



Meeting 4 Summary

California Commission on Teacher
Credentialing Child Development Permit
Workgroup

February 2024

The content of this report was developed under a grant from the Department of Education through the Office of Program and Grantee Support Services (PGSS) within the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), by the Region 15 Comprehensive Center at WestEd under Award #S283B190053. This contains resources that are provided for the reader's convenience. These materials may contain the views and recommendations of various subject matter experts as well as hypertext links, contact addresses, and websites to information created and maintained by other public and private organizations. The U.S. Department of Education does not control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of any outside information included in these materials. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service, enterprise, curriculum, or program of instruction mentioned in this document is intended or should be inferred.

Workgroup Meeting 4

Meeting Date and Time

The Child Development Permit Workgroup met virtually on January 16, 2024, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Attendees

Workgroup Members

- Amy Smith, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
- Becky Green, Imperial Community College District
- Chris Reeve, Legislative Director, California School Board Association
- Christine Shreve, Holy Cross Preschool
- Giovanni Aragon, Community Action Partnership Kern
- Giselle Navarro-Cruz, Cal Poly Pomona
- Heather Snipes, El Dorado County Office of Education
- Helen Davis, University of California, Los Angeles
- Hilary Seitz, California State University Chancellor's Office
- Jacqueline Cruz, United Teachers Los Angeles
- Jeanne Veich, Shasta College
- Jessica Tejada, Mount Pleasant Elementary School District, San Jose
- Julie Montali, Sacramento County Office of Education

- Katie Mervin, EDvance College
- La Tanga Hardy, Los Angeles Community College District
- Liz Alvarado, Californians Together
- Mandy Redfern, Glendale Unified School District
- Melissa Wheelahan, Orange County Office of Education
- Nicole Willard, Windmill School, Portola Valley
- Pranita Venkatesh, Paragon Montessori, San Carlos
- Ranae Amezquita, Los Angeles Unified School District
- Stephanie Orozco, First 5 Los Angeles
- Tommetta Shaw, Mount St. Mary's University
- Toni Isaacs, Ventura County Office of Education
- Valerie Denero, EveryChild California

Liaisons

- Cathy Yun, Learning Policy Institute
- Deborah Stipek, Stanford University
- Erin Dubey, California Department of Education
- Kate Williams-Brown, Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- Lisa Velarde, California Department of Social Services
- Melanee Cottrill, Head Start
- Monica Belton, California Department of Social Services
- Shanna Birkholz-Vasquez, California Department of Education

Members of the Public

- Alana Pinsler, California Department of Education
- Alice Chinn, Merrit College
- Alicia McFarland, Ventura County Office of Education
- Amanda Shoffner, San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools
- Andrea Fernandez-Mendoza, CA Children's Academy
- Angie Ford, California Department of Education
- Beth Kirkley, Ukiah Unified School District

- Caroline Jen, East Los Angeles College
- Chan Theus, Grannas Daycare
- Cherid Doria, Lindsay Unified School District
- Clarence McFerren, University of California Merced Extension
- Crystal Jones, Crystal Clear Learning Center
- Diana Flores, Ventura County Office of Education
- Diana Prado, Escondido Union School District
- Donne Cecil, San Diego Mesa College
- Glorious Jackson, Auntie Dobbies Kids
- Heather Haubrich, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Jannika Wagner, KidarooCare
- Jennifer Osalbo, California Department of Education
- Jessica Sawko, Children Now
- Jessica Parra, Santa Maria Bonita School District
- Laprice Brown, San Joaquin Delta College
- Lisa Wilkin, Child Development Consortium of Los Angeles
- Lupe Granados, International Institute of Los Angeles
- Malissa Mastropierro, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Maria Rosales, Merced County Office of Education
- Martina Ebesugawa, Diablo Valley College
- Nellie Rios-Parra, Lennox School District
- Nyisha Galvez, HG Learning Academy
- Phyllis Jacobson, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- Rachel Bynum, Luv Muffins Preschool and Childcare
- Ramona Thomas, Sacramento County Office of Education
- Rocio Munoz, Bakersfield City School District
- Sara Gassner-Wollwage, San Mateo County Office of Education
- Sherry Groce, New Generation Childcare
- Shmahsad Khalil, San Francisco Unified School District
- Sole G., Options for Learning

