commission members had any changes or amendments to minutes as circulated.

Commission Action:

Dr. Jonathan Brownlee motioned for approval of minutes as presented; Ms. Kay Lowrance seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Scheduling Upcoming Meetings

Discussion followed regarding upcoming Commission meetings. The May 16 Fourth Quarter Meeting had already been scheduled, so May 17 will be added for a Special Rules Review meeting. Chairperson Weinert asked for a motion to approve adding the additional meeting date. Ms. Linda Vandevender motioned for approval and Ms. Laurie Morin seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Elizabeth Gilleland proposed a July meeting instead of August, and Chairperson Weinert proposed several specific dates. There was consensus among Commission members to schedule July 25 and July 26 as the First Quarter Meeting and Special Rules Meeting dates.

Introduction of Director-Pam Shue

Ms. Tammy Barnes introduced Dr. Shue as DCDEE's newly appointed Division Director.

DCDEE Update, Pam Shue, Division Director

Joint Legislative Oversight Committee in Health and Human Services—Subcommittee on Statewide Early Education and Family Support Programs - This subcommittee met on January 28 and February 25 and received presentations from DCDEE on the subsidized child care program and the NC Pre-K program. The NC Partnership for Children presented information on Smart Start to the Committee. At its second meeting, the Committee heard from child care providers, local Smart Start partnerships, and local

NC Pre-K contractors. The group's next meeting is scheduled for March 23, with a subcommittee report due by April 1, 2016.

CCDF Reauthorization - Proposed rules were published to implement the Federal CCDF Reauthorization, and the public comment period ended on February 22, 2016. Approximately 150 comments were received, including those from DCDEE.

Week of the Young Child Activities – The National Week of the Young Child is April 10-16, 2016. Staff from DCDEE and the NC Department of Health and Human Services will be reading and sharing literacy activities with children in child care and NC Pre-K classrooms across the state.

Rules Review—Social Services Commission/Subsidized Child Care – On Thursday, February 18 the Rules Review Commission (RRC) reviewed the final submission of the Social Services Commission's Rules report that categorized rules for the Subsidized Child Care Program, beginning the periodic review of existing rules process. RRC will now review and submit this report to the Administrative Procedures Oversight (APO) committee, which has 60 days to review and approve that listing. Once this listing has been approved, the Social Services Commission will submit a proposed date to have all rules in 10A NCAC 10 readopted to the RRC for their approval.

Subsidy Related Issues:

- **Reversions/Reallocations** – A reversion of non Smart Start funds was completed in January 2016 and a total of \$2.6 million was needed to be redistributed to counties to maintain current service levels. Another reversion and reallocation of non Smart Start funds is anticipated for March 2016.
- **NC FAST** – The Regulatory Interface, Provider Portal, and Child Care Application are in functional testing to move Child Care Subsidy Assistance into the NC FAST system. Reports Management, Eligibility Rules and Service Plan, as well as On-Going Case Management are in active development. A pilot for implementation in NC FAST is scheduled in July and August 2016, with rollout following in September and October 2016 for counties starting from the West to the East across the state. Buncombe, Durham, Lee, and Orange Counties will be the first counties to pilot utilizing NC FAST for subsidy management and enrollment.
- **Child Support Cooperation Legislative Report** - [SB 114 – Custodial Parent Cooperate w/ Child Support](#) was signed by the Governor on 6/4/2015 and became S.L. 2015-51. This law required that DCDEE and the NC Division of Social Services (DSS) research and describe a plan to require that all applicants for Child Care Subsidy Assistance first seek support from non-custodial parents and cooperate with the statewide Child Support Enforcement program if they are not already working through the State system, before they may become eligible to receive subsidy assistance. This required report was submitted by its due date and DCDEE and DSS are now awaiting further direction from the General Assembly.
- **Infant/Toddler Market Rate Increases for Tier 1 & 2 counties** - The legislative budget for 2015-16 included funds to increase child care market rates for infants/toddlers in 3-5 star programs in Tier 1 & 2 Department of Commerce (economically challenged) counties, and this increase was implemented in January 2016. \$3 million was included to support this increase in 2015-16 and \$6 million in 2016-17.

