



Meeting 7 Summary

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Child Development Permit Workgroup

June 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 7

Meeting Date and Time

The Child Development Permit Workgroup (Workgroup) met virtually on April 30, 2024, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Attendees

Workgroup Members

- Amy Smith, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
- Becky Green, Imperial Community College District
- Betsy Uda, Head Start
- Chris Reeve, Legislative Director, California School Board Association
- Giovanni Aragon, Community Action Partnership Kern
- 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
- Kate Williams-Brown, Commission on Teacher Credentialing

- Katie Mervin, EDvance College
- LaTanga Hardy, Los Angeles Community College District
- Laurel Doyle, Cosumnes River College
- Liz Alvarado, Californians Together
- Lynette Ridgel, Riverside County Office of Education
- Melissa Wheelahan, Orange County Office of Education
- Nicole Willard, Windmill School, Portola Valley
- Ranae Amezcuita, 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

- Deborah Stipek, Stanford University
- Erin Dubey, California Department of Education
- Kate Williams-Brown, Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- Lisa Velarde, California Department of Social Services
- Melanie Huitt, Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division
- Shanna Birkholz-Vasquez, California Department of Education

Members of the Public

- Alana Pinsler, California Department of Education
- Alesha Brown, Unknown affiliation
- Alexis Duffy, First 5 Shasta
- Amanda Elsemore, Siskiyou County Office of Education
- Andrea Ball, Ball/Frost Group
- Anupama Joshi, California State University, Dominguez Hills
- Bertha Barajas, Unknown affiliation
- Betty James, Berkeley Unified School District
- Carolina Mendez, Los Angeles Valley College

- Caroline Jen, East Los Angeles College
- Catherine de la Torre, San Juan Unified School District
- Crystal Turner, Alameda County Office of Education
- Diana Flores, Ventura County Office of Education
- Diana Prado, Escondido Union School District
- Diana Saenz, California Department of Social Services
- Edilma Serna, WestEd
- Erica Vuong, Sonoma County Office of Education
- Felicia Urrabazo, Fresno County Office of the Superintendent of Schools
- Guadalupe Rivas Jer, San Mateo County Office of Education
- Heather Haubrich, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Jan Fish, California State University, Northridge
- Jasmine Reaves, Children's Paradise
- Javonelle Fosu, The Children's Collective, Inc.
- Jeanette Mulhern, Consumnes River College
- Jessica Parra, Santa Maria-Bonita School District
- Jessica Sawko, Children Now
- Kimberley Radmacher, California State University Dominguez Hills
- Lanre Ajayi, West Contra Costa Unified School District
- Laprice Brown, Delta College
- Leanne Runyan, California Department of Social Services
- Linda Haddadin, California Department of Social Services
- Lisa Penisini, Modesto Junior College
- Lisa Wilkin, Child Development Consortium of Los Angeles
- Lucia Garay, Unknown affiliation
- Lupe Granados, International Institute of Los Angeles
- Maeva Marc, Kidango
- Malissa Mastropierro, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Mallory Centeno-Dominguez, Riverside County Office of Education
- Maria Pelayo, Orange County Department of Education

- Mary Beth Miller, Fresno City College
- Megan Ricks, California Montessori Alliance
- Natalie Miller, California Department of Social Services
- Nathalie Gomez, Madera County Superintendent of Schools
- Nellie Rios-Parra, Lennox State Preschool
- Patricia Moreno, Long Beach Unified School District, Office of Child Development Centers
- Patricia Nunley, unknown affiliation
- Randi Wolfe, Early Care & Education Pathways to Success
- Rebecca Grasty, Family Child Care Home Provider
- Ristyn Woolley, California Department of Social Services
- Robby Martinez, Unknown affiliation
- Ronica Dixon, Lowell Joint Preschool and Child Care
- Rosita Barron, Kern Community College District
- Samantha Juarez, Waterford Unified School District
- Samantha Thompson, Black ECE
- Sara Gassner-Wollwage, San Mateo County of Education
- Soledad Galvez, Unknown affiliation
- Tanessa Sanchez, Palomar College
- Terrissa Hein, Contra Costa County Office of Education
- Tina Watts, Skyline College
- Tony Jordan, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Veronica Garcia, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Victoria Coverson-Baxter, San Mateo County Office of Education Early Learning
- Vyju Kadambi (Emma Johnston León), Montessori Alliance

