

School Readiness Committee
Standards Workgroup Meeting Notes
December 5th, 2017

Present: Irene Carney; Chris Chin; Holly Coy; Kathy Glazer; Bonnie Graham; Mark Allan; Shelley Lingamfelter; Bridget Hamre; Teresa Harris; Marie Masterson; Patsy Moon; Kathy Gilliken;

- (Irene) Notable that after just a year of the SRC's work, we're on the cusp of having a newly updated set of competencies, and recommendations to make to the SRC.
- (Holly & Kathy Glazer) on 12/6, SRC will consider adoption of rec's, then after General Assembly session will resume regular SRC meetings with newly appointed members, etc. After today, will have some final work for the expert drafters to do; Alison Lutton will review and make sure we're in line with the updated national standards.
- (Teresa) In the big picture, reviewed the Standards and considered them in light of new national research-backed best practices and SRC recommendations. (Marie) Took original three sections – which included Learning Environment, Communication w/Families, and Learning Strategies – and separated into five, breaking out Effective Social-Emotional Interactions, Behavior Guidance. That let us sort and better assess content. (Teresa) Goal was both to update them and make them more useful for people in the field. Looked at Alison Lutton's crosswalk, other state documents. Eager for feedback from the group. (Marie) Took pains to include supports for English Learners, children with special needs, and families
- Review of "Supporting Children's Development through Engagement with Families"
 - Wanted to make sure it's clear that the skills are never "achieved," it's constant quality improvement
 - Spread out most important competencies, bigger focus on bias and respecting dignity of students with differences; increased focus on building community partnerships
 - (Marie walks through section by section)
 - Citations? Listed in each section
 - Didn't go into content areas – for length, for focus; the foundation blocks themselves talk more about content areas, so this is more about cross-curricular learning strategies needed for all ages/activities
 - (Mark A.) Under Mediating Stress – is "therapeutic intervention" an appropriate competency given that it is its own field (Marie – can probably change exact wording but want to keep trauma-informed care; will change to 'effective' intervention)
 - (Irene) Are these sections broadly in line with what we understand to be best practices? (group says yes; Shelley – with 'level 1' professionals, what's the baseline of trusting relationships we want them to have, just describe it or demonstrate it? Marie – let's add 'demonstrate')
 - (Bridget) Higher-level comment: I'm a proponent of 'less is more', but concerned we're communicating to the field that content-area skills are just about the environment and not about content pedagogy. (Group lands on conclusion that there should be a balance,

- and/or looking at cross-curricular elements, like using books for information, etc.). Also, is executive functioning/self-regulation captured here?
 - (Mark) In role of families, “learn about *and incorporate* family values” could be politically charged (switch to ‘respect’)
 - (Patsy) What exactly is included in the term “technology”? (will clarify)
- (Teresa) reviews Levels
 - (Mark) add preamble to help translate levels for public ed programs, note that not every item will be applicable for all settings (Kathy Gilliken – mention licensing standards as well)
 - (Bridget) drop ‘quality improvement’ from level 1
- Teresa – reviews Health, Safety & Well-Being domain
 - (Shelley) Does anywhere in doc address physical exercise, gross motor skill development? (Yes; maybe reconsider terminology?)
 - (Chris) Add years in citations
 - (Bridget) is “personality” the right term? (“temperamental differences”?)
 - Question of where developmental appropriateness gets inserted (around play, e.g.)
 - Question of where self-care/well-being of early childhood professional is addressed (“recognize impact of own stress on children”)
 - Lots of discussion about question between brevity/efficiency and wanting to pull out particular populations of students – especially students w/special needs & English Learners; ask Alison Lutton to provide guidance on the degree of specificity that national standards will be using; group generally doesn’t like idea of putting students with special needs, etc., “in a box” vs. embedding throughout
 - Discussion about who the audience for the document is; suggestion of development of Level-specific handbooks in addition to the master document, versions for program administrators, higher ed, etc.
 - (Bonnie – could we avoid talking about educational levels? Teresa – authors of this section want to be sure even Level 1 professionals have the baseline knowledge & skills of a high school diploma/GED)
 - (Kathy) Charge is to build something with immense depth
- Remaining sections reviewed (no group comments)
- General discussion about Level 1 demonstrate vs. explain; making sure this reflects reality on the ground
- Next steps:
 - Teresa & team makes edits
 - Send on to Allison L for review
 - Irene gives brief update at SRC on 12/6
 - Depending on results of Allison’s review, figure out what needs to happen next
 - (Bridget/Kathy Gilliken: copy edits, also – consistent verbs, titles of sections, consistency of ‘levels’, format, etc.)
- Vote for approving the current draft as a first draft to advance to full SRC – YES.