- Storiann Camps, Bakersfield City School District
- Terrissa Hein, Contra Costa County Office of Education
- Theresa Hill, Hill Dreamz Daycare
- Tonia McMillian, BlackECE
- Tony Jordan, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Valentina Ware, California Department of Education
- Victoria Coverson-Baxter, San Mateo County Office of Education Early Learning Services
- Yolanda Thomas, Best Beginnings

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Staff

- David DeGuire
- Debra Keeler
- Bronwyn Kennedy
- Mika Laidler
- Renee Marshall
- June Millovich
- Christina Villanueva

Region 15 Comprehensive Center Staff

- Liz Jameyson
- Victor Diaz
- Edith Gurolla
- Barbara Jones
- Brianna Moorehead
- Krista Murphy
- Khamia Powell

Meeting Items

Item 1: Welcome and Connection

Renee Marshall and Dr. Debbi Keeler welcomed the Child Development Permit (CDP) Workgroup members, liaisons, and members of the public. Liz Jameyson led a brief connection activity, shared findings from Meeting 3, and reviewed the Workgroup Agreements.

To ground the segment, Dr. Keeler reviewed the agenda and CDP Workgroup Charge, and Ms. Jameyson provided a reminder of the Workgroup's process through a roadmap graphic that showed the topics for each of the planned seven meetings.

Item 2: Permit Levels Discussion

Ms. Jameyson provided a summary of the data from Meeting 3, including the poll results for collapsing current permit levels. Ms. Jameyson reviewed points of balance that emerged from the data, including balancing access and quality and balancing units, degrees, and coursework with other training and professional learning methods.

Ms. Marshall presented the first drafts of the proposed permit models, which were developed by considering Workgroup input.

- **Model A (the teal model):** This model includes three educator levels and one administrative level, with the suggested education level of a bachelor's degree.
- **Model B (the red model):** This model includes three educator levels and two administrative levels; the first administrative level has the suggested educational level of an associate's degree, while the second has the suggested education level of a bachelor's degree.

Workgroup members and liaisons were offered time to reflect upon each model and ask clarifying questions.

Item 3: Matrices (Permit Level) Discussion

Ms. Marshall reiterated that the draft models are a work in progress. Dr. Keeler then walked through each model thoroughly.

Workgroup members and liaisons were presented with the two models to work with more closely. Each Workgroup member and liaison chose a program-specific affinity group by considering where their expertise could best support the needs of the early childhood education field. These affinity groups included

- California State Preschool Program (CSPP)
- Department of Social Services-funded programs
- Community-based programs
- Head Start
- Family child care

Workgroup members and liaisons moved into their expertise-specific breakout room to discuss the models in depth. Once in a program-specific breakout room, Workgroup members and liaisons discussed the models and authorizations for each permit level and determined which model they preferred while attending to the key questions and considerations below.

Key Questions

Considering the recommendations outlined in the Master Plan, which model will most adequately support the preparation of the workforce:

- For their job roles, considering the needs of employers for well-qualified staff?
- To develop the knowledge and skills needed to meet the multifaceted educational and developmental needs of children?

After considering each column of the models, what would be your preferred matrix, in addition to any changes you would make? How will the various proposed ideas adequately support the preparation of the workforce for their job roles, considering the needs of employers for well-qualified staff.

Considerations

The number of units or the degree specified are suggestions only and should be discussed by the Workgroup. The authorizations borrow heavily from the current permit matrix and should be discussed by the Workgroup. The current versions have removed titles and replaced them with terms such as “ECE 1,” “ECE 2,” and so on. The Workgroup should discuss whether this is the preferred approach.

Points of balance

- Access and quality
- Units, degrees, coursework, and other methods of training and professional learning

Workgroup members and liaisons shared their responses to the key questions and considerations based on the model they selected. Each group shared a group-created slide highlighting their main points of discussion.

After the meeting, all responses were analyzed and themed. From this analysis, several themes arose, including a focus on education requirements and one versus two administrative levels.