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Staff

- Phyllis Jacobson
- Debra Keeler
- Bronwyn Kennedy

- Renee Marshall
- June Millovich

Region 15 Comprehensive Center Staff

- Liz Jameyson
- Edith Gurolla
- Barbara Jones
- Brianna Moorehead
- Krista Murphy
- Andrea Rolla
- Victor Diaz

Presenters

- Phyllis Jacobson, California Department of Education
- June Millovich, California Department of Education
- Katie Merwin, EDvance College
- Toni Isaacs, Ventura County Office of Education
- Lynette Ridgel, Riverside County Office of Education

Meeting Items

Item 1: Welcome and Connection

Renee Marshall reviewed the Workgroup's accomplishments and emphasized the importance of its commitment to children. She expressed appreciation for the Workgroup's journey and encouraged active participation during the meeting.

Liz Jameyson led a reflection exercise to help attendees clear their minds and be present.

Item 2: Early Childhood Education Levels 1 and 2

Ms. Jameyson summarized quantitative data from small-group conversations during Meeting 6 regarding Early Childhood Education (ECE) Levels 1 and 2. These results consisted of Workgroup members' opinions on whether they agreed with the proposed elements of the matrix as written.

Items 3, 4, and 5: Matrix Small-Group Conversations for Early Childhood Educator 3, Early Childhood Administrator 1, and Early Childhood Administrator

Ms. Jameyson invited participants to review proposed options for ECE 3, Admin 1, and Admin 2 elements in small-group discussions. Each breakout room completed a CDP matrix worksheet with key considerations relative to authorization, unit and degree requirements, coursework preparation, experience and fieldwork, renewal requirements, and emergency certification—all based on previous Workgroup session suggestions and revisions. The outcome of these conversations will drive the options the Workgroup members and liaisons vote on during Meeting 8.

Item 6: Competency-Based System

Competency-Based System Presentation: Phyllis Jacobson and June Millovich presented the elements of a competency-based system, focusing on performance expectations for candidates, program standards, and performance assessments. They explained how these elements ensure candidates demonstrate competence and readiness through embedded assessment tools. The team worked to align the Curriculum Alignment Project (CAP) courses with Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) to maintain quality standards. Dr. Millovich also described the Program Quality Peer Review Accreditation Process and shared insights from the pilot self-study conducted at four colleges, which included findings and considerations.

CalFTPA Presentation: Bronwyn Kennedy gave an overview of the Early Childhood Education California Formative Teaching Performance Assessment (CalFTPA), outlining the professional development provided on three modules conducted on May 3 and May 10. The presentation highlighted the structured approach to ensure teachers are well-prepared and assessed rigorously throughout their training.

TPE Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations: Ms. Jameyson shared the survey results on TPE Ad Hoc Committee recommendations administered during Meeting 6.

The TPE Ad Hoc Committee presented recommendations to maintain the current structure of TPEs by domain, keeping the domains and elements as they are. They suggested considering specific TPEs for each specialization if they become part of the structure. The discussion included thoughts and questions from members, with one member agreeing with the recommendations and another emphasizing the need to explicitly mention "all children" throughout the document, not just in the introduction. Another member raised questions about the foundational level of TPEs in credentials and their applicability, prompting a discussion on alignment with current credentials.

Discussion Highlights: One member inquired about the routine nature of peer review. Dr. Millovich explained that the micro-pilot was an initial step, and the intention is for a recurring

cycle every 7 years. A liaison confirmed that the process is still in draft form and is open to refinement. The group discussed the need for additional TPEs related to specializations, with several members advocating for more specific TPEs to address diverse needs more effectively. Two members supported the development of specialized TPEs by experts to enhance hiring and staff capabilities, ensuring comprehensive and inclusive educational standards.

