

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 11/08/12, San Diego, CA

37. San Diego Infant and Toddlers Community Stakeholders – 11/08/12

Hosted by: San Diego Infant and Toddlers Community Stakeholders ³			
Primary facilitator(s) name:	Phone:619-316-2343		
Michelle Soltero	E-mail: msolter@wested.org		
Number of attendees not including	CCELP Element(s) that you focused on:		
facilitator(s):	Access to Quality Early Learning and Care		
13 participants	Family and Community Engagement		
	Program Quality Assessment		
	Workforce Development		

37.I. Getting Started

Visioning activity

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

- **Higher standards for ECE Professionals** [Adequate funding to support education and training especially birth to 3; minimum education for all child care workers; quality rating system will be inclusive of all types of quality improvement assessments tools such as CDA. Inclusive of all types of programs, centers; family child care; faith based; nonprofit; state funded and equal opportunity to participate. Improve licensing requirements- required annual training hours, units, quarterly site visits; required curriculum and improved health and safety standards.]
- Education and Resources for Parents [give parents opportunity to stay with their children at least for the first two years. Instead the government pays child care; let the mothers have longer time with their young children. New parents receive more information regarding their child's development and importance of the first three years and quality child care.
- Access [paid child care for all eligible families at rates that supports quality standards; all parents have quality early care and education regardless of income]

37.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:

- 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.
- A.9 Support the implementation of the federal home visitation program and coordinate and link with early learning programs, including license-exempt as well as licensed providers.
- A.18 Restructure the child care reimbursement system or publicly funded infant-toddler programs so that providers are reimbursed for the true cost of providing quality care.

CCELP Element #2:	Program Quality	y Assessment
CCELI Element #2.	_i rogram Quant	y Assessment

³ San Diego Association for the Education of Young Children Infant Toddler Committee, WestEd, The Program for Infant Toddler Care, Partners for Quality, and YMCA Childcare Resource Service



Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 11/08/12, San Diego, CA

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

- L.8 Given the growing body of research that demonstrates the importance of quality adult-child interactions or children's learning and development use the Classroom Assessment Scoring System in a random sample of classrooms on a periodic basis in order to supplement the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale- Revised [ECERS-R] data.
- L.7 Pilot a rating process that would employ environment rating assessment every two to three years and at higher tiers, would measure teacher-child interactions for preschoolers with the Classroom Assessment Scoring System [CLASS] and for infant/toddlers with the Program Assessment Rating Scale.
- L.10 After the Quality Rating and Improvement System [QRIS] is in place, provide technical and financial assistance to help providers improve their ratings.

Comment: The rating systems [ECERS and the like] do not address the relationships between provider and child, child and parent and parent and provider. The relationships component is critical for proper infant toddler development.

CCELP Element #3:	Workforce Development						
Prioritizing question. Pleas	se list responses to prioritizing	CCELP	Element	#3 here.	Please	use	bullet
points:							

- 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 supports children's cognitive and language development.
- M.18 Address the need for financial supports for practitioners to pursue additional education and professional development, either through the workforce investments programs or the QRIS, if one is implemented.
- 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.

CCELP Element #4:Family and Community Engagement
Prioritizing question. Please list responses to prioritizing CCELP Element #4 here. Please use bulle
points:

- I. 10 Establish a brand for the Quality Rating and Improvement System [QRIS that informs and promotes quality early learning and care programs.

 Comment: This piece would communicate to parents the quality of a program in a manner that would be easily understood.
- I.3 Consider funding programs in conjunctions with other evidence based strategies for disadvantaged children, such as home visiting or programs that combine parent education with center based education.
 - Comment: What activities could be utilized to support relationships and parent/child support with minimal privacy invasion? Example, music therapy or other "like activities."
- I.2 Make Title 22 licensing requirements for both family child care and centers include the provision of written information and orientation for families at the time of enrollment.



Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 11/08/12, San Diego, CA

37.III. Prioritizing Final Plan Elements

Voting

Please list the top 4 elements your attendees voted on. Please use a numbered list.

- 1. Access to Quality Early Learning and Care
- 2. Family & Community Engagement
- 3. Workforce Development
- 4. Program Quality Assessment

37.IV. Evaluation Comments

What was useful about our work today?

Please list the comments you received. Please use a numbered list.

- 1. Hearing other professionals' ideas and suggestions! Bringing different professionals makes for very interesting and important conversations.
- 2. Hopefully we can work at the grass roots level to help the persons who control the funding determine the true priorities of early education from the people in the field.
- 3. Hopefully our input will help determine what exactly is focused on. Listening to others input helped to shed light on gray areas based on their experiences.
- 4. Everything! Thank you for your efforts to improve how we serve children.
- 5. An opportunity to voice my interest to suggest improvements on early care programs.
- 6. It is as a great opportunity to have our voices hear. There were some great ideas and thoughts circulated among us and we hope these will go to the right people and will a make difference.
- 7. Discussing the elements with other professionals that have a passion for quality and infants and toddlers. Sharing stories, experiences and knowledge.
- 8. First of all it was great idea coming together. Early Childhood educators and share their ideas. Secondly it was a good knowledge and the facilitator was great teacher.
- 9. To hear what other people in the child care field thought was important. Appreciated being able to have my voice heard regarding the importance of quality child care.
- 10. I.6 was useful. I learned how important children, early childhood and that staff need some education.
- 11. Learning more about the content and possible direction of the proposed system. Having input to the global process.
- 12. There were many different backgrounds of the participants, but all were able to collaborate and share ideas to come up with the most important recommendations.
- 13. Clarifying what is important for infants and toddlers.

What suggestions do you have for the other local input meetings? Please list the comments you received. Please use a numbered list.

- 1. Hopefully to get more individuals involved everyone has opinions but their voices could be heard.
- 2. This was a very well run meeting don't change a thing.
- 3. Working in small groups provides opportunities to share ideas.
- 4. Be honest we can make a difference.
- 5. None, good pace, information
- 6. Continuing the way you are doing
- 7. None, Michelle did great!



Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 11/08/12, San Diego, CA

37.V. Facilitator's Evaluation

1. Please rate how easy it was to use this toolkit

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