Questions:

- Chairperson Weinert inquired as to why Tier 3 counties were not eligible to receive a market rate increase? Janice Fain responded that the market rate increase was only legislated for economically challenged counties, which include those designated as Tier 1 and Tier 2.

Rules Update

- **Rules .2001-.2007 - Rulemaking, Administrative and Legal Actions—Bethany Burgon**
After the Division submitted Rules .2001-.2007 to the RCC, the RCC notified the Division with concerns that included technical as well as some substantive changes. Subsequently, the decision was made to pull the rules from the December RRC meeting and resubmit the revised rules for the January meeting after the concerns were addressed. No objections were made to the resubmitted rule package, and there was unanimous RRC approval of these rules.
- **Adopt Rule .1718 – Requirements for Daily Operations—Dedra Alston**
The public hearing for Rule .1718 that applies to Family Child Care Homes was held on November 17, 2015. The comment period for this rule ended on November 30, 2015.

Chairperson Weinert clarified that today’s Commission vote to approve is confined to only the ‘see or hear’ portion of this rule: “For school-age children, the operator 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.”

Ms. Humphreys asked a question about why the language “the operator must interact with the children while moving about the indoor area” was only for school-age and not preschool-age children. Ms. Gruber stated that this was an error and should be moved to Subparagraph (4)(c).

Vice Chairperson Campbell inquired as to the answer to the question submitted via email for the previous meeting asking about whether children could be on different levels than the operator in a split level home? The Division’s response to this is that children must be on the same floor as the operator, and Ms. Alston confirmed that the Division did respond directly to the email correspondent.

The potential effective date for this rule change is May 1, 2016 pending RRC approval.

Commission Action:

Ms. Humphreys moved to approve Rule .1718 by making the last sentence in Subparagraph (4)(b) a new Subparagraph (4)(c). That sentence now reads: “The operator must interact with the children while moving about the indoor or outdoor area.” Ms. Gilleland seconded. The motion carried with Ms. Morin abstaining from voting.

Playground Discussion—Jeff Gaster, South Central Program Manager, DCDEE Regulatory Services

Mr. Gaster provided general information to the Commission regarding regulatory rules and policies for play areas and playground safety. He stated that the history of the Division using Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) rules to govern playground safety dates back to 1996 when CPSC rules for playgrounds and playground equipment were originally developed. These rules were amended in 1998 and remain the most current version of the rules. In addition to the CPSC, there is also the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) which has over 13,000 standards. ASTM 1292 Standard is specific to measuring the impact of a child’s head with surfaces, such as the ground under play equipment. If a provider wishes to use a surface material for their outdoor play area that is not included in the existing ASTM or

DCDEE rules, such as a mixture of mulch and mats, then the provider is given the option of submitting that material and paying ASTM, at their own cost, to have it tested.

The ASTM 1292 Standard is currently 6 inches of approved surfacing materials under equipment, which is required to protect a child from severe injury by falling. Dr. Brownlee asked for clarification as to what is meant by “to protect a child”. Mr. Gaster responded that in this case, ‘protect’ means that a fall should not result in head trauma.

Vice Chairperson Campbell asked for clarification about acceptable amounts of mixed materials, such as a rubber mat and mulch? Mr. Gaster replied that a combination such as this is acceptable *as long as* a provider has ASTM 1292 documentation that the mat and mulch combination/depth is acceptable, per safety requirements. Mr. Walton asked if sites must have surface protection 6 feet to the sides of a swing set? Mr. Gaster replied that this is required because of the risk of children jumping or falling out of a swing, or as a result of a swing chain breaking.

Mr. Gaster explained guidelines on best practices for measuring mulch in play areas. Consultants should measure at multiple points within the fall zone, up to six feet from a piece of equipment. Measurement should take place when material is not in use. Given that most citations are due to maintenance issues, sites should keep mulch raked on a continuous or at least daily basis. Consultants should **not** be measuring mulch depth if the ground is frozen because children should not be playing on it if the ground is frozen and hard.

