

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/19/12, Oakland, CA**32. PACE – 10/19/12**

Hosted by: Professional Association for Childhood Education (PACE)	
Primary facilitator(s) name: Gina Ayllon Heather Phebus	Phone: (415) 749-6851 E-mail: gina@pacenet.org hphebus@pacenet.org
Number of attendees not including facilitator(s): 30 attendees	CCELP Element(s) that you focused on: 1. Access to Quality to Quality Early Learning and Care 2. Workforce Development

32.I. Getting Started**Visioning activity**

Please list statements and themes from your meeting here. Please use bullet points:

3 Main Themes

- Adequate compensation for early care and education professionals, including directors, teacher, and additional on-site staff.
- Access to and support for all quality early care and education centers and/or facilities.
- Support for families regardless of income

List of Statements:

- To value staff for their competencies in working with children, rather than by the paper degree they hold
- Increased compensations to for quality, and ECE to become first priority for California
- Better pay and wages for ECE teachers with focus on comprehensive learning opportunities.
- “Buy in” by state, locals, parents, and community to support ECE.
- Subsidized, sliding scale fee structure for quality programs
- More special needs help for schools and families
- That each child has a healthy attached relationship with a stable, consistent adult/caregiver.
- That every early childhood professional can make a living income to support her/his family and be respected as educators.
- High-level training for all the teachers.
- B.A. requirements and high level pay
- Good pay for teachers
- High quality environment and interactions for children, birth to age eight
- Quality for all
- Programs that instill love of learning and respect for the planet
- That every child in a group care setting has high quality, play-based, developmentally appropriate experience with consistent, educated teachers and/or caregivers.
- More budget!
- More hours in the classroom for regular elementary levels
- Less children in each classroom, preschool through twelfth
- Smaller ratios in classrooms
- More training for teachers
- Having more play in schools

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/19/12, Oakland, CA

- Enforcing and paying teachers to continue education every year to learn new ideas
- More budget for schools, higher pay for teachers
- I wish all children came from loving homes---screening when necessary, more involved parents.
- I wish a “deep pocket” for all schools
- Nutritious meals for all children
- Compensation for teacher education
- Full services which follow the child: mental health, special needs, etc.
- Budgetary support for sustainable budgetary practices
- Money for all programs
- More parent participants
- Nutritious meals for all children
- More training/ professional education/development for staff
- More ECE training for teachers who are or will be teaching transitional Kindergarten
- Staff and teachers get paid higher wages and have great benefits
- All children would have access/ availability for a preschool experience
- Inclusive ECE programing
- Budget support – stipends
- Higher pay for teachers
- Families are supported in preparing their children for pre-school to Kindergarten and linking services for children with special needs
- That all children of California have access to quality early care and education regardless of income
- That children can learn through developmentally appropriate programs that embrace play-based, natural learning
- More communication between families and teachers
- Access for more children to quality childcare
- More opportunities for training for staff, teachers and families
- That there is legislative support and respect for ECE, including reimbursements and pay for ECE
- That there is support and a sense of value for all current ECE programs both private and public
- All children have access to quality programs, private and/or public
- Every child has the right to attend preschool
- Increased funding to provide high quality early learning opportunities for all children
- Reimbursement for continuing education for staff/teachers
- Easier access to services for families
- Family involvement
- Resource training
- First 5 training on CLASS to be available to all schools free of charge
- Programs would receive additional funds for quality to improve teacher benefits
- To improve Desired Results to insure teacher-child interactions
- Affordable, quality childcare
- Parent education
- Support systems for parents
- Sense of community for families

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/19/12, Oakland, CA

- Well trained, well paid teachers
- Affordable early learning programs
- Best practices and developmentally appropriate programs for all
- Parent (working poor/working class) would receive financial benefits towards ECE programs
- Resources for teachers to receive on-going training and remove the label of “babysitting”
- Leadership training for Directors
- Tolerance of all teaching philosophies
- Variety of program delivery
- Parents invest and profit from ECE

32.II. Clarifying and Building on Plan Elements

CCELP Element #1: Access to Quality Early Learning and Care

Prioritizing question. Please list responses to prioritizing CCELP Element #1 here. Please use bullet points:

