

**Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/12/12, Foster City, CA****41. San Mateo County – 10/12/12**

<b>Hosted by: First 5 San Mateo</b>	
<b>Primary facilitator(s) name:</b> The Glen Price Group	<b>Phone:</b> 650-802-5443 <b>E-mail:</b> ndillman@smcoe.k12.ca.us
<b>Number of attendees not including facilitator(s): 63</b>	<b>CCELP Element(s) that you focused on:</b> 1. Access 2. Developmental Screening 3. Dual Language Learners 4. Early Childhood Mental 5. Family and Community Engagement 6. Finance, Governance, and Other Systems Issues 7. Kindergarten Transition 8. Program Quality Assessment 9. Workforce Development

**41.I. Getting Started****Visioning activity**

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

- Access (28 cards from this topic area):
  - Universal access to high quality early care and education for children and their families
  - A cohesive high quality system with universal access for children birth to 18 that adequately meets their developmental needs and prepare them for success
  - Access to quality programs, teachers, and facilities for all children
  - Affordable free quality services for all children 0 to 6 years (attendance mandatory)
  - Universal access to early childhood combination of public and private and funding
  - All inclusive learning for children 0 - 18: self-reg, relational, art, music, high quality ready for future
  - Every child has access to high quality inclusive, early learning pre school experience for two years before start of school
  - Collaboration with families, CBOs and ed and govt agencies
  - Put children first and "Walk the Walk, Walk the Talk"
  - Dependable sufficient revenue stream
  - An adequately funded system that supports the diversity of children and families, including Developmental needs, learning needs, linguistic and cultural differences, and family
  - An adequately resourced system that helps families sustain and build strong relationships
  - Quality early education
  - Systemic support - access, resources, record keeping, societal support
  - Safe and quality care
  - Family involvement - transparent policies, family partnership
  - Nurturing families and caregivers
  - Authentic family engagement and outreach to all
  - Well trained - well compensated staff
  - Assessing and addressing individual needs of children (i.e. health, mental health, culture, ability)

**Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/12/12, Foster City, CA**

---

- High quality diverse, well paid teachers: including more male teachers, standard training for all and connecting to community
- Professionalization of ECE workforce, education, compensation, respect
- Integrated services and systems
- Health care for all families and kids age 0 to 18. Include mental, medical, dental, etc.
- Healthy safe homes/environments (including nutrition)
- Universal access to health care include dental, behavioral, and nutritional
- Early intervention for all families at risk
- Safe, affordable and healthy homes
- CA. policy supporting valuing many languages spoken as a springboard to achievement with ongoing professional development
- Inclusion of early childhood programs serving children and families for student/family success

**41.II. Clarifying and Building on Plan Elements**

---

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

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. A.22. Raise the quality of early learning and care programs through a...
2. A.1. Include early learning and care in a comprehensive Preschool to Grade 12...
3. A.6 and A.20 were tied for the 3rd place rank.

**Additional Comments:**

This group also added: A.23: Access to preschool and infant toddler care for individuals at risk for special needs and disabilities and those identified with IFSP and IEP (and be successful with supports).

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

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. E.1. Take steps to ensure that screening for developmental and health problems...
2. E.4. Include training on working with children with special needs in teacher preparation.
3. E.2. Standardize screening tools to facilitate revising assessment results...

**Additional Comments:**

This group added to A.4 as follows: ...and consultation/coaching and to ensure that children with special needs are included in quality ECE programs.

**CCELP Element #1: F. Dual Language Learners**

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. F.3. Focus on incorporating research-based strategies to teach dual language learners...
2. F.4. Move toward thinking of educating English learners as a systemic issue...
3. F.1. Target the subgroup of children with non-English-speaking parents for enrollment...

**CCELP Element #1: G. Early Childhood Mental Health/Behavioral Health Services**

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. G.3. Professionals providing treatment and interventions should have basic knowledge...

---

**Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/12/12, Foster City, CA**

---

2. G.5. The mental health system, policymakers, and funders must commit to creating...
3. G.2. Increase Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation in family child care programs.