Ms. Gilleland inquired as to whether Mr. Gaster knows if there is going to be any reconsideration of these guidelines using more updated research? For example, she cited the rule that young children could not hang from their arms because that exercise is not developmentally appropriate. Mr. Gaster stated that he did not know whether guidelines will be revisited, but he assumes the guidelines are based on recent developmentally appropriate research. Dr. Brownlee also stated that these guidelines are probably based on both developmental appropriateness and legal liability, and that there is actual medical concern for young children inappropriately reaching or holding their body weight by their arms, in some cases, as well as related to their hand strength and grip extension.

Meeting break at 10:25 a.m., meeting reconvened at 10:35 a.m.

Curriculum Discussion

Chairperson Weinert reviewed how there has been an ongoing discussion before the Commission, for quite some time, of how to determine the appropriate process for approving curricula for use in 4-5 star four-year-old classrooms and the NC Pre-K program. Chairperson Weinert stated that one of the continuing questions that has yet to be answered is whether the publisher of a curriculum is responsible for documenting alignment with Foundations, and, if so, how they can demonstrate that alignment. Chairperson Weinert provided an example of this type of documentation provided by a curriculum publisher at the last Commission meeting, and asked if the Commission would find that satisfactory.

Ms. Gilleland asked to confirm that it has officially been decided that the Commission **does** in fact have the legal authority to determine the approval process; Ms. Burgon confirmed that the Commission has this authority. Vice Chairperson Campbell asked, if up until now the Commission and Division have been implementing the approval process through policy, would it be preferable to continue to implement the process through policy instead of adopting rules for the approval process? Ms. Burgon read the definition of policy and stated that it would be *possible* to continue to approve curriculums as a policy, or adopt rules, but that is up to the Commission. Regarding this question Ms. Gilleland expressed that she would be interested in hearing the thoughts of the Division.

Director Shue asked whether already approved curricula would need to go through the new approval process, whenever that is determined. Chairperson Weinert stated that her understanding is that the exiting curricula would continue to be ‘approved’ while the new process is implemented, and once the new process is implemented, existing curricula would be expected to demonstrate alignment with Foundations and meet any other approval requirements.

Ms. Barnes asked for clarification as to who would be responsible for determining whether documentation provided by publishers actually does in fact demonstrate alignment with Foundations. She does not feel that this determination should be left to the interpretation of multiple consultants, to be done on site across the state. Ms. Vandevender stated her opinion that teachers are now highly qualified and trained in how to align curricula with Foundations, and that facility Directors need to also be trained in how to align curriculums. In this way, the site would have two individuals trained on Foundations able to determine whether a curriculum’s alignment documentation is appropriate.

Vice Chairperson Campbell asked that the Commission review the language regarding curriculum approval that had been submitted to the legislature during its previous session. Chairperson Weinert requested that the Commission break for lunch, review the wording of the legislation and that the conversation would continue again, after the established public comment time required by the agenda.

Lunch break at 11:30 a.m., meeting reconvened at 12:30 p.m.

12:30 p.m. Public Comment

- **Ms. Sarah Vidrine, NC Child/Ms. Kelly Close, NC Early Childhood Oral Health Collaborative** - Ms. Vidrine and Ms. Close referenced a letter sent March 1, 2016 to the Commission concerning fluoride toothpaste use for children less than two years of age. Dental decay is the most common chronic childhood disease and has serious impact on a child’s health. A rule amendment or clarification is needed to ensure that children under the age of two have access and the ability to receive fluoridated toothpaste in child care comparable to children over age two. Because toothpaste labels advise to “ask a dentist: for children under two years of age”, child care providers have been directed to treat toothpaste as a prescription medication. Rule .0803(13) requires that child care providers document each administration of over-the-counter or prescription medication and Rule .0803(7) provides a list of over-the-counter products. Inclusion of fluoridated toothpaste in this list would greatly reduce the burden of paperwork and permission for use on providers and increase access to tooth-brushing for young children.
 - Ms. Morin inquired as to what is the recommended age for brushing young children’s teeth. Ms. Vidrine and Close stated that the recommendation is that children under the age of three should be provided a toothpaste smear the size of a grain of rice, and children over three years of age should be provided a toothpaste drip the size of a pea.
- **Mr. Jerold Bryant—Frog Street Curriculum** —Frog Street Press has submitted a curriculum approval request. Mr. Bryant appeared before the Commission and spoke previously about the curriculum and enlisting the Commission’s guidance through the curriculum approval process. Frog Street continues to request this approval so that their product can be sold and used in North Carolina.
- **Ms. Kim Keith—YMCA of the Triangle**—Ms. Keith referenced a letter in Commission members’ packets dated January 28, 2016 discussing that for the past 5 years the YMCA has been granted inactive status during the traditional school summer break to allow for the accommodation of the distinctly

different summer needs of the communities they serve in Wake County because of year-round school programs. The Division sent a letter to the YMCA this year informing the organization that they would no longer be able to place their license on “inactive status” during the summer months.

