



# Meeting 6 Summary

## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Child Development Permit Workgroup

---

**April 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 6

---

## Meeting Date and Time

The Child Development Permit Workgroup (Workgroup) met virtually on March 26, 2024, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

## Attendees

### Workgroup Members

- Amy Smith, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
- Christine Shreve, Holy Cross Preschool
- 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
- Laurel Doyle, Cosumnes River College
- Liz Alvarado, Californians Together
- Lynette Ridgel, Riverside County Office of Education

- Mandy Redfern, Glendale Unified School District
- Melissa Wheelahan, Orange County Office of Education
- Nicole Willard, Windmill School, Portola Valley
- 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 CA
- 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, Merritt College
- Alicia Osborne, EDvance College
- Amy Carr, Mendicino County Office of Education
- Amy Vega, Mount Cross CDC
- Ana Del Aguila, Las Positas College
- Andrea Fernandez Mendoza, CA Children's Academy
- Andrea Avila, Early Edge California
- Calvin Moore, Council for Professional Recognition
- Camilla Rand, Early Care & Education Pathways to Success
- Carolina Mendez, Los Angeles Valley College
- Caroline Jen, East Los Angeles College
- Christina Villanueva, Commission on Teacher Credentialing

- Cristabel Rodriguez, Long Beach Unified School District, Office of Child Development Centers
- Crystal Jones, Crystal Clear Learning Center
- Debbie Look, Assembly Education Committee
- Dee Zelinski, Orange County Department of Education
- Emma Johnston Leon, Montessorita
- Erica Vuong, Sacramento County Office of Education
- Fabiola Salceda, Robla District
- Felicia Urrabazo, Fresno County Office of the Superintendent of Schools
- Guadalupe Rivas Jer, San Mateo County Office of Education
- Jamie Radley, Childcare Careers
- Jasmine Reaves, Children's Paradise
- Javonelle Fosu, The Children's Collective, Inc.
- Jeanette Mulhern, Consumnes River College
- Jennifer Osalbo, California Department of Education
- Jenny Mendoza, Merced County Office of Education
- Juliet Terry, Child Care Resource Center
- Katorra Enoch-Longshore, Council for Professional Recognition
- Khieem Jackson, Community Member
- Kimberley Radmacher, California State University Dominguez Hills
- Kristy Ford, Scripps Health
- Lanre Ajayi, West Contra Costa Unified School District
- Laura Hernandez, ABC Unified School District
- Leah Catching, Marin County Child Care Commission, Local Child Care and Development Planning Council
- Leanne Engel, Jessup University
- Leslie Cox, Family Service Association
- Lisa Hicks, Children's Paradise
- Lisa Schut, Modesto Junior College
- Lisa Wilkin, Child Development Consortium of Los Angeles
- Lupe Granados, International Institute of Los Angeles
- Malissa Mastropierro, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Mari Estrada, Moorpark College
- Maria Arellano, Child Care Resource Center

- Marrietta Gilliard, Fullerton Community College
- Megan Ricks, California Montessori Alliance
- Melanie Long, Castaic Union School District
- Monique Gapuz, Escondido Community Child Development Center
- Nathalie Gomez, Madera County Superintendent of Schools
- Nina Buthee, EveryChild California
- Pam Shaw, Early Care & Education Pathways to Success
- Patricia Moreno, Long Beach Unified School District, Office of Child Development Centers
- Ramona Peralta, OSD
- Randi Wolfe, Early Care & Education Pathways to Success
- Rebecca Grasty, Family Child Care Home Provider
- Robin Stearns, Beginnings & Beyond Montessori and East Bay Montessori Training
- Rosita Barron, Kern Community College District
- Sandy Moreno, Tulare County Office of Education
- Sara Gassner-Wollwage, San Mateo County of Education
- Season Turner, Highlands Community Charter Schools
- Sha'Breau Wilson, All Kids Academy Head Start
- Shamshad Khalil, South San Francisco Unified School District
- Sharon Donovan, City College of San Francisco
- Sue Handy, Diablo Valley College
- Terri Kemper, Mountain View Whisman School District
- Tessie Loomis, Highlands Community Charter School
- Tessie Ragan, Family Childcare Educator
- Vanessa Mininger, Merced County Office of Education
- Veronica Garcia, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Victoria Coverson-Baxter, San Mateo County Office of Education Early Learning
- Wendy Shenk-Evans, Montessori Public Policy Initiative
- Yeni De los Santos, CVUSD
- Yvon Frazier, Allan Hancock College

