



# Meeting 8 Summary

## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Child Development Permit Workgroup

---

July 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 8

---

## Meeting Date and Time

The Child Development Permit Workgroup (Workgroup) met virtually on June 12, 2024, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

## Attendees

### Workgroup Members

- Betsy Uda, Head Start
- Cathy Yun, Learning Policy Institute
- Chris Reeve, Legislative Director, California School Board Association
- Christine Shreve, Holy Cross Preschool
- Giselle Navarro-Cruz, Cal Poly Pomona
- Helen Davis, University of California, Los Angeles
- Hilary Seitz, California State University Chancellor's Office
- Jessica Tejada, Mount Pleasant Elementary School District, San Jose
- Jody Johnson, Santiago Canyon College
- Juliet Terry, Child Care Resource Center
- 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
- Mandy Redfern, Glendale Unified School District
- Martha Dominguez-Brinkley, CA First 5
- Melanee Cottrill, Head Start California
- 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

- Deborah Stipek, Stanford University
- Erin Dubey, California Department of Education
- Lisa Velarde, California Department of Social Services
- Melanie Huitt, Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division

### Members of the Public

- Alana Pinsler, California Department of Education
- Alyssa Corrigan, Kidango
- Amanda Elsemore, Siskiyou County Office of Education
- Amy Carr, Mendocino County Office of Education
- Andrea Estupinan, Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County
- Angela Capone, Los Angeles County Office of Education
- Anjum Abid, Family Day Care
- Bella Gonzalez, Kings County Office of Education
- Bertha Barajas, University of California Riverside
- Blanca Sargizian, Child Development Training Consortium
- Unknown Representative, California Montessori Alliance

- Camila Rand, ECEPTS
- Carolina Mendez, Los Angeles Valley College
- Caroline Jen, East Los Angeles College
- Cherry Vu, Kidango
- Cheryl Direen, San Bernardino City Unified School District
- Chris E.G, La Jolla Daycare
- Chrystina Long, Fontana Unified School District
- Daisy Viveros, Los Angeles County Office of Education
- Felicia Urrabazo, Fresno County Superintendent of Schools
- Genesia Gonzales, Baldwin Park Unified School District
- Guadalupe Rivas Jer, San Mateo County Office of Education
- Hawani Negussie, UMass Global
- Heather Haubrich, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Hong Schauble, Poway Unified School District
- Jan Fish, PEACH
- Javonelle Fosu, The Children’s Collective, Inc.
- Jennifer Osalbo, California Department of Education
- Jessica Sawko, Children Now
- Joyce Robinson, Crazy Quilt Solutions
- Kelly Love, Humboldt County Office of Education
- Kelly Reynolds, Early Edge California
- Ken Herron, California Children’s Academy
- Kimberly Armstrong, Grossmont Union High School District CDC
- Kimberley Radmacher, California State University Dominguez Hills
- Kisha Hayes, Early Care and Education Pathways to Success
- Kristina Brower, San Mateo Community College District
- Kristy Ford, Scripps
- Lanre Ajayi, West Contra Costa Unified School District
- Laprice Brown, Delta College
- Laura Cardenas, Crystal Stairs

- Laura Reyes, Los Angeles County Office of Education
- Laura Surace, San Bernardino City Unified School District
- Libriana Khan, Learn and Grow Playcare
- Linda Haddadin, California Department of Social Services
- Lisa Estrada, Child Development Training Consortium
- Lisa Schut, Modesto Junior College
- Lisa Wilkin, Child Development Consortium of Los Angeles
- Maddie Torret, Mendocino County Office of Education
- Maeva Marc, Kidango
- Malissa Mastropierro, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Marco Marano, Los Angeles Harbor College
- Maria I Lopez, Alisal Union School District
- Maria Pelayo, Orange County Department of Education
- Mario Amaro, Amaro Family Child Care
- Marissa Duran, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Martina Ebesugawa, Diablo Valley College
- Mary Lopez, Long Beach Unified School District
- Mary Beth Miller, California Early Childhood Education Curriculum Alignment Project
- Michelle Hall, Chapman University
- Mirian Ferroni, Family Child Care Home
- Myeisha Jones, Oakland Unified School District Early Childhood Education
- Nanette Schonleber, Sonoma State University
- Natalie Dunaway, State of California
- Nathalie Gomez, Madera County Superintendent of Schools
- Nina Buthee, EveryChild California
- Pamm Shaw, Early Care and Education Pathways to Success
- Patricia Moreno, Long Beach Unified School District, Office of Child Development Centers
- Pedro Sousa, Mission College
- Randi Wolfe, Early Care & Education Pathways to Success