- (1) Consider targeting linguistically isolated children.
- (1) Provide financial and non-financial incentives (e.g., higher reimbursements rates) to support continuous quality improvement in early learning and care programs.
- (1) Provide financial and non-financial incentives (e.g., higher reimbursement rates) to support continuous quality improvement in early learning and care programs.
- (1) Create a new state revenue source that supports early birth to five and within this stream set aside at least 30 percent for infants and toddlers.
- (2) Restructure the childcare reimbursement system for publicly funded infant-toddler programs so that providers are reimbursed for the true cost of providing quality care.
- (2) As models, look to other states with more stringent monitoring requirements for publicly funded exempt providers.
- (2) Recognize that quality, particularly the recruitment and retention of qualified teachers, costs more.
- (2) Advocate for and establish a “set-aside” or guaranteed minimum percentage for infant-toddler programs in the state and federal funds, such as Title 1, RTT-ELC grants, and Child Care and Development Fund.
- (3) Increase reimbursement rates for Title 5 programs to be a least equivalent to those for voucher programs, which are held to lower quality standards than title 5. This will make it more possible for Title 5 programs, one of the state’s higher quality programs, to remain in operation.
- (3) Recognized that quality, particularly the recruitment and retention of qualified teachers, cost more.
- (3) For infants and toddlers, target any expansive to children at high risk.
- (3) Include early learning and care in a comprehensive Preschool to grade 12 education and reform package with an equitable and adequate financing system.

CCELP Element #2: Workforce Development

Prioritizing question. Please list responses to prioritizing CCELP Element #2 here. Please use bullet points:

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/19/12, Oakland, CA

- (1) Set higher compensation levels to Early Childhood (ECE) teachers if ECE teacher education standards are to be set higher to improve recruitment and retention.
- (1) Pay attention to the content and quality of the degree program and the context of the ECE work environment (which can support or hinder effective practice), rather than focusing on attainment of particular degrees or credentials in isolation.
- (1) Focus degree programs and ongoing training on particular areas where research suggests teachers are not yet strong, such as dual language learners, children with special needs, and adult-child interactions that support children's cognitive and language development.
- (1) Pay attention to the content and quality of the degree program and the context of the ECE work environment (which can support or hinder effective practice), rather than focusing on attainment of particular degrees or credentials in isolation.
- (2) Institute a more rigorous program of evaluation for higher education programs in ECE, including measurement of effects on participant competencies, quality of care provided, retention in the ECE field and child developmental outcomes, and how those impacts are mediated by the work environment.
- (2) Develop a well-defined ECE career pathway and associated credentials that are aligned with the Early Childhood Educator Competencies, the postsecondary education and training programs, and the potential or actual QRIS.
- (2) Continue the process of alignment and articulation of the ECE curriculum within and across the California Community Colleges and the California State University system.
- (2) Set higher compensation levels for Early Childhood Education (ECE) teachers if ECE teacher education standards are set to be higher to improve recruitment and retention.
- (3) Address the need for financial supports for practitioners to pursue additional education and professionals, especially development, either through the workforce investment programs or the QRIS, if one is implemented.
- (3) Establish clear timelines with systemic support for an articulation and transfer process within and among colleges and universities, building on community colleges' efforts to align courses with state university courses to create a pathway toward two-and four-year degrees, but without creating dead ends for the early learning and care workforce.
- (3) Set higher compensation levels for Early Childhood Education (ECE) teachers if ECE teacher education standards are set to be higher to improve recruitment and retention.
- (3) Ensure broad availability of college courses and professional development opportunities for infant-toddler caregivers, and provide the additional supports for college readiness that are needed by infant-toddler caregivers to help them satisfy course requirements.

32.III. Prioritizing Final Plan Elements

Voting

Please list the results of the element voting activity in order from most to least votes. Please use a numbered list.

1. Access to Quality Early Learning and Care
2. Workforce Development
3. Developmental Screening and Services to Children with Special Needs
4. Finance, Governance, and Other Systems
5. Early Childhood Mental Health/Health
6. Child Assessment to Support School Readiness

32.IV. Evaluation Comments

What was useful about our work today?

