

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/09/12, Camarillo, CA**44. Ventura County – 10/09/12**

Hosted by: Local Planning Council of Ventura County	
Primary facilitator(s) name: Carrie Murphy	Phone: 805-437-1510 E-mail: cmurphy@vcoe.org
Number of attendees not including facilitator(s): 60	CCELP Element(s) that you focused on: Dual Language Learners Program Quality Assessment

44.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):
 - Funding: Increased reimbursement rates, restored to the 2009-10 levels.
 - Spaces: Free public system of high quality programs for 0-5 year olds with opportunity for all children to attend; full day learning for parents if desired; small group learning opportunities (parent and me, pre-k, state pre, full day, etc)
 - Facility Development: Create child care friendly land use powers and procedures that encourage and fund child care facility development
- Work Force Development(22 cards from this topic area):
 - Higher pay for teachers reflecting education requirements and supporting staff retention
 - Community Colleges: efficient and effective education that is current with the field's research and connected to higher education (consistency between institutions curricula); healthy funding for these colleges and to support teacher's ability to fund their higher education degrees.
 - Professional Development: Ongoing PD available, with access for both public and private (existing and future teachers and all staff working with children), focused on integrating meaningful language, literacy and math experiences and supporting special needs and family involvement.
 - Qualified and Educated Staff: All ECE teachers hold at least a 4 year degree.
- Quality Education (16 cards from this topic area):
 - High Quality DAP programs through lower ratios, diverse materials and a curriculum that is developmentally and culturally appropriate, less commercial, driven by assessment and integrated
 - Collaboration between Preschool and K-12 systems
 - Mandated participation in Quality standards for programs, regardless of funding (public or private)
- Health (14 cards from this topic area):
 - Nutrition: an established program in all ECE centers with balanced free meals.
 - Health: free quality health care and prevention care for all children from 0-5; where children receive services for needs.

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/09/12, Camarillo, CA

- Safety: safe environments are the foundation for quality care
- Mental health support at all schools
- Dual Language Learners (13 cards from this topic area):
 - Supported Dual language programs for early childhood with certified staff members for a quality bilingual education.
 - Contextualize teaching approaches with dual language learners (determine strategies that support DLL based on languages present; teacher vs. children and support families both bilingual and monolingual)
 - Strong oral language focus on teaching and learning for all children, including DLL's
- Family Involvement (11 cards from this topic area):
 - Strong economic and community resources for families to support effective, timely services (mental health, parenting skills, education and job stability)
 - School resources and programs supporting active parent engagement to reinforce parent's promotion of their child's development
 - Home visits: getting to know and understand the families outside of the classroom setting

44.II. Clarifying and Building on Plan Elements

Confirmed attendees were asked in an email to select two Elements for discussion, prior to our Local Input meeting (i.e. Public Forum); the top two responses were selected.

CCELP Element #1: Dual Language Learners

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

- Priorities identified from the group: #1) F5; #2) F7; #3) F8; and #4) F4 (with comments below)
- 15-20 minutes was needed at the start of the discussion to understand, clarify and define terms. It helped to have several higher education faculty facilitate this process. After reaching consensus on terminology, prioritizing became much easier. The language used in writing out some recommendations was deemed inappropriate by some participants (i.e. F2), questions arose around words used (i.e. what "systems" in F4) and participants wanted expansion on some items (i.e. F7 – assessment which drives curriculum; F4 – evidence based systems)

CCELP Element #2: Program Quality Assessment

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

- Priorities identified from the group: #1) L2 (with the point system vs. block system and L8 included emphasizing the importance of CLASS); #2) L10; and #3) L3
- Being a CSP/RTT County, several participants felt the template was not current in representing the QRIS hybrid matrix. However it became an opportunity to engage more community members with QRIS.

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/09/12, Camarillo, CA

- 15-20 minutes was needed at the start of the discussion to understand, clarify and define terms. It helped to have several higher education faculty facilitate this process. After reaching consensus, prioritizing became much easier.
- Debate around whether or not to include L8, knowing it is part of the State QRIS, but by including it as a priority the input of CLASS would be emphasized.

44.III. Prioritizing Final Plan Elements

Voting

Please list the top 5 elements your attendees voted on. Please use a numbered list.

1. Access to Quality Early Learning Care (33)
2. Dual Language Learners (18)
3. Family and Community Engagement (15)
4. Developmental Screening and Services to Children with Special Needs (15)
5. Attention to Food and Nutrition (15)

44.IV. Evaluation Comments

What was useful about our work today?

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

1. Hearing all the different points of view during small/large group discussions
2. Different points of view helped me understand what I would need to do when becoming a teacher
3. Knowing that our thoughts and input will be reported back; good to know. Seeing how other organizations prioritize their thoughts
4. Group work on CCELP – excellent opportunity to discuss and network
5. Focusing on language development; sharing ideas
6. Learning more about what CCELP is; what the components are; learning L1-L3 and different opinions
7. Hearing everyone's view on the L1-L13 policies. Seeing how some would agree on point of views and how some ideas like mine L11 works off L1 and L2
8. The workshops and information
9. Multiple agencies and the diversity of participants to discuss important ECE issues
10. Hearing the different voices and opinions of experts in the education field and how we can improve it for the future
11. Brainstorming and coming to a consensus of the importance of our children's education
12. Discussion group
13. Networking and hearing others comments
14. To be a part of the decision making process
15. It was a great opportunity to interact and listen to other members input. In addition, to be part of the CCELP; it was a great value to understand more about it.
16. Breaking down into small groups then coming back together for a bigger discussion; great points were addressed.
17. Great working with caring people in Ventura County
18. Working in the DLL group which is an area I do not generally know about
19. I like the discussion in group because this is the best way to know what we are thinking about the new strategy

Local Input Meeting Results Summary: 10/09/12, Camarillo, CA

20. Agreeing in part how the funds need to be distributed, mainly on what parts, and calculating the highest percentage
21. The opportunity to have input into the process and to hear what my colleagues around the County are thinking
22. Being able to discuss as a group different perspectives and cultures were represented. It allowed us to hear other perspectives from the field
23. One of the things that was very useful; the importance of people getting together for the same purpose, our children. Also because it helped me understand how things in the field I'm studying works
24. Reflection about the whole new CCELP
25. I found everything important, each comment from each person, the activities were useful
26. Getting more clarification about how the programs will be assessed and what to do with results. Small group discussion was informative and useful

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

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

1. Keep the activities
2. Discuss a lot and make sure you are heard because we need funds and our voices are the best tool for receiving necessary funds
3. More in depth research presentation; more clearly stated directions; overview of agenda's activities at beginning
4. Involving educators/parents for input and information
5. More students involved in these meetings and try to include parents or people of the community with no children or even grandchildren
6. More time to discuss benefits
7. It is always helpful to have the information prior to the discussion to digest it
8. Longer time to discuss more topics and more in depth
9. More direction – perhaps less options (it was a lot of consideration for a short period of time)
10. More time – more background on current changes in systems and materials
11. Clearer language about policy recommendations to help groups prioritize
12. More ideas about it
13. To be more involved in these workshops where we can be heard
14. None – this was well organized
15. You should have more advertisement for more people in the community to be involved
16. Everything was great! I have no suggestions
17. To extend the information about CCELP
18. Consider doing these meetings in Spanish

44.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
	x		