- Rebecca Grasty, Self
- Rosa Solorio, San Lorenzo Unified School District
- Ruby Moreno, Early Childhood Education Teacher
- Sara Gassner-Wollwage, San Mateo County Office of Education
- Sarah Soriano, Young Horizons
- Serette Kaminski, Association of CA School Administrators
- Sha'Breau Wilson, All Kids Academy Head Start
- Soledad Galvez, Options for Learning
- Sonia Angulo, VESD
- Sylvia Iniguez, Ventura County Office of Education
- Tanessa Sanchez, Palomar College
- Terese Torres, Long Beach Unified School District – Office of Child Development Centers
- Terrissa Hein, Contra Costa County Office of Education
- Tina Watts, Skyline College
- Tony Jordan, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Tonya Omar, Los Angeles County Office of Education
- Valerie Madrigal, Child Development Training Consortium
- Veronica Garcia, Stanislaus County Office of Education
- Victoria Coverson-Baxter, San Mateo County Office of Education Early Learning
- Yumi Ramirez, Boys & Girls Clubs of Garden Grove

### **California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Staff**

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

### **Region 15 Comprehensive Center Staff**

- Liz Jameyson
- Corey Cornett
- Edith Gurolla

- Barbara Jones
- Brianna Moorehead
- Krista Murphy
- Andrea Rolla

## Meeting Items

### Item 1: Welcome and Connection

Renee Marshall welcomed the Workgroup and stated that there may be slight adjustments in the wording of the final permit matrix shared with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The adjustments will maintain the intent and intended purpose of the wording. She mentioned there will be a celebration on July 19th to which members of the public will be invited.

Liz Jameyson reviewed the Workgroup agreements. Debra Keeler walked through the agenda and Ms. Jameyson the Roadmap.

### Item 2: Meeting 7 Summary

Ms. Jameyson shared the results for the two levels of the permit matrix, early childhood educator (ECE) 1 and ECE 2 matrices that were settled, including authorization, provisional certification, alternative requirement options, field experience, and renewal requirements, including the voting percentage for each element.

Dr. Keeler stated that there are several steps before this version is finalized, which will involve working with the CTC, aligning with regulations, and receiving public feedback.

### Items 3, 4, 5, and 6: Required Units, ECE 3, Admin 1 and 2, Google Voting (4 Items)

Ms. Jameyson invited Workgroup and public participants to answer separate permit matrix surveys. Each participant individually completed a Google survey on the specifications of each element up for discussion, including coursework recommendations, authorization, experience and fieldwork, and units and degrees. Ms. Jameyson shared the results with the group shortly after they had voted. The results of this survey will inform recommendations submitted to the CTC.



## Item 7: 105 Professional Learning Hours

Ms. Jameyson invited participants to join small groups to discuss the requirement of 105 hours for professional learning, answering the question: “What would an ideal system look like?” She then asked facilitators to report back to the whole group on what topics came up in their discussions.

## Item 8: Ad Hoc Committees’ Recommendations

Dr. Keeler asked the public and Workgroup members to vote on whether they agreed or disagreed with various Ad Hoc Committee recommendations. The Ad Hoc Committees were the Multilingual Learners Committee, the Infants and Toddlers Committee, the Expanded Learning Committee, and the Special Education Committee.

