

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/30/12, Sacramento, CA**35. Sacramento County – 10/30/12**

Hosted by: Sacramento County Office of Education	
Primary facilitator(s) name: Natalie Woods Andrews, Ed.D.	Phone: (916) 228-2555 E-mail: nwoodsandrews@scoe.net
Number of attendees not including facilitator(s): 43	CCELP Element(s) that you focused on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services to Children with Special Needs • Assessment to Support School Readiness • Program Quality Assessment • Early Childhood Mental Health/Health • Family and Community Engagement • Access to Quality Early Learning and Care • Workforce Development

35.I. Getting Started**Visioning activity**

- Access to high-quality programs:
 - Access for all children to free, high-quality child development programs
 - Universal preschool with equitable access for 0-5 year olds
 - Curriculum for children that respects their competence in learning
 - Every child will receive a quality early childhood education
 - Every family will have: access to quality early childhood programs; and knowledge and skills necessary to raise healthy, happy children, who will be successful in school
 - Equal access to high-quality preschool (fully funded with small size classes) for all children
 - Universal preschool for all!
 - High-quality programs
- Comprehensive Support:
 - Comprehensive support services to children and families
 - Strengthen and wide collaborative partnerships with families, community and schools in a way that is reflective and honoring of the children's cultures in the community.
 - Programs are designed to serve all children (environment, staff team, support in program) with disabilities, ELL, and challenging behaviors.
- Family Engagement and Support:
 - Alignment and promotion of an effective system and supports for families
 - Legislators that prioritize the interest of children and families
 - Families having the background to support their children
 - Programs receive support and engage in effective, robust and positive family engagement and collaboration
- Teacher Preparation and Compensation:
 - Compensated and professionally supported field
 - Certificated teachers that meet consistent education requirements e.g. BA, MA
 - Professionally prepared, dedicated and well compensated staff

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/30/12, Sacramento, CA

- More than adequate training for educators/teachers
- Early learning professionals will have unprecedented access to credentialing and degree programs in ECE and 100% funding support for all teachers – and that teachers will be viewed as the gateway to educational opportunities and compensated accordingly.
- Fiscal Resources:
 - Fiscal resources to support quality of early childhood education

35.II. Clarifying and Building on Plan Elements

Yellow highlights indicate suggested edits to original meta-analysis recommendations.

CCELP Element #1: Developmental Screening and Services to Children with Special Needs

Round 1		Round 2	
1	E.1. Take steps to ensure that ongoing screening for developmental and health challenges is conducted for all children in early care and education programs taking into consideration second language acquisition to determine if children would benefit from individualized support to be successful or/and may be eligible for IDEA services.	1	E.1. Take steps to ensure that screening for developmental health problems is conducted for all children, in all classrooms, early in the program year to provide appropriate intervention prior to determining children may be eligible for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Services.
2	E.4. Include training on working with children with special needs in teacher preparation and ongoing professional development.	2	E. 4. Include training on working with children with special needs in teacher preparation.
New 3	E.7. Special Education staff provide support to child, family and early care teacher in the early care and education program collaborating together.	3	E.2. Standardize screening tools to facilitate revising assessment results and making consistent decisions across classrooms and groups of children.

CCELP Element #2: Child Assessment to Support School Readiness

Round 1		Round 2	
1	C.2. Identify and address children's needs earlier in their lives through ongoing, developmentally appropriate assessments, including the adoption of a statewide kindergarten assessment observation instrument.	1	C.3. Promote the use of child assessments by Early Childhood Education (ECE) caregivers and teachers to improve practice. Provide professional development to support effective use by teachers.
2	C.3. Promote the use of child assessments by Early Childhood Education (ECE) caregivers and teachers to improve learning. Provide professional development to support effective use by teachers and child care givers.	2	C. 1. Invest in training and technical assistance to counties on how to report Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) results on an individual basis while de-identifying data securely. Ensure that this child-level data can be linked to other data at the classroom and teacher level. (add program, district, county & state levels – include DRDP access)
3	C.1. Invest in training and technical assistance to counties and tribes on how to report Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) including DRDP access results on an individual basis while de-identifying data securely. Ensure that this child-level data can be linked to other data at the classroom and teacher level.	3	C.2. Identify and address children's needs earlier in their lives through ongoing, developmentally appropriate assessments, including the adoption of a statewide kindergarten assessment observation instrument. (not contrived) observe in typical routines and natural environments authentic.
			C.5. note: high stakes = loss of objectivity with teacher assessment (DRDP can be fairly subjective)