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Staff

- Mary Sandy
- David DeGuire

- Renee Marshall
- Debra Keeler
- Bronwyn Kennedy
- June Millovich
- Phyllis Jacobson

## Region 15 Comprehensive Center Staff

- Liz Jameyson
- Corey Cornett
- Edith Gurolla
- Khamia Powell
- Brianna Moorehead
- Krista Murphy
- Andrea Rolla

## Presenters

- Barbara Boyd, California Department of Education
- Julee Brooks, Woodcraft Rangers
- Mary Beth Miller, Fresno City College

## Meeting Items

### Item 1: Welcome and Connection

Dr. Debra Keeler, Renee Marshall, and Bronwyn Kennedy welcomed all participants. Dr. Keeler shared updates, including that Meeting 8 will be held on June 12. She invited attendees to use the chat and for Workgroup members and liaisons to respond to the polls and exit ticket.

Liz Jameyson reviewed Session 5 exit ticket responses and revisited the Workgroup agreements with participants. Dr. Keeler reviewed the agenda and reminded participants of the Workgroup charge. She expressed her confidence that by Meeting 8, the Workgroup would have recommendations to put forth to the Commission.

Ms. Jameyson reminded the Workgroup of its progress by reviewing the Roadmap to Recommendations graphic, a visual representation of the topics and progress across the Workgroup's seven planned sessions.

## Item 2: Matrix Discussions

Ms. Jameyson shared the goal of the morning's task, which was for Workgroup members and liaisons to take a stance on each element of the proposed matrix, stating whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposal and offering alternative language or options when they disagreed. She explained that between Meetings 6 and 7, the Region 15 Comprehensive Center (R15CC) and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) teams will conduct qualitative and quantitative analysis of each element and present data-informed options for approval in Meeting 7. She clarified the process for today and reviewed a protocol the group would use to accomplish the task efficiently.

Ms. Jameyson explained that participants will be in the same groups as previous sessions and review each permit level, integrating input from previous meetings. She emphasized the need to take a stance on each element of the proposed matrix for each permit level.

Participants were given 140 minutes in breakout rooms to discuss the matrix, focusing on the proposed elements in the first three levels of the permit: Early Childhood Educator (ECE) 1, 2, and ECE 3.

## Item 4: Child Development Associate Presentation

Ms. Kennedy explained that after the segment, Workgroup members and liaisons would be asked to complete a brief survey to give their opinions on the following question: *Should the CTC offer the Child Development Associate (CDA) as equivalent to ECE 1 under the revised permit matrix?* Ms. Bronwyn then presented on the history of the CDA; CDA demographic data, including distribution of issuance across age and gender, as well as the area of specialty (preschool, infant and toddler, family childcare); other CDA facts, including the number of CDAs issued in its history and organizations that sponsor official CDA training in California; educator pathways to obtaining the CDA; how candidates prepare for the CDA; and education requirements to obtain the CDA.

Dr. June Millovich then shared how preparation for the CDA compares to preparation for the current California Associate Teacher permit. Ms. Kennedy ended the segment by describing the CDA renewal process and the cost of acquiring the CDA. She then asked Workgroup members and liaisons to complete the brief survey.

## Remarks From the CTA's Executive Director

Dr. Mary Sandy expressed her appreciation for the Workgroup and the importance of this work. She stressed the dynamic tension between access, cost, and quality while being challenged to conduct cost-effective work that meets all students' needs.



## Item 5: Matrix Discussions

Ms. Jameyson invited participants to continue reviewing each permit level with Early Childhood Administrator 1 and Early Childhood Administrator 2. Participants were offered an additional 40 minutes in their breakout rooms to discuss, vote, and revise aspects of the matrix. Each breakout room completed a CDP matrix worksheet with key considerations relative to authorization, unit/degree requirement, coursework preparation, experience/fieldwork, renewal requirements, and emergency certification—all based on previous workgroup session suggestions and revisions.

During the combined breakout time in Items 2 and 5, most groups completed recommendations for ECE 1 and 2, necessitating more time to focus on ECE 3, and Early Childhood Administrator 1 and 2 in Meeting 7.