This change would require licensing all of the YMCA’s Wake County summer day camp programs which would lead to several concerns: 1) inability to provide employment to over 300 teens who are younger than the required age; 2) without the 16-17 year old staff, the Y will no longer be able to run summer day camp programs after colleges resume, leaving 1400 children without childcare; 3) prices will increase due to increases in cost to license summer camp programs and pay and recruit older staff.

The YMCA is asking DCDEE and the Commission to consider allowing the organization to remain on inactive status during the traditional calendar school summer, which would allow them to provide high quality summer camp programs. If not, the Y would like to request an extension beyond summer 2016 to make this change, in order to allow adequate time to meet licensing requirements.

Ms. Alexi Gruber outlined the rule that is related to this situation and the misunderstanding concerning “inactive status” from the perspective of DCDEE. Chairperson Weinert inquired as to whether it is feasibly possible for these programs to get licensed in time for the summer at this point. Ms. Keith stated that the YMCA is exploring solutions; however, they do not feel they can achieve licensed status before summer, which is why they are requesting an additional year to plan accordingly.

Ms. Tammy Barnes inquired as to whether Wake County YMCA programs have looked at other YMCA programs and how they maintain licensure. Ms. Keith explained that Wake County’s situation is unique because they are the only county that runs track out programs.

Ms. Gruber explained that this requirement is in rule, and therefore the Commission has no authority to grant an exception of status. Chairperson Weinert expressed that the Commission and Division helped create this problem by granting the inactive status, so she feels that the YMCA programs should be given time to correct for this mistake. Ms. Gruber stated that these programs had been informed in July of 2015 of the issue, so they were given a year to plan. Ms. Keith stated that the program’s 2016 budget had already been decided, not including these licensure expenses, when they received the letter establishing the concerns.

Vice Chairperson Campbell asked Ms. Keith if the YMCA programs receive subsidy and she responded that they do not. Ms. Gilleland inquired whether the Commission could grant the programs additional time to comply if they demonstrate evidence of a plan of action. Ms. Gruber stated that the only way that the Commission/Division can grant an extension is to change the Rule.

Chairperson Weinert inquired as to whether there is a way to make sure that counselors under 18 are not alone with children, therefore resolving that problem. Ms. Keith replied that this is not feasible because the 18 year old college students go back to college before the camp is over.

Ms. Gruber suggested that there may be options of a compromise position, which satisfies safety requirements on a one-time basis and advised Ms. Keith to have the attorney for YMCA to contact the Division. She also stated that the Commission does not have the authority to make this decision unless there is a petition to change the Rule and that the Division will continue to work with the YMCA to try and achieve a solution within the requirements of the existing rule.

- **Ms. Paige Moretz—NCAEYC**—Ms. Moretz wanted to let the Commission know to feel free to use them as a resource for any issues discussed.

- **Ms. Anna Mercer-McLean—Director, Community School for People under Six**—Ms. Mercer McLean commented that if publishers are required to align with Foundations, training is needed; also, that DCDEE ultimately needs to approve the alignment documentation. She also recommended that the Commission read the Institute of Medicine’s recommendations regarding staff qualifications.
- **Ms. Linda Piper—Director, NC Licensed Child Care Association**—Ms. Piper stated that she provides the perspective of how rules affect providers; she passed out documentation for the Rules discussion on March 8.