Item 7: Report on Ad Hoc Committees

Infant Toddler Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

The Infant Toddler Ad Hoc Committee proposed adding three core courses for ECE 1: Child Growth and Development, Child Family Community, and Early Childhood Principles and Programs, specifically covering infants and toddlers. An additional course, either an Introduction to ECE or Infant Toddler Care and Development, was also recommended. For ECE 2, the committee suggested the same core courses plus an Infant Toddler course. They also suggested considering a specialization for infants and toddlers with 6–12 additional units. They recommended revising the TPEs to include the phrase "Children 0–8" at the end of domain titles. Group discussions highlighted the need to clarify whether these courses are additional to existing requirements and the time required for college course approvals.

Multilingual Learners Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

The Multilingual Learners Ad Hoc Committee recommended creating a 6-unit specialization for multi- and bilingual instruction, incorporating the bilingual TPEs and instructional methods for dual-language learners. Dr. Keeler emphasized the attention given to the needs of multilingual learners. Liz Alvarado, a Multilingual Learner Ad Hoc Committee member, also suggested the importance of developing these skills across all permit levels, ensuring early and accessible pathways for training.

Expanded Learning Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

The Expanded Learning Ad Hoc Committee suggested a School Age and Expanded Learning Specialization modeled after existing CAP expansion courses. This would include two additional courses beyond the existing requirements at each permit level. They noted that no new TPEs were needed as current ones cover ages 0–8 but emphasized that “school age” keeps getting younger. CAP extension coursework tied to EL specialization was recommended to justify the addition to community college schedules. Members raised questions about alternate training pathways, such as CDA and Montessori, and the potential elimination of the school-aged permit.

Item 8: Workgroup Comments

Note that the Workgroup comment below has been paraphrased and summarized for clarity.

- One Workgroup member emphasized the interconnectedness of EA2 requirements, cautioning against imposing requirements that could be too time-consuming or costly for participants.

Item 9: Public Comments

Members of the public made verbal comments in the meeting, and written comments were made on a Padlet.

Verbal Public Comments in the Meeting

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

- **Randi Wolfe, Executive Director of Pathways to Success:** Emphasized the need for degree-applicable courses, clarity on implementation timelines, and consideration of alternative pathways.
- **Emma Johnston, Board of California Montessori Alliance:** Advocated for aligning ECE credentials with Montessori credentials and including various educational paths.
- **Denise Monnier, Director of Advocacy for Montessori Public Policy Initiative:** Highlighted the rigor of Montessori credentials and urged ensuring access to well-prepared Montessori teachers.
- **Pamm Shaw, Director of YMCA of East Bay and Community College Teachers:** Called for easier permit acquisition, retention, and dual-language approaches to address low teacher compensation.
- **Jessica Sawko, Children Now:** Stressed the need to consider the broader system, including compensation, and advocated for clear pathways and multilingual coursework.
- **Lucia Garay, Former Executive Director for Early Learning in the San Diego County Office of Education:** Emphasized alignment between early childhood and K–12 for career advancement and integration of coursework and TPEs.
- **Jan Fish, PEACH Leadership in California:** Applauded infant-toddler coursework inclusion and cautioned against compromising quality for accessibility.

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.

Alternative Pathways (23 comments)

The majority of comments (15) related to including Montessori training as an alternative pathway to obtaining the permit. Two sets of two comments each in this category bore remarkable similarity. Because the origin of these comments cannot be determined, each comment was counted as a single comment. Three comments pertained to the courses or degrees accepted for the permit, and two comments expressed concerns about obtaining a bachelor's degree and suggested alternatives. Two additional comments were not sub-categorized.

- **Comment Summary:** Public comments on alternative pathways to acquiring the permit predominantly focused on recognizing Montessori credentials. Many advocated for the acceptance of an associate's or bachelor's degree in any subject combined with a Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education (MACTE)-accredited Montessori credential to qualify for ECE 2, ECE 3, EC Admin 1, and EC Admin 2 levels. This recognition, they argued, aligns with the National Association for the Education of Young Children's Professional Standards and Competencies and supports the Commission on Professional Excellence's goals for flexible and multiple career pathways. Commenters highlighted the comprehensive nature of Montessori teacher preparation, including a significant practicum component and its equivalence to college credit hours. They urged for credit from MACTE-accredited programs to count towards the permit. Concerns about the potential exclusion of educators with non-regionally accredited Montessori credentials under the proposed requirements were raised. Additionally, there was a call for simpler pathways for family childcare educators to transition to the PK–3 credential and for more accessible routes for out-of-state educators. The possibility of earning domain credit by examination was also mentioned, allowing permitted educators to demonstrate competency in specialization areas, such as infant-toddler education. Some comments expressed concern over barriers such as general education requirements hindering progress and the need to consider related fields and supplemental ECE coursework for those with a bachelor's degree in a different field.