## Item 6: ECE Teacher Performance Expectation Discussion

Dr. Keeler introduced the next segment, grounding the discussion in the charge of the Workgroup. Ms. Kennedy then described how the ECE teacher performance expectations (TPEs) are used in educator preparation programs and how they are incorporated into the permit.

Dr. Keeler introduced the purpose of the small-group discussion by sharing the guiding questions:

1. Which TPE structure would be clearest?
  - Maintain the current structure (organized by permit level and domains within each permit level)
  - Organize based competency level (e.g., foundational, early intermediate)
  - Organize based on domain, showing the progression of competencies across domains (like K–12 content standards are typically organized)
2. Do the current TPEs adequately represent the Master Plan for Early Learning and Care (MPELC) competencies?
3. Do the TPEs taken as a whole adequately address areas of specialization?

She briefly explained what the organizational structures referenced in Question 1 might look like. The groups broke for discussion, focusing on the questions. After the discussion, Workgroup members and liaisons were asked to independently complete a survey in which they answered each of the questions. Responses to these questions will be shared in Meeting 7 as a launching point for further discussion of the ECE TPEs.

## Item 7: Reports From Ad Hoc Committees

### Infant and Toddler

Dr. Keeler introduced Helen Davis and Katie Mervin, who provided the Infant Toddler Ad Hoc report.

The Infant Toddler Ad Hoc Committee is progressing and will have an extra meeting to finalize their recommendations. They recommend enhancing CAP 8 courses to better focus on the 0 to 8 age range, specifically for infants and toddlers. They are reviewing the ECE TPEs to ensure the content is relevant for children aged 0 to 8, emphasizing that ECE TPE elements should be applicable to all children in this age group. Additionally, they recommend building capacity to increase the availability of coursework related to infants and toddlers, including adding a course on early relational health.

Workgroup members and liaisons were asked to complete a survey that included the following questions:

1. Do you believe that the permit should offer a special authorization for serving infants and toddlers?
2. Do you agree with the direction the Ad Hoc Committee is going regarding enhancing the language in the ECE TPEs related to infants and toddlers?
3. Do you agree with the direction the Ad Hoc Committee is going regarding the consideration of coursework related to infants and toddlers?

## Item 8: Workgroup Comments

Note that the Workgroup comments below have been paraphrased and summarized for clarity.

- Several Workgroup members appreciated the small group discussions because working on the matrix is the “crux of what we have been doing.” Several workgroup members also expressed that they hope to continue the conversation to delve more deeply in future sessions because their groups were not able to finish the work.
- A Workgroup member appreciated the pre-work and input forms in advance and liked the structure of the groups.
- A Workgroup member appreciated the opportunity to be a part of this group because it is making an effort towards professionalizing the field; however, more attention should be given to alternative qualifications. Career changers, although having varied backgrounds, contribute tremendous value and knowledge to classroom learning and address rapidly increasing teacher shortages.

- A Workgroup member specified that Workgroup may want to reconsider the use of the word “levels” because all educators are teachers, and the field does not use “level” or “ECE 1”, etc. This member also asked whether the terminology around “levels” is designed to align with the PK–3 specialist or multiple subject credentials.

## Item 9: Public Comments

Members of the public made verbal comments in the meeting and captured them on a Padlet.

### Verbal Public Comments in the Meeting

Note that public comments below have been paraphrased and summarized for clarity.

