



Washington State Department of Early Learning

Professional Development Consortium

Friday, April 17, 2009

9:00 am – 1:00 pm

Clover Park Technical College

Meeting Minutes

In attendance: Billie Young, Bobbie Weber, Susan Yang Affolter, Michelle Andreas, Agda Burchard, Tenlee Bell, Sheryl Garrison, Hannah Lidman, Brenda Boyd, Mary Seaton, Amber Havens, Kelli Bohanon, Joel Ryan, Katie Warren, Sally Holloway, Linda Tyler Murray, Kursten Holabird, Juliet Morrison, Nancy Gerber, Char Rupp, Jackie Jainga-Hyllseth, Mari Offenbecher

Mari opened the meeting by asking everyone to reflect upon and share a powerful professional development experience that made an impact. The common theme was there are multiple ways and experiences to provide providers with opportunities to advance professionally.

Juliet addressed SHB 1943. We will devote time at the next meeting to address specific deadlines and to do some strategic planning. Kursten acknowledged Hannah's work on SHB 1943 and Hannah stated that this will more than likely be the final version of the bill.

Mapping

The group felt that mapping our professional development system would be difficult to do at this time, as the current system is not yet integrated and the group has not been able to make recommendations on the end goals for the system. It is difficult to identify gaps when we don't know where we are ultimately going. Juliet, along with the co-chairs proposed mapping what we currently have today – using group expertise along with resources such as *Paving the Pathways*. It was proposed that the NAEYC state team heading to the Professional Development Conference in North Carolina can start some of the work on mapping what we have in our state today. Kursten liked the small group focus and felt that June is a reasonable launching point. Brenda asked whether the work would need to be

completed in June and agreed that we have the information, we just need to pull it together. Mary added that it is important that we know how we want to organize the information so it can be updated regularly. Juliet felt that the state team could come up with a first draft to share with the larger Consortium and Agda stated that it will be important to connect with the after school folks prior to leaving. The group agreed to allow this smaller team to work on moving this effort forward. Juliet will meet with members to discuss possible formats and other direction before the June meeting

Standards Examples

Juliet thanked everyone who came to the last meeting and provided feedback. We took the feedback from the group who attended the last consortium meeting and created standard examples based on compiled feedback.

Items that the group felt were important to include:

- Links to Benchmarks, QRIS, Skill Standards
- Should include measurable outcomes
- Provide pathways information
- Inclusive of school age, infant and toddler
- Include a glossary
- Address health and safety, interactions and well-being
- Address experience
- Include mentors and coaching
- Simple and useable
- Visually pleasing
- Include some sort of tracking tool/provider record
- Research based with a systems approach

This is a first draft that needs to be re-crafted and be made appropriate for Washington State. We started with the Skill Standards and broke the standards into levels which will need to be discussed further. Level One is speaks to new providers, Level Two speaks to those with a credential or certification, Level Three addresses those with an AA and Level Four those with a BA. We simply needed a starting point; however Juliet noted the need for a larger group discussion around pathway points and levels. The highlighted language was added by looking at other standards and gaps in the format of Skill Standards language. Hannah would like to look at the other state competencies that were reviewed in the last meeting. DEL will send those out, however Virginia's competencies are currently not readily available for distribution.

The last page of the document has common categories that were not addresses in this model. Juliet acknowledged the group consensus that we don't need to reinvent the wheel and that the document needs to be useable and simple. DEL will support the consortium by crafting language and compiling information, but needed more feedback to move forward.

Feedback from Small Groups

Group One: (Agda)

- All four sets of Skill Standards need to be used
- If this is a policy document, the first level seems too low
- Need to frame what resources are needed to move
- Should represent all age groups

Group Two: (Kurstin)

- Need to define how this document will be used
- Oregon has a thoroughly designed Registry system to complement their lattice with 12 levels and community based trainings have sets or levels as a way of advancing
- Do we need to come up with standards or are there existing built in requirements
- Could be too cumbersome for the community colleges to have one system and for us to have this
- Credentialing (CDA etc) has more variability

Juliet stated that feedback from the CCDF survey addressed the need for more challenging training. Jackie expressed the need to address what competencies come from the Skill Standards first. Bobbie asked of Washington's higher education system has something in place that is competency based – if the work has already been done. Michelle replied that there is a focus on learning outcomes in the community and technical college system. She further stated that the community and technical colleges are the largest provider of early childhood education in the state and that NAEYC standards are integrated into the curriculum. Rather than creating parallel systems, the challenge is to create a system that allows for seamless movement. In the past, early learning was not as dominant an issue as it is now, so groups worked tirelessly on trying to figure out how they can fit together. It is complex because many people have ownership of this work.

Group Three: (Hannah)

- The language in the rationale is not user friendly for all audiences
- How do we want to use these?
- Need to be mindful of how the levels are presented
- Need to look at the special needs and behaviorally challenged children – this needs to be woven throughout
- Need to be culturally sensitive. For example, it is not appropriate to address parents by name in some cultures

Group Four: (Kelli)

- Echoes what has been said

- Alignment is important
- Discussion focused on creating a continuum; as it exists now, there is not progression
- Need to address foundational skills
- Need an integrative approach and focus
- Need a glossary

Amber stated that it needs to align all the way through the levels.

Group Five: (Mary and Brenda)

- Many of the comments heard resonate with us
- How do we use this document
- Addressing competencies creates a different set of questions; need to define how we will use it before we evaluate it
- Need to use systems that exist but show alignment between them
- This is a complex task

Mary stated that we are struggling with two tasks:

1. Defining what professionals who work with children birth through age 8 need to know
2. Aligning existing systems that work on professional development

This document can be used as a communication tool, but we need systems integration on those that provide professional development.

Michelle added that what we are doing is working on eventual products. We need to define our preferred future and know where we are going. The group agreed that in addition to continued efforts on this document, we must go back to the beginning and do a larger visioning exercise on our preferred future. Juliet stated that DEL's role is to serve the consortium and to incorporate feedback from member recommendations. There was a larger discussion on ensuring system alignment using the NAEYC standards and P-3 endorsement standards that are already aligned with higher education at the higher levels as well as alignment with the CDA in level 2 of the core knowledge document. The group had continued discussion and various viewpoints on what the lower levels would focus on.

Juliet stated that there are so many pieces that tie together. We can work on visioning and create products simultaneously. Joel feels that the process has been good, but we need to define what the document will be used for. We need to focus on both the possible and the impossible and keep in mind what is best for children and families. There are some people that shouldn't be entering the system and the public will pay for quality. Mari stated that she agrees with Michelle-sometimes it takes peeling back the onion first to discover our next steps.

Bobbie Weber Presentation – Power Point presentation attached

Along with presented material Bobbie emphasized the following points based on Consortium member discussion:

- Credentials often fill gaps between community based training and higher education
- Licensors have multiple roles and are an important part of professional development. Teacher behavior is almost never measured, nor is it measured or researched in home based settings.
- There is not as much variance in the K-12 world as everyone has a degree. A lot of the research is similar to our field however.
- We are an unusual practitioner profession as there are no minimums.
- A combination of education with coaching and training gives us the most bang for our buck.
- Research shows that experience doesn't count. A provider could be doing it wrong for thirty years with no education or training.

Next Steps:

The group agreed that we need to complete an in-person, all day visioning exercise for our next meeting. The announcement for our May meeting will be circulated via email.