

Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC)

Early Achievers Review Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

Friday, October 30 from 10:00am to 12:00pm

Racial Equity Lens and Draft Definitions

- a. Review ELAC Racial Equity Principles and Questions
- b. Review and provide input on draft definitions of Diverse Cultural Backgrounds and Cultural Humility
 - o [Culturally Diverse Backgrounds & Cultural Humility Definitions](#)
 - o [ELAC Racial Equity Questions](#)
 - o [ELAC Racial Equity Commitments-Principles](#)

Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAC developed guiding principles for conduct as individual, organizations, and for an equitable early learning system. The idea is that this subcommittee would also adopt these principles. • Essential Racial Equity Questions: first set of questions are broad, and you can go deeper with questions on the second page. These are living documents and will be revised as they're being used. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Using tools like the questions can be challenging to take on. We should be intentional about continuing to come back to these tools, so that they truly are living documents. o Include providers throughout the questions documents (currently kids and families continue throughout, but not in questions 2 and 3) o This is an opportunity to professionalize and use the term "educators" in place of "providers." o Suggestion to add subtitle addressing the WHO: "Concerning all children, families, educators..." rather than repeating in each question, then can expand each question to focus on what we mean by <i>IT</i> in "Is it good for..." o We will continue this conversation and continue refining on an ongoing basis. • Culturally Diverse Backgrounds definition is needed for the annual report. The proposed definition is broad enough to be inclusive and specific enough to be clear about what we mean. • Overall, also need a definition of provider, so it's clear to the audience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Luba will pull the definition of provider from Early Start Act and include it in the next draft. o The committee can also help define "provider" for the audience and professionalize the language by changing "provider" to "educator" and begin to use that language in all the work. Educate that provider and educator are the same and do the same work. o This will help make the case that early learning is part of the education continuum. This simple act could lay a foundation in helping educate community that providers are all teachers. • Cultural Humility definition: moves beyond cultural competence. • Support noted for cultural humility definition.
Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue refining questions and definitions on an ongoing basis.

2. Early Start Act Annual Progress Report

- a. Review and provide input on the report outline and development process
 - o [Early Start Act Report Outline](#)

Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some data points are not yet included in the rough draft. More data points in specific places will be included in the next draft. • Is the data presented in a way that is easy to understand, visually compelling, or confusing? Does it tell the story of Early Achievers participation to date? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The table on page 12 clearer than the table on page 11. Add the number of participants to the table on page 12. o Describe the relative size of the regions—how many providers total and how many in Early Achievers. o A description of the different times each regions started rolling out is included at the bottom of page 8. Add the specific dates. o Change the map on page 9 from color coded dots to each of the counties colored by region instead of above or below the statewide average. Legislators can zone in on county and county area—with clear information on when county/region rolled out. o Comparison to statewide average could just be a statement above the map. Then people can compare their county percentage. o Some data falls off the map, isn't readable. (South) o Possibly include some of the more detailed versions of tables and maps in the appendix? Some of the Early Start Act (ESA) annual report data requirements will be included in the appendix. o Will have to be really clear in the table on page 12 that the number is referring to the number of providers and not a percentage. • Conversion rates: It's important to include and tell the story behind the conversion rates, especially with racial equity lens. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The paragraph references the change in the ERS threshold, and with no context/explanation about why lower ERS score requirements was appropriate, the audience might just think the bar was lowered. o Questions that will come up include why is there a different conversion rate between centers and family homes? Is the rating unfair to family homes? Do family home providers need more resources? o The explanation of the change to the ERS threshold can be included in several places, including the section on how Early Achievers has changed over the years. We planned to add the explanation somewhere up front. o Conversion rate higher for centers than family homes—do we have data that speaks to that yet? Even if we can't answer that yet—should acknowledge our awareness of that question. • Each section includes high level accomplishments and challenges. We are seeking input on what to highlight. They are organized by key themes from which to hang examples. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Pull successes and challenges from the federal Race-to-the-Top report. • SECTION 1 (p. 13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Accomplishments
------------	---