CCELP Element #3: Program Quality Assessment

Round 1		Round 2	
1	L. 1. Establish a quality rating structure such that: obtaining an entry level rating requires meeting Title 22 licensure standards; obtaining a mid-level rating requires meeting Title 5 contract standards; and, obtaining a top level rating requires meeting nationally recommended quality standards, such as those of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).	NEW 1	L.14: Create a quality rating system that relies most strongly in a rich and valid assessment system that includes observation direct child assessment and documentation of children's emerging development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. rationale: positive child-outcomes are the best index of quality and therefore should be at the center. b. previous evidence shows that structural and regulable aspects are not good indications of quality; ECERS and CLASS are valuable but incomplete indicators of quality and are at the class level.
2	L.2. Establish a five-tier block system that assesses five quality elements. A program would need to meet all the standards within each tier before advancing to the next tier. The five quality elements are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratios and group size • Staff education and training 	2	L. 2. Establish a five-tier block system that assesses five quality elements. A program would need to meet all the standards within each tier before advancing to the next tier. The five quality elements are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratios and group size • Staff education and training

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/30/12, Sacramento, CA

	• Teaching and learning • Program leadership • Family involvement		• Teaching and learning • Program leadership • Family involvement
3	L. 10. After the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is in place, provide technical and financial assistance to help providers improve their ratings.	3	L. 10. After the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is in place, provide technical and financial assistance to help providers improve their ratings.
L.10. Rationale:		Achieving high quality is a process of continuing improvement financial and other sources of support for program improvement should be provided.	
L.2. Rationale:		Recommend changing “a program would need to meet standards related to each of the 5 elements”	

CCELP Element #4: Early Childhood Mental Health/Health

Round 1		Round 2	
1	G.5. The mental health system, policy makers, and funders must commit to creating and sustaining a trained workforce in mental health.	1	G. 1. Establish a common, cohesive, effective approach for (to facilitate children's) social-emotional development across the state by using the CSEFEL model, which aligns with California's social-emotional Preschool Learning Foundations.
New 2	G. 8. Educate families on the importance of early intervention services and 'buy in' to the process.	2	G.4. Clinical judgment, combined with parent voice, is needed to set priorities, choose, and adapt early childhood mental health programs in ECE settings.
3	G. 1. Establish a common, cohesive, effective approach for social-emotional development across the state by using the CSEFEL model, which aligns with California's social-emotional Preschool Learning Foundations. To include all early care and education facilities – federally funded, state funded, private sector and exempt programs.	3	G. 3. Professionals providing treatment and interventions should have basic knowledge in key areas such as those outlined in the California Training Guidelines and Personnel Competencies for Infant-Family and Early Childhood Mental Health, Revised.
Suggestion:		G.2. Increase Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation in family child care programs and support in early learning programs.	
Suggestion:		G. 7. Continue to fund research on the short- and long-term effectiveness of early childhood mental health services. Include training on working with children with special needs in teacher preparation and ongoing professional development.	

CCELP Element #5: Family and Community Engagement

Round 1		Round 2	
1	I.4. Provide training for teachers on building partnerships with families through collaboration that focuses on a child's individual development.	1	I.3. Consider funding programs in conjunctions with other using evidence-based strategies for disadvantaged all children, such as home visiting or programs that combine parent education with center-based education.
2	I.5. Support family engagement in developmental and early learning services for infants and toddlers from prenatal through the earliest points of their entry into the programs.	2	I.1. Require programs to submit plans for how they will partner with families and meet their cultural and linguistic needs, and how they will recruit and retain staff members who reflect the community and provide accessibility for all families.
3	I.9. Use the following California Early Childhood Educator Competencies as a springboard for a more specific measurable menu of best practices for engaging families: • Culture, Diversity, and Equity • Family and Community Engagement • Dual-Language Development	3	I.8. Use the Environmental Rating Scale subscale for “Parents and Staff” to measure family involvement as well as the Title 22 licensing requirements related to family engagement as proxies for the family engagement element of the rating scale.
Suggestion:		I.9. Use the following California Early Childhood Educator Competencies, Environmental Rating Scale for “Parents and Self” and Title 22 licensing requirements as a springboard for a more specific measurable menu of best practices for engaging families: • Culture, Diversity, and Equity • Family and Community Engagement • Dual-Language Development	
Suggestion:		Combine I.8. and I.9.	

CCELP Element #6: Access to Quality Early Learning and Care

Round 1		Round 2	
1	A.1. Include early learning and care in a comprehensive Preschool Birth to Grade 12 18 education and reform package with an	1	A.22. Raise the quality of early learning and care programs through a multi-pronged approach that includes quality measurements and monitoring, financial incentives and supports, and accountability through evaluating child outcomes to include

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/30/12, Sacramento, CA

	equitable and adequate financing system.		access for children with special needs (as defined by children with IFSPs and IEPs, with a guaranteed minimum of 10%).
2	A.4. Create a There is a new state revenue source that supports early learning birth to five and within this stream set aside at least 30 percent for infants and toddlers.	2	A.4. Create a new protected state revenue source that supports early learning birth to five and within this stream set aside at least 30 percent for infants and toddlers.
3	A.22. Raise the quality of early learning and care programs through a multi-pronged approach that includes quality measurements and monitoring, appropriate documentation of teaching and learning financial incentives and supports, and accountability through evaluating child outcomes.	3	A.19. Provide higher reimbursement rates in a tiered system for programs meeting standards at the higher levels of a Quality Rating and Improvement System and recognize that quality, particularly the recruitment and retention of qualified teachers.
Suggestion:		The system should be constructed from the point of view of the learner and the child's experience.	

