

**CCCECE Response to CTC Child Development Permit Changes 10.26.17**

(To be read at the CTC Commission Meeting 10/26/17-10/27/17)

California Community Colleges Early Childhood Educators (CCCECE) has been the professional organization serving and acting on behalf of the needs of community college early childhood or child development departments and child development centers and lab programs in California for over 30 years. California Community Colleges are the primary training institutions for early childhood educators. Our mission is to advocate for high quality child development instruction and early care and education programs. In response to Educator Preparation Committee's, Update on Work Related to the Child Development Permit” (EPC 3D-1), CCCECE has the following response:

CCCECE supports the work of the Educator Preparation Committee and their recommendation for revisions to the current California Child Development Permits. If the permit revisions are to remain on hold as the expanded Performance Expectations and Program Guidelines are drafted and provided for field review, we ask that the following items be addressed:

1. Under the existing Child Development Permit Matrix, waivers are currently being issued to child care programs to allow teachers who do not have the required 24 Early Childhood Education units (plus 16 units of General Education), to serve as a teacher with only an Associate Teacher Permit (12 Early Childhood Education units). This lowers the quality of care of these programs, and is not in compliance with the current Child Development Permit Matrix. If we are to advance quality and teacher performance expectations, we must adhere to the minimum requirements which are outlined in the current Child Development Permit Matrix.
2. The current requirements for the Child Development Teacher Permit include 24 units of Early Childhood Education Units. This requirement does not currently require a Supervised Field Experience Course within these 24 units. We request that the Commission amend this requirement to include at least one Supervised Field Experience course. CCCECE feels that lead teachers in early childhood programs must have practical teaching experience under the supervision of a Mentor Teacher.
3. We also support that all students must have field experiences with at least two of the following age groups: infants/toddlers, preschool, and school-age. This would enhance their education with children ages 0-8. Pre-school experience alone is not sufficient preparation for early childhood teachers.
4. CCCECE supports the work of the Commission on defining measurement tools for the Performance Expectations and Program Guidelines. We request further input and discussion with community college faculty on a method to measure the Performance Expectations and Program Guidelines. The SLOs and learning objectives of the current CAP8 courses are general in nature and inconsistent in their application. While they hold the potential to address all of the performance expectations, there is no guarantee that they do. We believe that clear pathways to verifying the performance expectations must be identified and implemented.
5. CCCECE, an organization which represents the California Community College early childhood education workforce preparers, requests vital, meaningful and continued input into the Child Development Permit revision and the quality assurance processes developed.

We thank the Educator Preparation Committee and the Commission for their work and continuing efforts towards increasing quality early childcare through review and possible revisions to the Child Development Permit matrix.

California Community Colleges Early Childhood Educators (CCCECE), October 2017 For more information go to: cccece.net

Jeannette & Barbara’s Notes form 10/20/17 conversation:

· **No waivers (12 unit teachers) no longer allow 24 units**

· **24 units include Practicum (supervised field experience)**

· **Emphasis on performance expectations**

· **Manner to measure the performance expectation**

· **CCCECE would like more input into the quality insurance processes and the permit beyond the panel and TWB8 workgroup –“Programs and program sponsors…”**

· Performance Expectations are quantified

· SLOs do not equal performance expectations – cannot be the measure

· Find a way for HE to show that they are meeting performance expectations (no way CTC could verify that a program is meeting expectation – stretched too thin.)

· Multiple age groups – implementation of School Age: Not all private or public

Mary Jane’s Position 10/19/17:

I think the phrase of concern in the agenda item is the following:  
  
"Given the concerns expressed by the field regarding the potential effects of implementing the Panel-recommended changes to the child development permit structure and requirements, the cost of implementing these changes, and the current lack of infrastructure to support many of these changes, staff is not recommending that the Commission adopt any structural changes to the Permit at the present time."

**My first concern relates to a finding that came out in our panel discussions that many Title 5 child development program contractors are working on waivers from CDE that allow them to staff an ECE preschool classroom with associate teacher permit holders (12 units of ECE/CD coursework), with no expectation that there be a lead teacher who holds the teacher permit. A teacher permit (24 units ECE/CD plus 16 units general education) has been the requirement for teaching in state-funded early childhood classrooms since the inception of the child development permit matrix. Because of these waivers, any work that the CTC staff undertakes to create performance standards for teacher and master teacher will be for naught, and become increasingly so as the trend continues for Title 5 early childhood centers being allowed to staff a classroom with someone who holds an associate permit rather than a teacher permit.**