- Voluntary participation is higher than most states. Share their averages to compare with ours. Be accurate—that it was not voluntary for ECEAP.
 - High rate of providers rating level 3 on re-rates. It isn't just the rating, it's the support system that tells the story of how we got those scores is different than other states.
 - Partnerships organized as a part of the support system
 - **Challenges**
 - Providers required versus not required. (Perhaps include in section 3.)
- **SECTION 2** (bottom of p. 19)
 - **Challenge**
 - Differentiated starting line/time for providers that is not flexible enough to meet their needs.
 - MERIT database for ECEAP providers/childcare—designed for centers, not working well for those with multiple centers. Experience has been extremely negative/challenging.
 - Need a place where we can say whether systems are scalable and able to support the work.
- **SECTION 4** (bottom of p. 29)
 - **Challenges**
 - Level 1 doesn't have any meat—not defined what will do with Level 1
 - Don't collect demographic data that allows us to understand/create understanding whether needs are being met regarding diversity of our state. (May be overarching)
 - A lot of data we would like doesn't exist or it is not consistent across the board
 - Need more information on the big picture to
 - Racial Equity—differentiated approach, some might need more than others, don't know where
 - Politically: explicitly outline the need so we can advocate to make those needs.
- Question on Page 26: What is clearer? Are we answering the right question? What is the story around services, coaching, region, etc. that we want to tell?
 - Be clear throughout the report whether talking about child care participating in Early Achievers versus ECEAP. Coaching data is limited only to childcare providers. There is a second part of the report that refers to ECEAP.
 - Report should be more about what we have done to date. It has been more about getting people ready to rate and less coaching until recently.
 - It is important to include how long it takes to get people ready to rate. We are finding it is taking longer than our initial guess of around a year. Speaks to the point of cost of implementing.
 - Page 25 chart—shows ramp up—good picture.
- DEL is required to deliver differentiated services based on need. What is the range—average spread of what providers are accessing? This could be statement—what the average amount of supports is, and what range it represents.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the cost of doing this need to be represented? ESA is not asking for budgetary information—we are painting a programmatic picture. Fiscal division is working on a different report with that cost info. The subcommittee is welcome to have that information, but for the purposes of this report it is not included. • Need to focus attention on labeling the tables and visuals, so it tells the best story. Legislators are likely going to skip the narratives and go for the data visuals.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valisa will circulate new options for maps and tables offline. • Read the full draft report and submit suggestions directly to Luba at luba@del.wa.gov. She will share with Valisa and Carrie.

3. Early Achievers Review Subcommittee

a. Discuss subcommittee charter development process

o [Charter Development Process](#)

Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each ELAC subcommittee needs to develop its own charter to build foundation of core agreements. • Would like to develop objectives, structure, committee composition, etc. in collaboration with the subcommittee. • The next few meetings need to focus on developing the Annual Report, so we propose scheduling separate times for charter development by a smaller group of people interested in participating. The smaller group will bring back draft proposals to the larger group • The Early Achievers Review Subcommittee is a standing subcommittee, so we want to be intentional and thoughtful about the charter development. • Charter Development Process Document includes a proposed timeline • ELAC members have made recommendations around committee membership, support for participants and skilled facilitation.
Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEL will send the Charter Development Process document as follow up and schedule time for subcommittee members interested in developing a draft charter.

4. Next Steps

a. Assign any follow-up tasks

b. Next Meeting: **Tuesday, November 10** to review the second draft of the annual progress report and the accreditation approval model.

Participants:

Dee Hirsch, Lois Martin, Bethany Newby, Sandy Nelson, Deeann Burtch-Puffert, Christine Rosenquist, Jan Thoemke, Wilanne Ollila-Perry, Lee Williams, DeEtta Simmons, Iftin Iftin Hagimohamed, Zam Zam Mohamed, Jennifer Jennings-Shaffer, Karen Sampson, Caroline Shelton, Dan Torres, Valisa Smith, Luba Bezborodnikova, Suzanne Rose, Carrie Wolfe, Deanna Stewart, Ashley Palar, Evette Jasper