Curriculum Discussion (continued)

Following conclusion of the public comment period, the Commission returned to its discussion of curriculum approval. Chairperson Weinert read from the letter previously sent to Representative Moore and Senator Berger from the Commission asking the legislature to grant the Commission authority to select and approve curricula for use in child care programs that align with the standards of Foundations. This language included that an administrator and a teacher from each center would be trained in implementation of Foundations. Vice Chairperson Campbell stated his feeling that this is the solution to the current issue. Ms. Gilleland agreed that this should be the intent of the rule, and that specific policies can follow.

Chairperson Weinert inquired as to whether a framework such as described could operate as policy while the Commission was completing the lengthy rulemaking process. Ms. Burgon stated that it is her understanding that once the Commission begins the rulemaking process, that it can also begin implementation of the process/requirement. Chairperson Weinert stated that in addition to documentation that proposed curricula align with Foundations, programs or publishers should also include documentation that the administrator and at least one teacher have completed Foundations training.

Vice Chairperson Campbell asked whether this is an instance that meets the provision to create a temporary rule. Ms. Burgon replied that this does not meet the provision for temporary rule.

Ms. Lowrance asked Ms. Cindy Wheeler whether the Foundations training ensures administrators and teachers will be able to evaluate whether a curriculum aligns with Foundations. Ms. Wheeler replied that she does not feel that the current training alone ensures this and that she feels that supports also need to be built into the training to educate providers about curriculum usage and alignment with Foundations.

Ms. Barnes raised the question of whether the Division could accommodate the amount of training on the Foundations document that this would require and questioned whether we could feasibly train as many as 6,000 people in the time required. Ms. Wheeler stated that this training could be completed, but it would depend on multiple factors, including delivery method and certainly would require additional planning.

Ms. Vandevender suggested utilizing partners as a way to mentor and move training forward. Ms. Wheeler reiterated that the train the trainer model to build local capacity already provides strategies established with NC Pre-K, but that the Division would certainly try to leverage the skills and availability of partner groups.

Ms. Gilleland asked for an agenda item at the next meeting to have the Division report on capacity and strategy for implementing this Rule. Chairperson Weinert expressed that she wants to move this forward expediently. If the Commission is in agreement, she feels that it should vote to move forward with this plan.

Ms. Gruber also reminded the Commission that this rule change will require a fiscal note. Chairperson Weinert asked if it would be sufficient for the publishers to take the Foundations training and demonstrate alignment of curricula with Foundations in order to be approved more quickly. Ms. Gilleland stated her feeling that would be potentially useful, but not in lieu of administrator and teacher training.

Mr. Blades echoed the sentiments of Chairperson Weinert that he wants to begin the process of allowing curriculums to be approved, with the understanding that there would be many more steps to follow. Ms. Gruber stated that the existing language is a good basis, but much more detail will be needed for Rule provisions for what happens when facility staff are trained and leave, etc. Division staff will come with proposed rule language at next meeting in May that the Commission could vote on, and until the new rule goes into effect, all processes will have to operate under current rule language. Vice Chairperson Campbell and Chairperson Weinert brought up the fact that there are publishers waiting to meet whatever requirements are established, and that they would like for this new process to be established as quickly as possible.

Ms. Vandevender issued a challenge to publishers to offer training if they want providers to use their curriculum, and Vice Chairperson Campbell expressed the importance of facilities having options when choosing a curricula to use.

Screen Time Discussion

Ms. Gilleland led the Commission in a discussion about allowances for screen time in child care, as referenced on the agenda. She pointed out summary information from a number of articles that had previously been sent electronically to all members and asked for member input and questions. Per this discussion Ms. Gilleland specifically noted that the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) recommendation on screen time that was ‘revised and discussed by the Commission in September is not the full final recommendation, and that that full recommendation has not yet been published. She also noted information from the Campaign for a Commercial-Free Childhood (CCFC) summary of screen time research and “Time for a View on Screen Time” from the Archives of Disease in Childhood which equates screen time with dosage models for various ages of children. She also pointed out the article “Gray Matters: Too much screen time damages the brain” which provides information about the deterioration of brain matter as a result of exposure to screens. Ms. Gilleland referenced “The Great Disconnect” and asked that Commission members read and think about issues of policy and practice.

Ms. Gilleland stated her opinion that the child care rule should maintain a 30 minute limit for children’s exposure to screens in child care because members and providers know that children are also being exposed to screen time in other settings, so child care should be a time focused on high quality interactions. She also feels that the Commission needs to take a position against encouraging the risks associated with elevated screen time.