### Multilingual Learners Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

Workgroup members were asked to choose whether they agreed or disagreed with the following recommendations:

- No update is needed to the content of the ECE Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) because they already include basic elements that support dual-language learners, including English language development (ELD) and home language development.
- Create a specialization for those preparing for a bilingual setting (immersive, balanced bilingual program). Specialization would include 6 units for multi- and bilingual instruction that includes the following coursework:
  - Dual language development (including the Bilingual TPEs)
  - Instructional methods for dual-language learners

### Infants and Toddlers Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

Workgroup members were asked to choose whether they agreed or disagreed with the following recommendations:

- No update is needed to the content of the TPEs because they already include basic elements that support information technology.
- Add a statement that includes “all children 0–8” at the end of the domain titles in the TPEs.
- **ECE 1:** Core courses—including Child Growth and Development, Child Family and Community, and Early Childhood Curriculum—with coverage of infant and toddler courses and an option to add Infant and Toddler Care and Curriculum to complete the core 12 units.

- **ECE 2:** Core courses—including Child Growth and Development, Child Family and Community, and Early Childhood Curriculum—with coverage of infant and toddler in courses and recommend that the Infant and Toddler Care and Curriculum course be included within the 24 units or associate degree.
- Create a specialization for those who prepare themselves for an infant-toddler setting. Specialization would include 6 units in the following coursework:
  - Infant and toddler development
  - Early relational health for infants and toddlers (infant care and mental health).

### Expanded Learning Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

Workgroup members were asked to choose whether they agreed or disagreed with the following recommendations:

- No update is necessary to the content of the TPEs because they already include basic elements that support children 0–8.
- Create a specialization for those who prepare themselves for an expanded learning setting. Specialization would include 6 units in the following coursework:
  - School-age development and curriculum
  - Programming for school-age children
- The recommended expanded learning courses would be **in addition** to the requirements for each permit level

### Special Education Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

Workgroup members were asked to choose whether they agreed or disagreed with the following recommendations:

- No update is necessary to the content of the TPEs because they include basic elements that support special education.
- Create a specialization for those who prepare themselves to meet the needs of children with special needs. Specialization would include 6 units in the following coursework:
  - Introduction to children with disabilities or delays
  - Curriculum and strategies for children with disabilities or delays

### Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations: TPEs

Workgroup members were asked to choose whether they agreed or disagreed with the following recommendations:

- Keep the current organizational structure by domain.
- If the permit levels are renamed, the ECE-TPE titles and the roles should be updated to match.
- The specialization areas are included at a foundational knowledge level in the current ECE-TPEs but would not be considered a specialization. A specialization indicates “over and above.”
- If specialization areas are a part of the permit structure, then ECE-TPEs should be developed for each area within the framework of 6 additional units for each specialization.

### Item 9: Workgroup Comments

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

- Will the recommendations go out for public comment once they are finalized?
- Providing more professional learning for our early childhood educators is so important. It helps maintain parity with kindergarten through grade 12.
- We need to remember all of the professionals in the early childhood education field and maintain this collaborative work.
- We are doing this for our workforce and our children.
- My thanks for the process, especially to WestEd. It’s great to be aspirational, but more units and requirements require greater capacity. We need to ensure we are not creating barriers for families in poverty trying to access early childhood education and for people trying to become early childhood educators
- This approach has been so much more collaborative than the prior process. Thank you.
- It’s important to receive more information about the charge, the process, and next steps.

### Item 10: 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.

- **Emma, CA Montessori Alliance:** The avenue of equivalency for Montessori is very important. It is important for the requirement of professional learning that was discussed today.

- **Ken Herron, CA Children's Academy:** We appreciate your work. The recommendations will need to be accompanied by funding.
- **Kelly Reynolds, Early Edge California:** We recommend the 6-unit specializations in bilingual languages for infants and toddlers.
- **Pamm Shaw, Early Care and Education Pathways to Success:** We need to have articulation among organizations, like community colleges, CTC, etc. Finding teachers with associate's degrees will be a challenge. Community colleges need to be responsive to workforce issues. We need to have parity in funding for early childhood education.
- **Martina Ebesugawa, Diablo Valley College:** Teachers are struggling to meet the needs of students in their programs. All early childhood educators need to complete coursework in working with children who have special needs.