Unit Requirements (15 comments)

Seven comments proposed expanding the range of accepted bachelor's degree fields for ECE 3 and EC Admin 2 credentials. Two comments endorsed maintaining the bachelor's degree mandate for the ECE 3 level, while another two advocated for eliminating this requirement. The remaining comments did not have common sub-themes.

- **Comment Summary:** Members of the public expressed diverse opinions on the unit requirements for obtaining a CDP. Several contributors advocated for broader acceptance of bachelor's degrees, suggesting that degrees in any related field, not just ECE and Child Development, should qualify individuals for the permit. They also recommended including degrees with alternative titles, such as Human Development and Family Studies. Conversely, some argued against the necessity of a bachelor's for ECE 3, citing barriers such as wage discrepancies, cost, and accessibility of higher education. Others supported the bachelor's degree requirement, emphasizing its role in ensuring quality outcomes for children and maintaining professionalism within the field. Concerns were raised about current permit holders potentially losing their jobs due to new degree requirements, given the financial and logistical challenges of attaining the degree. Additionally, there was discussion about the inconsistency in unit requirements for different permits and the potential negative impact of raising educational standards on recruiting and retaining qualified early education staff. Lastly, aligning the Permit Matrix with degree requirements was highlighted to ensure equity, access, and efficient progress toward degrees.

Coursework (13 comments)

Most comments in this category related to coursework for specializations (nine comments), with four focusing on infant and toddler, two on special education, one on expanded learning, and two focused on multiple specializations. Two comments focused on the ECE TPEs, and two others were not subcategorized.

- **Comment Summary:** There was a strong consensus that specialization in key areas, such as infant and toddler care and special education, should be integrated into associate's and bachelor's degrees rather than requiring additional coursework, which could create barriers to student success and exacerbate issues of equity and access. Emphasis was placed on the necessity of including infant and toddler units as a core requirement due to its critical impact on workforce development and the ability of educators to meet diverse developmental needs. Public comments on the coursework for the child development permit underscored a perceived misalignment between current educational requirements and practical workplace needs. Participants noted that traditional coursework does not adequately prepare students for real-world ECE scenarios, particularly in areas such as inclusion, working with children with special needs, and engaging effectively with families—topics not sufficiently covered by Curriculum Alignment Project (CAP)-8 courses. The alignment of coursework with ECE TPEs was highlighted as essential for preparing educators capable of quality interactions in multilingual, infant and toddler, and special needs settings. Additionally, there was concern over whether administrators were sufficiently updated on recent advancements in quality assessment tools and professional development and whether the current and proposed recommendations reflect these changing expectations. Overall, the comments called for a curriculum that balances theoretical knowledge with

practical skills, simplifies degree completion, and maintains permit validity for ECE professionals.

Practicum and Field Experience (10 comments)

Within this theme, three comments pertained to access to practicum, three to requirements for supervisory experience, and two to widening options for field experience. Two other comments were not sub-categorized.

- **Comment Summary:** Members identified access to practicum as a significant obstacle, particularly for those with work commitments in family childcare or non-qualifying programs. They suggested that work experience be considered as an alternative to practicum courses to alleviate hardships for working families and reflect the value of on-the-job learning. The difficulty of obtaining practicum placements in community colleges was noted as a barrier that could delay educational advancement. Commenters also called for a more detailed framework for demonstrating competencies through field experience, including using assessment tools like the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP). There was a request to recognize hours of experience for individuals transitioning from other fields or those with extensive industry experience. Concerns were raised about the stringent requirement of 4 years of supervisory experience, which could disadvantage professionals returning to the field or those with dated classroom experience. Additionally, the inclusion of WASC-accredited TPEs from diverse educational programs, such as Montessori, was recommended. Finally, the need for a specific practicum component focusing on infants and toddlers was emphasized to address the unique needs of this age group and to move away from a preschool-centric model.

