In addition to commenting on the set of draft Teacher Level Performance Expectations as a whole, respondents were also asked to provide comments regarding individual performance expectations. Below are selected comments related to several specific Performance Expectations. The majority of responses are from workforce preparers. The Performance Expectation most often commented on is #3: 

The Introduction describes ALL children but does not include ages. Domains of development and children’s skills are mixed in together. Please consider "progression of ...cognitive, social, emotional, linguistic and physical development and related skills and content-based knowledge (e.g., literacy, math, science, social studies through hands-on experiences with elements of the physical and social world). (Preparer)

Standard 1 Performance Expectations (PEs):
- 1st bullet: Describe "typical progression of young children's cognitive, social, emotional linguistic and physical development and related skills."
- 3rd bullet: and "and learning" at the end
- 9th bullet: change to "for ALL Teachers at this level, require that they demonstrate understanding of the unique developmental period of 0-3 and its implications for working with children 0-3 and their families as well as working with preschool and school age children and their families."
- Standard 3 Narrative: Make explicit "first- and second-language acquisition and dual language and bi-literacy development, through inquiry-based pedagogical practices, as reflected in the planning of the classroom and outdoor physical environment, as well as teacher-child interactions 1:1. in small groups and in whole group." (Preparer)

Standard 4: PEs:
- 1st bullet: "...and role of classroom and outdoor environments and creation and maintenance of classroom community to support children's learning and development."
- 5th bullet "focused", and/or intentional?
- bullets 12-15: Include modification of program learning environments. (Preparer)

- Standard 6 PEs
  8th bullet: "how to observe adults working with children, listen to them and to provide constructive feedback to them..." (Preparer)

Reorder the expectations to indicate that we want smart teachers more than "nice" teachers. Move expectation standards 3 and 4 to number 1 and 2. (Preparer)
Survey II: Excerpt of Comments on Individual Teacher Level Performance Expectations

All standards need to reflect that we expect teachers to combine their knowledge of normal development with individual differences and inform the curriculum with that knowledge. *(Preparer)*

For Standard 2: This will be young children's first school experience. We invite them to make mistakes. The approach of "preventing challenging behaviors" is inappropriately control oriented. Children do not know what behaviors are challenging till we allow them to express those behaviors and tell them what behaviors are more effective instead. It will be counter productive to train teachers to think of squashing behaviors if those behaviors show signs of occurring. *(Preparer)*

OMIT THE FOLLOWING IN STANDARD 3: Performance Expectations: “Identify key content appropriate for young children as identified in the California Infant/Toddler and Preschool Foundations and Curriculum Framework for planning developmentally appropriate” This endorsement of the CDE materials is unnecessary and should be open to other resources and materials beyond the foundations and frameworks. A broader interpretation of the content should be included. *(Preparer)*

REVISE OR OMIT THE FOLLOWING IN STANDARD 3: Narrative: “For infants and toddlers, candidates implement the four foundational domains identified within the California Early Learning and Development System from the California Department of Education.” This statement prescribes the use of this California Early Learning and Development System. The content of these domains could be generally outlined but the specific requirements of the utilization of this system should not be part of the permit competencies. *(Preparer)*

OMIT THE FOLLOWING IN STANDARD 4: Narrative: “Candidates are familiar with California’s infant/toddler and Preschool Foundations and Curriculum Framework that provide guidance for the development and learning of the state’s young children and they apply this foundational knowledge when planning the care, development, and learning experiences for all young children.” This is too prescriptive in terms of having to use the foundations and frameworks. Also the wording of “the state’s young children” is especially troubling and confusing. *(Preparer)*

OMIT THE FINAL (underlined) PORTION OF FOLLOWING IN STANDARD 5: Performance Expectations: “Demonstrate effective lesson planning and the use of educational practices based on observation, assessments, and the California Early Learning and Development system resources from the California Department of Education. This portion again is prescriptive and needs to be expanded to allow for other content. I would suggest wording such as: “...and other resources such as, but not limited to, the California Early Learning and development system from the California Department of Education.” *(Preparer)*
REVISE OR EXPLAIN THE FOLLOWING IN STANDARD 5: Performance Expectations: “Develop a sample communication appropriate for children and families regarding student assessment outcomes.” I am uncertain of what this statement means. (Preparer)

CSTP Standard 3 —— Performance expectation language that references the educator’s role in facilitating and supporting development and learning rather than teaching content is more appropriate in ECE. (Preparer)

For Standard 3, children's social development and skills should be included as a subject matter. Young children need to be taught social expectations, how to make friends, and function in a group. Teachers need to be able to teach these skills in a culturally, linguistically and developmentally appropriate manner. (Preparer)

Standard #3 Both the narrative and the performances expectations describe learning content in terms of discreet learning subjects. However, in ECE we encourage integrated activities that cover multiple disciplines and a daily schedule that is not divided into subject area time periods. I think there should be more direction regarding content, emphasizing hands on, direct experience learning in multidisciplinary activities. Two concepts needing exploring: 1. use of the term 'academic.' The term 'cognitive.' and 2. use of the term 'lesson plans'. That terminology is used in ECE programs; however, programs actually develop 'activity' plans. The traditional lesson plan used in K-12 programs is not appropriate or applicable for ECE programs. (Preparer)

I strongly disagree with the proposed CSTP standards listed in the draft. The level and rigor of the performance expectations the draft describes are, for the most part, too high. I agree with the level and rigor in regard to CSTP standard #3. With the exception of standard #3, these standards are more in line with someone who currently holds a site supervisor permit and are far to [sic] rigorous for a site teacher. These standards seem to reflect across several permit levels rather than just that of a teacher permit. (Private Agency)

The expectations for standard 4 are too specific. The amount of time required to implement them is not a luxury most ECE teachers are provided with. (Other Public Agency)

#5. In a college classroom this would be fine. My concern is that "assessment" will be come part of preschool. It does not belong here. Our relationship with "norms" should remain casual. Just enough to shine a light on a potential need but not so much that children are denied their right to develop organically and at their own pace. (Employer)

#6 Dev. as a Prof Early Childhood Ed. include awareness of self (i.e., Dan Siegle info) (Employer)