- **Pam Shaw, *Early Care & Education Pathways to Success***: Education has difficulty recruiting and retaining, across urban and rural areas, whether they are state or federally funded degrees, plus permits have a lot to do with that. From an employer and education perspective, limiting the pathways to enter or only offering a single pathway is concerning. There must be more pathways for new and existing teachers who want to remain on one level; however, all levels should require continuing education courses.
- **Jeanette Mulhern, *Consumnes River College***: Although there is respect for other perspectives, this permit revision and restructuring is for professionalization and transparency. Education, as is, is unappreciated, poorly paid, and mostly women, so we have an opportunity to change this. There needs to be professional learning on trauma-informed practices, cultural responsiveness, etc. We need to advocate for continued professional learning.
- **Katorra Enoch-Longshore, *Council for Professional Recognition***: There is an appreciation for the organization of the CDA credential and an understanding of the effort to improve outcomes for kids and families. The CDA is a credential for birth through age 5, and there should be an effort to push credentialing to be able to earn and attain more. The CDA partners with higher education consortia and other organizations to help design a framework around the competencies with the support of the system. We are happy to partner to continue this work; please let us know.
- **Randi Wolfe, *Early Childcare & Education Pathways to Success***: Equity apprenticeships are high-quality professional learning opportunities and experiences. They are paid on-the-job training. Within this model, participants are given an array of services and support from their colleges and employers. It is competency-based according to the U.S. Department of Labor, and we have aligned it with ECE, as well. Early childhood was the largest growing industry in California within healthcare, technology, and security; therefore, this is also an imperative issue to the workforce. The issue is timing. The time it takes to finish an associate’s level is too long to work for low or no pay; it is a

disincentive. The CDA can be implemented in ways that makes everyone proud and can be completed and paid in 6 months and then straight into associate's programs and a credential. This is about creating equity of access, not a barrier. Community colleges (CCs) think of the CDA as a more popular option that takes away from them, but it doesn't. More students will attend CCs because they will have greater support by creating a pipeline that makes the process more equitable.

- **Emma Johnson Lean, *Montessorita*:** There is a concern with the matrix; it seems narrow. It is constructed under the assumption that people go into education from the beginning, but that's not always the case and doesn't mean they are less qualified. Montessori is credentialed by the state; teachers cover the same content, practicum, and requirements for continuing education. It is critical to have a pathway and opportunity to teach and meet the requirements. An associate's degree should not be an additional requirement; a degree should be acceptable, especially because many relate to education in some way. The regional accreditation of ECE TPE can be expanded to national accreditation; therefore, it seems repetitive to have to earn a regional one, as well.
- **Calvin Moore, *Council for Professional Recognition*:** There is an appreciation and applause for the work being done. The history of the CDA is important because they grappled with the same things in the 70s. For example, Headstart was the pathway to competence for adults who could prove with great evidence that they could be teachers, especially minoritized individuals, military, etc., so the CDA jump-started careers by providing a pathway in, not barriers. What value is a pathway that is only committed to a body of knowledge, not practice? We take pride in the fact that our test blueprints are established, protected, and robust, and they include the latest information about child development. If others wish to have more conversation about it with the Council, they are invited to do so directly. Many programs are grappling with the same issues. Credentials should not be, nor want to be, the only pathway. There should be many programs, all part of a fabric and community of credentialing organizations, including apprenticeship programs, who want to support and partner.
- **Crystal Jones, *Crystal Clear Learning Center*:** Gratitude was expressed for the opportunity to discuss equity and alignment. There was an ask for support: How can we be successful when the measure is changing? Inclusion and equity should speak to one system and, therefore, be aligned within and across states.

### Public Comments From the Padlet

Public comments from the Padlet were categorized and summarized because of the length and to allow ease of interpretation. The category order was determined by the number of comments in each category.

### *Broadening Accepted Pathways, Coursework, and Credits (13 comments)*

Members of the public called for clarity and inclusivity in the permitting process. They raised concerns about how employees will verify that their courses are recognized as ECE units for the permits, particularly with respect to the ECE TPEs language used in the proposed matrix. Members of the public advocate for the inclusion of units from nationally accredited programs, as the current emphasis on regionally accredited programs excludes many qualified educators. They highlight that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) already acknowledges ECE units from nationally accredited private programs and urge this recognition to carry over to the permit. Moreover, they propose expanding the criteria for the permit to encompass coursework related to child development from any state, military background, and various majors, such as family consumer science. Members of the public also disputed the lack of recognition for prior learning, such as a CDA credential or passing the CSET in home economics, urging for these to count toward ECE qualification on the permit matrix. Collectively, there is a strong push from the public for a credentialing approach that is more flexible and nationally oriented to tackle the challenges of recruiting and retaining ECE professionals.