Item 4: Entry-Level Pathways into the Profession

Ms. Marshall gave a brief overview of entry-level pathways. She described the multiple pathways into the profession, including

- Preprofessional
- College and career readiness pathway/career technical education
- Regional occupational program (ROP)
- Apprenticeships
- Aide to pre-teacher
- Re-entry

Workgroup members and liaisons returned to their program-based breakout groups and focused on their model of choice while considering how to best support entry into the profession. The groups attended to a key question while considering two points of balance.

Key Question

How can the model best support entry into the profession, taking into account the variety of pathways into the profession?

Considerations

Points of balance

- Access and quality
- Units, degrees, coursework, and other methods of training and professional learning

Workgroup members and liaisons shared their responses to the key questions and considerations based on the model they selected. Each group shared a group-created slide highlighting their main points of discussion.

After the meeting, all the responses were analyzed to determine the Workgroup's understanding of who is entering the profession and the support needed to enter the profession.

Item 5: Pathways to the TK–12 System

Ms. Marshall and Dr. Keeler reviewed updates from the PK–3 certification process. Workgroup members and liaisons returned to their program-based breakout groups and focused further on the matrices while discussing how to best position educators interested in pursuing various credentials. The groups answered a key question while considering two points of balance.

Key Question

How could levels ECE 1–3 best position educators who are interested in pursuing a PK–3 credential, multiple or single subject credential, or TK–12 administrator credential?

Considerations

Points of balance

- Access and quality
- Units, degrees, coursework, and other methods of training and professional learning

After the meeting, all responses were analyzed, and two main themes were found: understanding of alignment between the permit and the TK–12 system and ideas and opportunities for bridging between the systems.

Item 6: Field Connections

Ms. Kennedy shared data based on the Commission on Teacher Credentialing's outreach efforts to elicit input from the field through additional focus groups. Focus groups were conducted in September, November, and December of 2023. Data reflected approximately 113 focus group representatives who were asked the same five questions.

Focus group questions

- Given the present and future needs of the ECE workforce, what are your thoughts on the current permit structure?
- How should the current permit structure be updated to ensure that early childhood educators, administrators, and those who provide expanded learning opportunities are adequately prepared for their job roles?
- What knowledge and skills are needed to meet the multifaceted educational and developmental needs of children?
- How can educators work effectively in partnership with parents and guardians to promote children's learning and development?
- How do we support meeting the needs of employers for well-qualified ECE staff?

After listening, Workgroup members and liaisons shared their thoughts on the data shared.

Workgroup members and liaisons then returned to breakout rooms and had one final opportunity to discuss their input on the matrices. Each group captured their input on a copy of the matrix.

Item 7: Workgroup Comments

Note that Workgroup reflections have been paraphrased and summarized for clarity.

- It is important to consider whether there should be a separate infant-toddler permit.
- The Master Plan indicates birth through age 5; therefore, the permit should reflect the same range.
- As the Workgroup repeatedly convenes, there is an appreciation for continuing to delve deeper while leveraging data to guide and inform next steps.
- Credentialing needs to clarify requirements for clinical hours—which clinical hours count and from where.
- There should be more conversation about specializations and consideration of the Curriculum Alignment Project courses and how they impact each other.
- Assistant-level permits are important for paraprofessionals to have the opportunity to gain experience while determining if they like the field. We should consider keeping the assistant level as an option.
- It is important to acknowledge that the fewest permits obtained are those for Program Director and Assistant Teacher, while the most are for Associate Teacher and Site Supervisor; this should be kept center in the Workgroups' decision-making.

Item 8: Public Comment

Note that public comments have been paraphrased for clarity.

Comments shared verbally in the session

- *Andrea Fernandez-Mendoza, CA Children's Academy*: Infant and toddler development is essential and should be included as a permit within the current system and structure.
- *Heather Haubrich, Stanislaus County Office of Education*:
 - To support the alignment with the PK–3 credential, we need to ensure “the bridge” goes both ways for educators in the TK–3 and preschool space; there are barriers to pursuing ECE pathways. For example, if one wishes to enter, they would need to resign from their job to enroll in a teacher preparatory program and complete clinical hours in a PK–3 space. Many people can not afford to do that; thus, this is an issue of equity. However, PK–3 educators have a mechanism that does not require them to resign their current position—this consideration should go both ways.