My second concern is that if CTC recommends that the staff *only* proceed with building out the performance expectations for teacher and master teacher (as those positions currently exist on the child development permit matrix), the result will be a glaring mismatch between the *narrative and performance expectations* for the teacher working as the instructional lead for a classroom and the professional preparation of the staff working in this capacity, whether they hold an associate permit or a teacher permit. In the case of staff leading a classroom who have only an associate permit, we would be deluding ourselves if we were to think that twelve units of ECE/CD coursework prepares them to fit the narrative and performance expectations of teacher as described in the document presented to the CTC by staff at the April meeting. In the case of instructional staff leading a classroom who indeed have a teacher permit, this concern remains, at a lesser yet very significant degree. To illustrate this, I have excerpted language from the proposed CDP Teacher Level narrative and performance expectations as presented to the commission at the April meeting. Each of these bulleted “expectations” would *not*, by my estimate, be included in the 24-units of the entry-level CAP courses:

* Candidates also recognize when additional diagnosis and services may be needed.
* For candidates working or intending to work in an Infant/Toddler setting, understand the unique care, development, and learning needs of the youngest children and how to support their growth, development, and learning
* Candidates have the ability to recognize the effects of factors from outside the setting (e.g., poverty, trauma, parental depression, substance abuse, experience of violence in the home or community) that affect children’s learning and development, and how to adjust the learning environment as well as instructional practice to support children experiencing these effects.
* Candidates develop an understanding of content and concepts important in early learning of major subject matter areas, including linguistically-and developmentally-appropriate curriculum in early language and literacy, mathematics and mathematical reasoning, science, technology, engineering, arts, and history and social sciences. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the learning trajectories of how children learn (goals, developmental progressions, and instructional tasks and strategies) and become proficient in each of the Standards and specific subject matter areas. Candidates learn to set appropriate individualized goals and objectives to advance young children’s development and learning within and across Standards and subject areas For infants and toddlers, candidates implement the four foundational domains identified within the California Early Learning and Development System from the California Department of Education. Candidates are familiar with the strengths and limitations of commonly-used early childhood curricula, and with appropriate subject matter pedagogy for key subject areas in the early childhood curriculum.
* Identify key content appropriate for young children **as identified in the California Infant/Toddler** and Preschool Foundations and Curriculum Framework for planning developmentally appropriate curriculum and learning activities for young children
* Candidates are familiar with **California’s infant/toddler** and Preschool **Foundations and Curriculum Framework** that provide guidance for the development and learning of the state’s young children and they apply this foundational knowledge when planning the care, development, and learning experiences for all young children.
* Candidates understand how to advance the learning and development of children who are dual language learners. They understand the use of inclusive instruction, universal design, accessibility, and adaptation to advance the learning and development of children who have specialized developmental or learning needs such as children with disabilities or learning delays. In addition, candidates understand how to be responsive to children experiencing chronic stress/adversity.
* Use a variety of technology and media, and discuss the applicability of these technologies and media within early childhood instruction
* Describe appropriate strategies for supporting home language for the youngest learners
* Describe appropriate strategies for supporting dual language learners in developing English language and literacy skills for preschool age children
* Describe appropriate instructional strategies and potential curriculum and instructional modifications to help young dual language learners access the curriculum
* Describe appropriate instructional strategies and potential curriculum and instructional modifications to help young children with disabilities access the curriculum
* Describe appropriate instructional strategies and potential curriculum and instructional modifications to help young children with other identified socio-emotional needs and children who are gifted and talented access the curriculum.

Why these excerpts? The initial CAP 8 courses do not include coursework specific to infants and toddlers; working with children with special needs; and in-depth coverage of subject matter content areas, like language and literacy, dual language learning, science, and math. ECE degree programs have courses specific to these areas of study and subject matter areas, yet these are outside the 8 CAP courses, those commonly used to satisfy the 24 ECE units needed for a teacher permit.

It is important to note that the panel assumed, in the recommended CD Permit restructuring, that the additional ECE/CD coursework required for an AA degree would have the potential of assuring candidates for a teacher permit be prepared to meet these new performance expectations.

My third concern is with the final Step 6 in the proposed implementation plan, as follows:

“Revisit the CDP AP’s recommendations for structural changes in the permit based on field review following implementation of and practice with the Program Guidelines and the Performance Expectations.”

Addressing the structural changes in the permit “following implementation and practice with the Program Guidelines” is a futile exercise, if the coursework currently described in the CD permit remains, as the expectations set forth in the new performance expectations are beyond what can be offered in the current CAP 8 courses. To simply “re-visit” (sometime after 2018, most likely) the recommendations for structural changes in the permit suggests that they will be looked at, with no guarantee that there will be serious consideration for implementation. From the text in the agenda item, it appears that one thing is stopping CTC from moving ahead with structural changes to the permit now, and that is inadequate funding to Title 5 programs for children birth to 5. The dilemma is this – Unless the CTC acknowledges the need for higher standards, a trend sweeping across the nation, the legislature will remain reticent to support these programs at the level they truly cost. To continue to make young children, their teachers, and their families bear the burden of this reluctance is shameful, to say the least. It would be a terrible setback if we let the opportunity pass to begin the important task of restructuring the child development permit.