### *Authorization of ECE 1 (6 comments)*

Members of the public expressed that due to staffing requirements, teachers with 12 units of Child Development (CD)/ECE or a CDA credential should be allowed to supervise children alone within the ratio. They argued that ECE 1 level staff needed the ability to work independently in the classroom. While some agreed with the authorization requirements in principle, they also shared concerns about the necessity for constant supervision. They pointed out that the majority of the existing workforce would not meet these requirements and suggested that a substantial amount of time and compensation for professional development would be needed to bring the workforce up to the new qualifications. Members of the public noted that associate teachers had been serving as "lead" teachers in subsidized ECE classrooms for over two decades and argued that a change in this practice would have had a devastating impact on programs funded by CDE and CDSS. They were concerned that aligning ECE 1 authorization with an aide position would demote the current permit level and significantly affect how programs staff their classrooms. Lastly, they contended that the permit should be aligned with CDSS licensing, which recognizes that earning 12 units qualified an individual to be in the classroom unsupervised, rather than limiting ECE 1 to assisting roles that required oversight by someone holding an ECE 2 permit.

### *Experience (5 comments)*

Members of the public argued that experience was superior to college coursework in preparing individuals to work with young children, noting that some aides performed better than certified teachers in meeting children's needs. They expressed that all levels of ECE should include requirements for both experience and professional development. Moreover, members of the public contended that licensed family childcare providers with over 10 years of experience should be credited for their field experience. They acknowledged the expertise of family childcare providers and stressed the need for support and mentoring to foster their

development and learning. Advocating for continuous professional growth, they emphasized the importance of courses and professional development opportunities. Additionally, members of the public recognized the significance of field experience and called for alternative pathways to obtain credentials for those lacking the resources to pursue traditional degrees.

#### *Administrative Levels 1 and 2 (4 comments)*

Members of the public suggested that Montessori administration credentials, granted by the Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education (MACTE) accredited programs and accompanied by a bachelor's degree in any subject area, should be considered equivalent to the Admin 2 level of the permit. They recommended that the Admin 1 unit/degree requirement be specified as an associate's degree or higher, with at least 24 CD/ECE units. For the Admin 2 coursework requirement, they expressed that the wording should reflect a greater emphasis on management courses while still recognizing the importance of an ECE background. Lastly, they advocated for the acceptance of a variety of educational backgrounds at all ECE and administration levels, asserting that ECE coursework and units from any regionally or nationally accredited programs should have been deemed sufficient, alongside an associate's, bachelor's, or master's degree in any subject area.

#### *Broadening Accepted Coursework and Credits, Specific to Montessori (3 comments)*

Members of the public noted that MACTE is a significant accreditor for Montessori teacher education programs, acknowledged by the U.S. Department of Education. They noted that 11 states had already incorporated Montessori credentials into their teacher licensure pathways for various education levels. The public also highlighted that the Commission on Professional Excellence acknowledged the value of a Montessori credential alongside a bachelor's degree in any field, with Colorado recently awarding credit towards childcare center director qualifications. Emphasizing the comprehensive nature of Montessori teacher preparation, members of the public advocated for individuals with a Montessori credential to qualify for the permit, as these credentials cover essential topics and include practicum and continuing education requirements. Furthermore, they supported the alignment of Montessori teacher preparation with the National Association for the Education of Young Children's (NAEYC's) Professional Standards and Competencies, advocating for policies that offer flexible demonstrations of competence, including credit for prior learning and recognizing Montessori credentials as equivalent to appropriate ECE designations.

#### *ECE 1, Specific to the CDA (3 comments)*

Members of the public argued that the CDA credential should be included as an option in ECE 1 requirements. They felt that dismissing the CDA as an alternative to the ECE 1 permit was detrimental to the field, as it further isolated nontraditional students in California and did not acknowledge their contributions. The public advocated for efforts to better align the CDA with California's requirements, enabling the continued growth of the field through alternative pathways. They questioned why the CDA credential, known for its affordability, flexible hours,



and self-paced courses, was not being fully utilized to alleviate the stress on the system and to support the mentorship and educational goals of new educators entering the field.

#### *Infant and Toddler (3 comments)*

Members of the public emphasized that the ECE TPEs must address the needs of the youngest learners effectively. They suggested that terms such as "infant teacher," "toddler teacher," and "school-age teacher" be used to create better alignment within the ECE TPEs, fostering unity across different fields of teaching to form a more comprehensive educational sector. Additionally, they noted that the definitions for age groupings of infants and toddlers varied across different settings regulated by the state of California, and they argued that there should be a standardized alignment of these age definitions across all care settings.