CCELP Element #7: Workforce Development

Round 1		Round 2	
1	M.7. Develop the Early Childhood Educator Competencies, which include the Foundations, into a common and comprehensive course of study that is reflected in courses for associate's and bachelor's degrees and is delivered statewide.	1	M.13. 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.
2	M.3. 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.	2	M.17. Ensure that the Early Childhood Educator Competencies adequately prepare infant-toddler professionals, especially on issues critical to that age group such as emergent language, family engagement and reflective practice.
New 3	Compensation and resources need to be aligned to teacher education standards required of our workforce.	3	M.2. Set higher compensation levels for Early Childhood Education (ECE) teachers if ECE teacher education standards are to be set higher to improve recruitment and retention.

35.III. Prioritizing Final Plan Elements

Voting

Ranking	Element	# of Votes
1	Access to Quality Early Learning and Care	20
	Early Childhood Workforce Development	20
2	Family Engagement	14
3	Program Quality Assessment	11
	Services to Children with Special Needs	11
4	Child Assessment to Support School Readiness	8
5	Early Childhood Mental Health, Health	6

35.IV. Evaluation Comments

What was useful about our work today?

1. I was so happy to see so many different entities from the community involved in today's workforce. I think it will be very important for those who make policies and develop this plan to have access to the opinions of those who actually work with children 0-5 or have actual involvement.
2. I think being able to see priority and help redefine items that are significant to my program is valuable.
3. Voices were heard, great format and networking with other professionals was useful.
4. Small group discussion and allowing us to learn and rewrite the elements.

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/30/12, Sacramento, CA

5. Networking with others and seeing how we value the same things in this form of work.
6. Being able to talk to other stakeholders and define what we are talking about e.g. Title 1 was not familiar to me and Title 5 was not familiar to others.
7. Having diverse points of view that represent different consumers and providers of ECE.
8. The overview of CCELP and understanding of the plan and its purpose. Group focus on an element and learning from others as we discussed and decided on recommendations. Remaining on time and honoring time frames in the scheduled program.
9. Listening to the input from so many professionals in the field and the group activities.
10. The entire presentation and how the information may be used.
11. Collaborative efforts were very useful.
12. Hearing and sharing the dreams for continuing the work.
13. Breakout sessions were good, great conversation and discussion of priorities.
14. Really being able to listen to many different voices and viewpoints about important issues regarding children. Getting to look in-depth at topics and being able to see that there are topics that are important to many different individuals.
15. A chance to hear from a group regarding challenges in EL – interesting to see where others think we should head and it was well paced and thought out.
16. Networking with other participants and table facilitator
17. Very organized and well facilitated
18. Focused conversation and the ability to edit descriptions in the elements
19. Coming together as a multi-disciplinary team of stakeholders to talk about what California values in regards to early childhood education.

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

1. Involve teachers and families - these are the two main groups that will end up implementing the suggestions, these two groups actually do the work we are talking about.
2. More time for group discussions and gallery walk, there was not enough time to be completely thoughtful about my input, especially when considering writing a new recommendation or editing an existing one.
3. Family engagement did not have great recommendations – all “considering” and no action – this element needs its own work group. All other elements have stakeholders but this is where the work extends beyond the classroom to the community where it’s needed.
4. Send out notification earlier and documentation earlier so that two have more time to digest meeting notes. Lots of information without much time to go over everything.
5. A little more time in groups
6. This was great; I love feeling like I’m involved in something that matters.
7. Definition of terms, we have a mixed group.
8. Enjoyed the process, maybe just more time for opening activity or just do 1 wish, felt a little rushed.
9. Web-based survey or webinar
10. Before stating recommendations asking if participants have any questions, need clarification on any of the recommendations.
11. To strongly urge participants to read prep materials prior to participating.
12. More time to share input.
13. No changes.
14. Less overview to provide more opportunity to hear from other groups.

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/30/12, Sacramento, CA

15. If there were a way to move the meeting forward faster, it would be helpful.
16. Make sure to make open Monday-Friday after 6pm so that teachers can attend.
17. Stress the ability to edit/add actions to the elements.
18. Online access during the weekend.

35.V. Facilitator's Evaluation

Please rate how easy it was to use this toolkit

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