- Professional growth advisors are still part of an outdated system. Although there have been attempts to change and update the information, it was made clear that the program is no longer being supported because of a lack of funding. The system should fund it or get rid of the outdated information.
- *Sara Gassner-Wollwage, San Mateo County Office of Education:* There are many barriers within the field. Reiterating what others raised about the importance of an infant–toddler permit, it should be part of the matrix and teachers would benefit from having it, especially kindergarten teachers. Transitional kindergarten teachers send students to ELOP (Expanded Learning Opportunities Program) and afterschool programs, and if ELOP folks had requirements, it could be part of the permit and workforce.
- *Lisa Wilkin, Child Development Consortium of Los Angeles:* There is no benefit for the Assistant Teacher-level permit because they have no authority to do anything. The majority of teachers have an Associate-level permit. In the matrix, Associate Teachers must upgrade within a designated time or lose their permit, but what about those who do not want to move? The system has lost many teachers because of this. Why is being an Associate Teacher indefinitely not an acceptable career path and choice?
- *Andrea Fernandez-Mendoza, CA Children’s Academy:* Rather than reinvent the wheel, we should align with what is working, for example, by linking the website to the local ECE workforce registry because there is a lot of support and funding through Quality Rating and Improvement dollars. Regulations should align with whatever matrix is decided upon; otherwise, certain centers or programs will lose staff, which becomes an issue of equity and access because requirements may become unattainable. Regulations must align, or the system will have problems keeping classrooms open.
- *Sara Gassner-Wollwage, San Mateo County Office of Education:* It doesn't feel fair that all I have to do is pay a fee, but the ECE system is required to do so much more. The ECE and elementary worlds are very different, but they should align to be equitable.

Comments shared on the public comment Padlet

The public comment Padlet was made available during Meeting 4. Names are not included in the comments because they were not provided on the Padlet. Some comments have been edited lightly for clarity.

- Collapsing permit levels: Assistant Teacher permits are not required by Title 5 regulations. The Assistant Teacher permit should be eliminated and not collapsed with the Associate Teacher permit.

- When considering keeping the associate and/or assistant permit, let's make a clarification on the difference between being the Master Teacher versus the Associate. I have seen in many instances where the Assistant Level and Associate Teacher are dismissed.
- Permit models: Both models are unworkable for most Title 5 programs that have been operating under the current system for over 25 years.
- Early Childhood Administrator (ECA 1): Why are the Adult Supervision units set at 2 and not 3? Colleges generally offer this as a 3-unit class, right? It becomes confusing for advising.
- 2 Units of Adult Supervision: Isn't this offered as a 3-unit course at most community colleges?
- Bachelor's degree required: If the ECE 3 must have a bachelor's degree how does that impact classified and certificated unions and compensation? If current staff do not have a bachelor's degree, what is the time for them to obtain and is there any financial support or grandfather clause?
- Bachelor's degree required: How do we require ECE 3 to all have a bachelor's degree with regard to unions and timelines?
- Associate's degree: Are we assuming all colleges have the same requirements for an associate's degree?
- Bridging for me as an early childhood educator in the field for over 25 years means K-12 get the same amount of work that the early childhood education field has to complete before moving on up/down the ladder. There are plenty of differences in both age levels.
- Akin: Are the requirements akin, or do they follow the Title 5 requirements?
- Gathering data from other groups (TK, CSPP, elementary campuses): I have heard from multiple public school TK teachers that agree that ELOP systems need to require the Child Development Permit as these very young children are going to these programs after school, and these ELOP teachers/assistants show the extreme lack of how to work/speak/guide young children. I think TK teachers would be great to pull as a focus group to discuss this point of what they are hearing from families to further help braid the child development permit into other spaces.

Item 9: Closure and Exit Ticket

Ms. Marshall provided closing comments, expressing appreciation for people participating in conversations and remaining engaged throughout the session. She requested that Workgroup members and liaisons complete an exit ticket, emphasizing that their exit ticket input allows the planning team to be as responsive as possible. Dr. Keeler closed the meeting by extending her appreciation to attendees.