**CCELP Element #1: I. Family and Community Engagement**

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. I.9. Use the following California Early Childhood Educator Competencies as a springboard...
2. I.5. Support family engagement in developmental and early learning services...
3. I.4. Provide training for teachers on building partnerships with families.

**Additional Comments:**

This group added notes stating that they would like to combine I.4 and I.7 to reflect partnership between parents/family/teacher so that communication and engagement goes both ways for success of the children (not as large of an emphasis on training teachers on interactive reading)

**CCELP Element #1: J. Finance, Governance, and Other Systems Issues**

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. J.7. Coordinate so that children and families experience a system that is not siloed...
2. J.11. Evaluate options for alternative governance structures, and change the structure...
3. J.12. Establish a Children's Cabinet composed of the heads of each agency and department...

**CCELP Element #1: K. Kindergarten Transition**

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. K.4. School entry policies should focus on offering opportunities for early educational...
2. K.1. Provide more guidance to districts on TK standards, frameworks, curriculum...
3. K.2. Provide support to districts on how to provide high quality TK and kindergarten...

**Additional Comments:**

- This group indicated a tie for Rank #2 being K.1 and K.6.
- They indicated they prefer to delete the following wording from K.4 [especially among children from low-income families] and add the following wording: "provide greater flexibility for educators/parents".
- This group also indicated that K.1 and K.6 support one another

**CCELP Element #1: L. Program Quality Assessment**

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. L.2. Establish a five-tier block system that assesses five quality elements...
2. L.7. Pilot a rating process that would employ environmental rating assessments...
3. L.13. Build a network of the 16 communities that have already established a QRIS.

**CCELP Element #1: M: Workforce Development**

*Prioritizing question. Please use bullet points: Priority 1 thru 3*

1. M.2. Set higher compensation levels for ECE teachers if ECE teacher education standards...
2. M.18. Address the need for financial supports for practitioners to pursue additional...
3. M.9. Implement an ECE workforce registry compatible with K-12 workforce data to...

**Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/12/12, Foster City, CA**

**41.III. Prioritizing Final Plan Elements**

**Voting**

1. Access to Quality Early Learning and Care
2. Early Childhood Mental Health/Health
3. Family and Community Engagement
4. Workforce Development
5. Finance, Governance, and Other Systems Issues

**41.IV. Evaluation Comments**

Using the following rating scale, please rate each of the workshop areas below:

5                      4                      3                      2                      1

**EXCELLENT                      AVERAGE                      POOR**

Content	Process	Facilitation	Venue
<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.2</b>

*Please provide comments on your rating above.*

- It was quick but very efficient!
- Great space; it got a little loud during the breakouts.
- Extremely organized.
- Room set up worked well.
- Visioning at the beginning was excellent way to set the stage for the afternoon.
- Rich content, unfamiliar for many elements.
- Thanks for a great overview of research and priority areas and then for putting us to work. Fun to work in several different groups.
- Access element is confusing as to whether it's addressing access to quality, special needs or other, so the special needs people in our group all voted for that and don't seem familiar with critical funding issues.
- Having a diverse group today, many without much knowledge of ECE field and critical issues, was both negative and positive.
- I think it would have been nice if we could have spread out a little ore when in the breakout groups. It was a little loud in the classroom.
- Elements should be de-duped, combined where possible, and worded consistently.
- About the process-it might be helpful to do some work before the meeting for feedback to be more insightful. For those who would have the time to do some thinking about prioritizing in advance, this could be a helpful strategy to consider.
- Acoustics not so great, and our table was badly warped, so we were trying to write on a slope.
- Excellent combination of providing information, soliciting information and leveraging local resources for an important investment in state's future.
- Overall it was well organized, good facilitation and discussion among a divers group of different backgrounds/specializations.

***Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/12/12, Foster City, CA***

---

- 1st activity: content was perhaps a little too broad, made it hard to feel like we'd finished our work.
- Overall the venue was great. Latecomers were put into the position of sitting with their backs to the speakers.
- Complex elements but glad to see them.
- For a Friday afternoon meeting, I would have wanted to be anywhere else! Great and inspiring work. I hope we can implement some of these locally and of course state wide.
- The process was challenging (due to amount of recommendations) but useful.
- After working in different roles in SM county over the last 30 years (public health, medical, COE, CCS), I have identified several systems issues at the local and state levels that impact CCEL and did not feel the process allowed for any consideration; early childhood mental health diagnostic services limited by medical providers.
- Meeting was well thought out and executed. Information was very valuable. AIR study was excellent; will download the entire report.
- Process for participation was good, and I felt we had adequate time to reach top 3.
- Food was great.
- Twisting in chairs during the presentation was distracting.
- Content was quick but informative.
- Facilitators were great.
- This was a well planned, well facilitated workshop. The timing was tight, but we got the work done; I felt like we had time to discuss.
- Excellent event; gave us a lot to think about everything that was presented.
- Is it possible to get copies of the slides?
- The process on prioritizing was challenging; some elements needed more time to digest.
- Content was excellent, incredibly valuable plan.
- Comprehensive resource, everything in one document.
- Process: loved opportunity to discuss with colleagues in groups.
- Facilitation: flowed well and stayed focused.
- Venue: needed round tables; discussion was hard to hear; chairs facing backward difficult to see PowerPoint.
- Some of the policy recommendations could have been clearer.
- Overall, amazing job of synthesizing a lot of complex information.
- The content in the AIR report, the timeline for state report and processes to gather feedback.
- I feel very informed as to what SM County will develop and proceed with recommendations.
- Process was too short, especially when you have such a passion for our county's ECE programs, children and families.
- Great job!
- Session was very informative. Topics were wide ranging and hopefully results will be useful for planning in San Mateo County.
- Room was a bit tight, though.
- The process allowed for representation from many participants.
- This is a much-needed planning forum to facilitate best learning practices and applications going forward.
- People had different perspective on how to rank, including "Do I rank measurable goals that can be implemented right away or long term goals."

***Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/12/12, Foster City, CA***

- A diverse group of stakeholders were present; I liked the format of the brainstorming; it started big and became more focused.
- Great content, great timing for a newcomer to the field. Very good process, facilitation well-managed.
- Venue acoustically problematic, no internet.
- Content was very clear and pertinent.
- Process very thought out, smooth.
- Excellent work in inviting a well-versed audience in early childhood issues from diverse backgrounds; made for rich discussions.
- Good balance of whole group/small group.
- Important info, well presented.
- Difficult to follow groups' share-out of priorities when seeing them in writing.
- Excellent process; well planned and facilitated. Great pace and content.
- The content of the meeting was comprehensive and very helpful in [something] the activities. The process was very good; it would have been nice to have more time for discussion.
- As long as male involvement at all levels throughout 0-5 are included and not hidden behind the term "family" I'll be happy.
- I loved the balance of group input, voting and announcements on the meta-analysis and purpose.
- The organization of the afternoon was great. Information provided at the beginning following small group work.
- Presenters were knowledgeable of the work and reading [sic] to answer questions.
- Nice venue, approach and workshop.
- Well organized, great overview, much material to go over.
- Very good process and presentations.

**What was useful about our work today?**

- Overview of the what and why of CCELP.
- AIR snapshot of the report.
- Group work allowed us to network, integrate ideas.
- Stimulate thought.
- The diversity of the attendees; nice to understand how today's input will be used.
- Hearing diverse perspectives.
- Connections with other organizations, discussion regarding common issues.
- The discussion on the individual topics.
- Research and data; understanding plan process; discussion.
- Hearing from others interested in the same topic area; small group discussion.
- Great to hear a little bit about the major elements of the plan.
- The group exercise.
- Collaboration and project progress update report.
- Chance to hear other views/visions.
- The meta-analysis overview was great.
- Small groups.
- Good people.
- Being able to hear and share recommendations.
- Meeting people from different roles and perspectives working in the field across the county.

***Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/12/12, Foster City, CA***

- First small group visioning process went well. Second was very frustrating; the recommendations were too scattered and numerous (access to ECE), and the conversation and voting were heavily influenced by a small minority in the group.
- Discussion and conversations with others.
- Seeing all areas of focus in one place.
- Opportunity to talk in small groups about the issues.
- I liked the small group activities and the way they were structured. It gave everyone and opportunity to participate.
- Small group for engagement and gathering input.
- The consensus in the room and what will be recommended for each topic that was addressed in the group sessions. All so important.
- Convening diverse stakeholders.
- The narrowing down of a multitude of priorities in an array of areas.
- Appreciate the opinions of stakeholders being cultivated.
- Group collaboration.
- To open the conversation with educators on how to best educate students for the future. Identify problem areas in children 0-3 who might have special needs.
- We really focused on bettering the education and lives of young people.
- Synthesis of research and policy recommendations, meeting county resource people.
- The opportunity to look at all the elements.
- All the different people in the room from different areas of the 0-5 will be helpful for what's needed for all our children in San Mateo County.
- The background and resources shared by AIR. The opportunity to discuss topics in small groups with participants from a range of agencies/interest areas.
- Be able to discuss at the table with people from different background, experience and perspectives were great.
- We had a great representation of the community in all areas.
- Small group discussion was rich.
- We want to make positive changes in the ECE field.
- Break-out sessions; knowledgeable facilitators.
- Small group discussion.

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

- I'm always smarter in the morning, but other than that, I thought it was informative and exciting work.
- Interdisciplinary groups e.g. ED, health...[the rest was indecipherable.]
- Keep up the great work.
- Encourage editing of recommendations; will help you in writing the plan.
- More time for break-out sessions.
- Would like to see outcome/sharing of progress after each phase. [smiley face]
- Could the tables be arranged perpendicular to the screen; half the attendees had difficulty turning around to see the speaker.
- Need more time for first activity.
- Would have liked one more color sticker for final activity to indicate something like low cost and not too difficult to implement.

***Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/12/12, Foster City, CA***

---

- Possibly having an opportunity to group like-minded or like-career folks together to brainstorm immediate changes.
- Quality was the theme for a lot of the groups. We have access issues for infants and toddlers due to current regs around part C services. We need to be sure that quality and evaluation processes do not take away from providing services. The more complicated the bureaucracy, the less direct services are provided because everyone is managing the bureaucracy; need state-level guidance and less county-to-county variability.
- I am wondering if the reporting out of the priorities of the recommendations might be done differently. Lots of auditory input. Maybe have a total list for us to be looking at and highlighting as the groups report out?
- For the last exercise, it would be easier if “state” and “local” were printed on the page and then you wouldn’t have to worry about colors of dots.
- Workforce development: combine some of the duplicates that were listed on the sheet.
- Information on the elements.
- Would love to continue opportunity for more dialogue.
- Allow tables to choose more than 3 “genie” wishes.
- To engage others - parents, child care providers and program providers – and across systems to gain input.
- More time to get more informed on all research that has been collected on the issues at hand and get more involved as to what the need of the county is that goes hand in hand with what will be presented.
- More discussion of early literacy.
- Expand universe of workshop participants.
- Define Access to Quality Care. Groups had difficulty with that definition; some focused on access, others on quality measures; took a lot of discussion to have unified understanding.
- Better training on facilitation. Streamline the policy recommendations worksheet and ranking format; it is confusing.
- Better venue.
- Separate family needs to be more father friendly throughout all of 0-5 areas; men are being excluded, maybe mandate a higher percentage of male involvement at all levels.
- More time to allow for providing input on more than one topic of interest.
- Local follow-up to incorporate the ideas and enthusiasm for implementing strategies.
- None, this was great!
- Teacher, assistants discuss DLL and help each other.
- As we were sharing, it would have been nice to have the items on the overhead so we had a better idea what each table chose and what they didn’t choose.
- I think it was excellent.

**Photos from the meeting may be viewed online in a private album at:**

<http://glenpricegroup.com/ccelp/sanmateolocalphotos/>