#### *Professional Development (3 comments)*

Members of the public emphasized that professional development should be maintained at all levels of the permit. They stressed the dynamic nature of child development and education disciplines, which continuously evolve through research, best practices, and responsive approaches, such as anti-racism and culturally relevant practices. Thus, they argued that necessary updates to practices and procedures would not occur without ongoing professional development. The public deemed professional development as a crucial aspect of growth and legitimacy within the field, and they expressed that upholding professional development requirements was essential for the success of educators.

#### *Renewal (2 comments)*

Members of the public advocated for the requirement of professional development hours in permit renewals. They also called for the group to reconsider the proposal on professional growth hours for ECE levels 1, 2, and 3, suggesting that while the involvement of a professional growth advisor for renewal was cumbersome and should be removed, the continuation of professional growth activities for renewal at all levels was necessary.

#### *Emergency Authorization, ECE 1 (2 comments)*

Members of the public noted that emergency authorization for ECE 1 would not meet licensing certification requirements, which called for at least 6 units. They also voiced that while an emergency credential for ECE 1 should be an option, the duration of emergency authorization needed to be limited to 1 year to prevent children from being taught by unprepared teachers for an extended period.

#### *Emergency Authorization, ECE 2 (2 comments)*

Members of the public suggested that in response to the proposal eliminating the 24-unit requirement and mandating an associate's degree for ECE 2 certification, an emergency certification should be created. This emergency certification should allow 24 ECE/CD units without an associate's degree, valid for two years, giving teachers time to complete their degree requirements. They also proposed that individuals with an education or related degree

should be allowed to obtain an emergency permit while they work towards acquiring ECE-specific units.

#### *Practicum (2 comments)*

Members of the public expressed concerns that working students are unable to take time off work to complete practicum classes at local colleges, which are required to be done at child development centers, creating an inequity in fulfilling permit requirements. They also noted that practicum classes filled quickly and were unable to meet the enrollment demands of students.

#### *Professional Standards for the ECE Field (1 comment)*

A member of the public emphasized the necessity of having professional ECE standards, comparing it to other professions that require clear standards. They reflected on the history of the nursing profession, which once faced similar challenges, and highlighted that by increasing professional expectations for nurses, the field saw improved wages, career interest, and gender diversity. They cautioned that continuing to lower expectations for the ECE workforce would undermine the perception of ECE as an attractive and viable career path.

#### *ECE 2 (1 comment)*

A member of the public expressed disappointment that feedback and resources provided previously did not result in including the recommendation by the Commission on Professional Excellence that California consider placing individuals with an associate's degree in any field and a Montessori credential as ECE 2 (and individuals with a bachelor's in any field at ECE 3).

#### *General, Uncategorized (6 comments)*

Members of the public praised the matrix question format for its ease of navigation and for facilitating a comparison between the old and new systems. They recognized the CTC's dedication to creating recommendations that aim for equity and encompass the entire field, from family childcare educators to 3rd-grade teachers. They appreciated the CAP ECE Team's efforts to align coursework with ECE TPEs and suggested the potential need for crosswalks to determine equivalency across different pedagogical philosophies. Additionally, members of the public questioned why the master plan was not being utilized to effectively guide the work of the permit revision, particularly in areas such as the inclusion of children with disabilities, which they felt was not adequately covered in current college coursework.

### **Item 10: Exit Ticket and Closure**

Ms. Jameyson extended appreciation for everyone in attendance and shared enthusiasm for seeing everyone again in about one month. Dr. Keeler expressed gratitude for everyone being along for the ride and acknowledged the congeniality, camaraderie, and excitement for this day. She extended her thanks to the R15CC for the analysis of the data and reiterated that all meetings inform the next meeting. She announced that we will continue this discussion and take it to the next level. She honored the group, their work, and their commitment to young



children. Ms. Kennedy expressed her thanks for a productive day and joy in facilitating and collaborating with the group and R15CC team. Ms. Marshall thanked and encouraged group members and liaisons to complete the exit ticket and emphasized the careful attention paid to their words, thoughts, and suggestions. She expressed appreciation for the time and effort of every member present and reminded the participants that we will have additional meetings in April and June. She extended a reminder for the April 18 CTC Commission meeting to share more about this process and progress and invited members to attend and share.