### Public Comments From the Padlet

There were 48 comments on the Padlet. Each comment was categorized into one or more categories and then themed within categories, where appropriate. The comments in each category (or each category theme) were summarized for ease of interpretation and length.

#### *Alternative Pathways (nine comments)*

The majority of comments (four) related to including Montessori training as an alternative pathway to obtaining the permit at levels beyond ECE 1. Two comments focused on credit for exams and credit for fieldwork. Two additional comments provided input on the ECE 2 degree requirement. One comment listed three alternate pathways (registered apprenticeship, Child Development Associate (CDA), Montessori) without offering further detail.

### Comment Summary

Public comments recommended that Montessori education be recognized as a valid alternative pathway for achieving the California Child Development Permit, in line with the National Association for the Education of Young Children guidelines. Educators with an associate degree in any field, coupled with a Montessori Credential from a Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education accredited program, should be eligible for an ECE 2 permit, while those with a bachelor's degree and the same credential should qualify for ECE 3 and ECA 1 and ECA 2 permits. Comments emphasized that it is essential that California include Montessori credentialed teachers in its early learning framework, acknowledging the rigorous Montessori teacher preparation that encompasses extensive coursework and student teaching. Moreover, professional development hours mandated by the American Montessori Society (AMS) should be acknowledged for both AMS ECE credentials and the permit to prevent unnecessary burdens on candidates. It is also recommended that credit by exam and fieldwork for experienced educators be considered valid for the permit. Additionally, the ECE 2 permit education requirements should be revised to include students in child development and ECE bachelor

programs who have completed the requisite coursework but do not hold an associate's degree, thus adopting more inclusive criteria.

#### *Access and Workforce Concerns (seven comments)*

These comments did not have sub-themes.

#### **Comment Summary**

Public comments emphasized that educational requirements for the permit should consider the barriers ECE professionals face, such as financial constraints and language barriers, and should provide support to facilitate their educational progression. The recommendations highlight that any new educational requirements should be implemented with corresponding funding to ensure the sustainability of private agencies and to make ECE careers attractive to potential employees. Increased educational demands should be paired with adequate compensation; otherwise, there is a risk that current educators will not renew their permits if education requirements increase while compensation remains steady. Comments suggested that entry barriers into the ECE field should be minimized. Finally, there was a call for clarity and rationalization in the requirements for ECE 3 and Admin 1 permits to streamline the path to qualification and better meet workplace demands. There was also a strong recommendation that ECE 1 permit holders be allowed to supervise infant and toddler programs without needing an ECE 2 on-site to avoid staffing issues.

#### *Specialization (six comments)*

The comments were split equally across specialization areas, with two focusing on infants and toddlers, two focusing on special education, and two crossing areas to include infants and toddlers and special education (one comment) and special education and multilingual learners (one comment).

#### **Comment Summary**

Public comments underscored that specific courses on infant and toddler care should be mandatory, as the depth required to work with these age groups is not sufficiently covered in existing Curriculum Alignment Project 8 coursework. All ECE permit holders should complete an infant course to qualify to work in infant classrooms and gain foundational knowledge of early development. Special education and family communication were highlighted as critical areas where an inclusion class should be mandated for every ECE professional, from entry-level educators to program directors. To better serve the immediate needs of new ECE workers, the core curriculum was proposed to be flexible, substituting the standard curriculum with infant and toddler development or inclusive practices, which are seen as more pertinent for those starting out in the field. Lastly, should special needs and multilingual learner content not be integrated into the required coursework, professional development or a learning requirement should be instituted, similar to existing health and safety training, to ensure educators are prepared to support all learners effectively.

### *Field Experience (five comments)*

The majority of comments in this section (three) focused on the lack of a field experience requirement for ECE 1. One comment focused on the number of hours of field experience required for ECE 3, and another focused on associating field experience with a practicum course to ensure hours apply to the prekindergarten through grade three (PK–3) specialist credential.