1. Think together as professionals was a powerful so important.
2. Appreciate the opportunity to have a voice as a private sector.
3. Interesting to dialogue with others, and how they consider and rate these topics/elements.
4. Felt it was useful to be a part of this process---felt my ideas, recommendations and concerns were heard.
5. Concerned it may create large bureaucracy
6. Interesting discussions
7. Introduction and understanding of CCELP and process
8. As a privately owned program we are happy to be included in the CCELP process.
9. Very useful to have meaningful discussions with peers
10. Learning about the direction of ECE and feeling that as a provider, I may have input into the future of where the ECE field is going
11. Individual thinking time and then group thinking time.
12. Getting to hear about other people's priorities and the focus of their thinking
13. Getting the private sectors input!
14. Networking
15. Discussing the topics with colleagues at the table
16. Discussing priorities with colleagues
17. Being able to discuss the issues with people who were knowledgeable about the issues
18. Necessary update on where Early Childhood Education is heading in California
19. PACE CCELP meeting was very organized, once we understood what we were doing.
20. We appreciate giving our input.
21. Elements worked well once we knew/understood the points. Working as a group helped the table understand different views.
22. To advocate as a private provider and teacher, we are quality.
23. Information was well organized.
24. The elements were very clarifying on the facts in this field
25. Having an understanding on what is going on in ECE, and being able to have an input on the subject matters
26. Being able to have input on subjects/Elements.
27. Sharing with other PACE members
28. Learning about the current trends and focus issues, as well as networking
29. Gaining a broader understanding of CCELP and that access is key
30. Hearing other perspectives
31. Everything, especially sitting with a table of PACE members and sharing "a-hah" moments, and exchanging classroom stories.
32. Defining our priorities!
33. Gaining a broader understanding of CELP. The fact that we (the majority) understand and agree that access to quality early learning is the most important/common issue we have.
34. Most of the language of the policy is geared towards institutional learning for 0-5, which is inappropriate and unrealistic.
35. Having a better understanding of CCELP, and what others think.

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/19/12, Oakland, CA

What suggestions do you have for the other local input meetings?

1. Too many choices on the elements questions, and need more time or simplify the process.
2. Want the opportunity to have input on the other elements.
3. Too many choices within the rating questions ---some very challenging ideas require more time; however, enjoyed the overall process.
4. How will this affect the private sector?
5. Simplify the process
6. Policy recommendations seemed focused on funded programs and not include issues or concerns of private programs
7. The CCELP Element Policy Recommendations worksheets should be updated so that the items that are already being addressed are not included on the worksheet.
8. Would be nice to include a time that each item be presented in more details--- a lot of knowledge at the table and would have been nice to have time to hear the other perspectives.
9. More clarity (background) on the elements.
10. Many of the policy recommendations for the workforce development element are either completed or on their way---seems like the recommendations are not reflective of the current state of affairs.
11. Please update Element recommendation /forms
12. Include an overview of recommendations that have already been implemented either fully or will be implemented/ on the track to be implemented in the future--- this way peoples' votes will count.
13. Have someone who can address which issues have already been addressed so votes and discussions are not wasted. All groups should have facilitator who is knowledgeable and joins the small group discussions.
14. Need more current "recommendation worksheets".
15. Did not understand how our input in scoring the elements would effect CCELP decisions to make changes in ECE.
16. Where can we find the answers to the questions that were asked—we would like to see where the input went
17. We need more time to have a better understanding about everything, including the elements.
18. Have a quick discussion on what the issues were/are
19. PACE presenters were very helpful with explaining the issues.
20. Thank you, PACE for hosting this meeting. We do appreciate all that you do. However, did not understand how our opinion would impact your decision.
21. What is our impact on this?
22. Make this information clear as whom it is for.
23. More information on how our answers on the elements are going to be used in the future, impact on my choices. Where can we find information on our answers to today's questions?
24. More time, so that we have a way better understanding of some subject matters that are fairly new to the field.
25. By us voting, where does it have an impact
26. The private sector, Title 22 is left out and these programs are a key part of the ECE system in CA, and are quality programs!
27. Add other programs under Title 22, parent choices, faith base, co-opts, etc.
28. I would love if they could dates out a year in advance...so that we could pencil it in.

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/19/12, Oakland, CA

29. We should continue the conversation and sharing of ideas. The policy should be all inclusive to all quality programs

32.V. Facilitator's Evaluation

Please rate how easy it was to use this toolkit

1 – Very easy to use	2	3	4 – Very hard to use
	XXX		