Ms. Gilleland asked Dr. Brownlee to report on what has seen in his practice and he commended Ms. Gilleland on her research. Dr. Brownlee described his experience as a pediatrician in his practice where he routinely sees parents take phones from children, and the children spend the entire time trying to get back the electronics; he maintained that kids should be free from electronics during child care and in preschool.

Ms. Morin provided examples of schools where all class and home work are done on tablets, and Mr. Walton agreed that screen time is a tool that can be used effectively.

Ms. Humphreys questioned why screen time would need to be introduced as early as it potentially is in child care.

The proposed screen time rule .0510(d)(2) currently states “When screen time, including television, video, video games, and computer usage is provided, it shall be (a) Offered only as a free-choice activity; (b) Used to meet a developmental goal; and (c) Limited to no more than a total of two and a half hours per week, per child. (3) Screen time shall not include teacher-directed activities. (4) “Usage time Screen time usage

periods may be extended for special events, projects, on-site computer classes, or occasions such as current event, holiday, or birthday celebrations.”

Ms. Gilleland would like for the rule to limit available screen activities to two and a half hours per week total, and **not** include the additional allowances proposed in Subparagraphs (3) or (4).

Chairperson Weinert proposed a compromise of allowing a larger allotment than the 2.5 hour total, but remove the ‘teacher-directed’ provision, so the limit would include any and all screen time. Director Shue asked how the Commission members felt that it was in the best interest of children and high quality experiences to be providing more screen time allowances after reviewing research and recommendations from AAP and NCAEYC.

Dr. Brownlee and Ms. Gilleland stated that if it were up to them, there would be no screen time in child care at all. Chairperson Weinert did note that screen time is not required at all in facilities and that the purpose of this rule is to place limits and allow use in an effective way. Ms. Gilleland again proposed limiting screen time to limit to 2½ hours per week and taking out proposed Subparagraphs (d)(3) and (4).

Vice Chairperson Campbell and Mr. Walton asked for clarification about whether this limitation would be for preschool-age or for children of all ages. It was confirmed that this rule is limited to 3-4 year olds. Ms. Barnes pointed out that Rule .2503(e) is the rule for school-age screen time, with an extended provision for homework.

Dr. Brownlee suggested including language relaying that the use of screen time should be for the purpose of developmental goals in conjunction with teacher-directed activities, if that provision remains. At this point, the proposed language is: Rule .0510(d)(2): “When screen time, including television, video, video games, and computer usage is provided, it shall be (a) Offered only as a free-choice activity; (b) Used to meet a developmental goal; and (c) Limited to no more than a total of two and a half hours per week, per ~~child.~~ child and no more than 30 minutes per day.”

Ms. Gruber stated that the Commission would need to specify a definition of “screen time” that includes dealing more with the activity than with the medium/device. A previously proposed definition of screen time stated: “Screen time is defined as looking at electronic media (including television) with a screen, including watching screens while others use the media”. Ms. Gruber stated that the Division will develop proposed language for tomorrow’s Special Rules Meeting and bring it back to the Commission for review.

Chairperson Weinert proposed language such as: “When any and all electronic media is used, children will be limited to a maximum of 30 minutes per day per child.” Ms. Vandevender stressed the importance of making sure any screen use is *intentional*; she proposed including language that the teacher must document the use of screen-based media on their lesson plan, so that usage can be monitored.

Dr. Brownlee shared that he will not be able to attend the Special Rules Meeting on March 8, but he will review the minutes and send questions when those minutes are available.

Chairperson Weinert adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Next meeting:

**March 8, 2016, 9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. (Special Rules Meeting)
Dix Grill**

**1101 Cafeteria Drive
Employee Center
Raleigh, NC 27603**

Future Meeting Dates:

May 16, 2016-Fourth Quarter Meeting

May 17, 2016-Special Rules Meeting

July 25, 2016-First Quarter Meeting

July 26, 2016-Special Rules Meeting

Meetings will be held at the Dix Grill, 1101 Cafeteria Drive, Employee Center, Raleigh, NC 27603