#### **Comment Summary**

Public comments suggested that the ECE 1 permit should require more on-the-job training, pointing out that the CDA credential requires 480 hours and registered apprenticeship programs require 2000 hours, whereas ECE 1 requires none. It was recommended that ECE 1 permit holders have field experience and be required to take coursework to enhance their quality as educators. A commenter voiced strong opposition to the proposed 100 hours of supervised field experience for ECE 3, considered inadequate compared to the extensive hours required by other programs and a step backward regarding educator preparation. Additionally, for those hours to apply for a PK–3 specialist credential, a commenter mentioned that they should be associated with a practicum course, ensuring relevance and applicability to the wider scope of early education settings.

### *Implementation (four comments)*

There were no sub-themes for this category.

#### **Comment Summary**

Public comments raised concerns about the implementation timeline for changes to the permit matrix, questioning whether it would account for the challenges posed by early education funding and suggesting a gradual rollout over the next two years to accommodate state budget reductions. Additionally, there were questions about how existing permits would be acknowledged, whether there would be a credit system for prior permits, and if a grace period would be established to allow current permit holders time to adapt to new qualifications or requirements. Finally, a commenter asked about the publication date of the updated permit matrix.

### *Workgroup Composition (three comments)*

There were no sub-themes for this category.

#### **Comment Summary**

Public comments expressed concern about the Workgroup's representation, questioning how many members are current permit holders or have operational responsibilities involving hiring permit holders. There was a call for more diverse professional pathways to be included in discussions about the ECE workforce, highlighting that limiting representation to community college and university pathways excludes innovative and effective approaches. Additionally, it was pointed out that people associated with bachelor's programs in child development and

early childhood education are also instrumental in preparing students for permits and should have been included in the Workgroup to ensure comprehensive representation.

#### *Consideration of Public Comment (three comments)*

There were no sub-themes for this category.

#### **Comment Summary**

Public comments expressed concerns about the inclusivity and representativeness of the Workgroup process, noting that not sharing public survey results during Workgroup meetings seemed exclusionary. There was skepticism about the reliability of statewide system changes informed by the small Workgroup size and the typical number of public commenters, as it may not accurately reflect California's broader permit holder population. The approach was criticized as top-down, with a suggestion that a more collaborative method would be preferable. Additionally, questions about the Workgroup members' ability to represent the ECE field without access to public surveys and narrative responses were raised. Concerns were also voiced regarding the public's preparation for voting, as there were instances of not receiving necessary materials to review beforehand.

#### *General Comments (four comments) and Questions (five questions)*

There were no sub-themes for this category. The comments and questions in this category could not be grouped with other themes.

#### **Comment Summary**

One comment suggested establishing equivalency between ECE 3 and Admin 1 requirements for those not interested in administrative roles, and another suggested maintaining the current program director requirements. A commenter questioned the inclusion of mentorship within the ECE 3 requirements because mentorship relationships are more organic and potentially conflicted if the mentor is also the supervisor.

#### **Question Summary**

One question inquired whether there have been discussions with the California Department of Education (CDE), the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), and Community Care Licensing (CCL) regarding the regulatory and monitoring implications of the proposed permit changes, noting that the changes might significantly affect state or federally funded programs. A question was raised about the alignment of the bachelor's degree levels of the permit with the PK–3 specialist credential, with concerns about the potential exodus of ECE professionals to transitional kindergarten or universal prekindergarten, which could have a profound impact on non-local educational agencies. Additionally, clarity was sought on how a bachelor's degree in ECE with 24 credits fits within the new permit structure and what the definition of supervision entails, particularly whether an ECE 1 can operate in a classroom without an ECE 2. There was a request for transparency in the CTC's follow-up actions. Lastly, there was a query about the

renewal process for the ECE 1 permit and whether it could be renewed indefinitely, contrasting with the current associate teacher permit restrictions.