TPE Study (four comments)

- **Comment Summary:** Members of the public raised concerns regarding the representativeness and implications of a study on ECE TPEs. They questioned the decision to conduct a pilot study with only two community colleges and two universities, suggesting that the limited sample size might not provide a statistically sound or accurate representation of the statewide ECE credentialing landscape, which could influence the validity of conclusions and recommendations drawn from the study. There was also apprehension about the potential impact of the study's delay in implementing the proposed permit matrix changes, with calls for clarification on plans and timelines for integrating the ECE TPE study results into practice. The concern was that the magnitude of the changes would affect tens of thousands of individuals, further emphasizing the need for a more comprehensive sample to inform such significant statewide policy decisions.

Authorization (three comments)

- **Comment Summary:** Members of the public provided input on authorizations, particularly concerning the ECE 1 and ECE 2 levels. They pointed out inconsistencies in the options available for describing the level of supervision or guidance required for ECE 1, suggesting that if an ECE 1 requires guidance by an ECE 2, then the description for ECE 2 should also include the option for providing guidance, not just supervision. Additionally, participants noted the absence of a “guidance only” option for ECE 2, which they felt was necessary alongside the “supervision” and “supervision and guidance” choices. The discussion also touched upon the distinctions in supervisory roles at the EC Admin 1 level, particularly in delineating responsibilities for supervisors overseeing single versus multiple sites and how management responsibilities might differ with larger staff or family numbers.

Access and Workforce Concerns (two comments)

- **Comment Summary:** Members of the public highlighted concerns regarding the economic implications of the proposed recommendations for ECE professionals. They acknowledged that while there had been discussions on aligning with TK–12 counterparts, there had been no corresponding conversation about increased compensation. The comments underscored the additional economic burden these recommendations might impose on ECE professionals and emphasized the potential challenges in filling existing vacancies within the sector, which could have a broader impact on California's economy, given the role of ECE as the workforce behind the workforce.

General Comments

Four comments were uncategorized.

- **Comment Summary:** Members of the public expressed concerns about apparent discrepancies between the perspectives of Workgroup members and those of public representatives, suggesting a potential disconnect between individuals engaged in direct ECE program delivery and those in traditional professional development roles. There was a call for greater inclusivity of Family Childcare Home Providers in the revised permit matrix, emphasizing their professional legitimacy and the benefits they would gain from inclusion. Concerns were raised about the impact of the emergency authorization in ECE 1 on service quality if educators were allowed to enter classrooms without completing all required units. Additionally, there was feedback questioning the need for an after-school or expanded care specialization, considering that such programs are not licensed and not required to hire permit holders. The suggestion was made that this specialization adds no value to permit holders, recommending that the requirement be dropped in favor of adhering to Title 22's existing unit requirements.

Questions

Members of the public posed 21 questions on diverse topics. They inquired about accessing Infant and Toddler AdHoc requirements, the significance of declining to comment in surveys, and interpreting such a response. Clarification was sought on the definition of ECE 2, its correlation with current permit levels, and the most reliable reference sources, such as Appendix D from the April CTC meeting. There was interest in whether feedback had been collected from permit holders and if updates to the Workforce Registry were planned. Questions also touched on the evolution of teaching credentials, particularly regarding the potential shift from the traditional K–8 credential to PK–3 or Multiple Subject (4–8) credentials. Participants requested guidance on exams for FCC Providers, the definition of "toddler," and the absence of action plans accompanying certain discussions. Questions were raised about the timeline for approving permit changes, the definition of "school age" in the new PK–3 credential, and how permit renewals would be managed, including the option to maintain current levels with continuing education. Further inquiries were made about the development and impact of alternative pathways on the permit matrix, including the effects of Assembly Bill 1930 on ECE associate teacher roles. Finally, questions were asked about ensuring consistency across the permit matrix, degree programs, ECE credential, TK positions, and aligning practicum requirements within the PK–3 credential framework.

Item 10: Exit Ticket and Closure

Ms. Marshall and Dr. Keeler closed the meeting, thanking all Workgroup members, liaisons, and members of the public for their invaluable work and input in revising the permit.