

Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC)

Early Achievers Review Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 10 from 2:00pm to 4:00pm

Early Start Act Annual Progress Report

- a. Review and provide input on the draft definitions and report.
 - o [Annual Report Definitions](#)

Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions: Luba provided definitions from the Early Start Act as well as from the U.S. Department of Education. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There was support noted for aligning terminology in this report with the Early Start Act definitions from the legislature, and also including a note that the Early Achievers Review Subcommittee suggests the term early learning educators as defined by the U.S. Department of Education. This will be the beginning of the groups continued efforts to educate legislators and the broader community on using “early learning educators” as the preferred, professionalized terminology. o The term “daycare” will be replaced with “childcare” to represent that the focus is on the child. o To refer to facilities, the group agreed on early learning home based and early learning center based. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does this feel representative to family home providers? o There was support noted for using the WA State Family Home Child Care and FFN provider definitions from the WAC and adding a footnote or a definitions section to indicate terminology is referring to those definitions. • SECTION 5 (p. 2) Promoting and Supporting Providers and Children from Diverse Cultural Backgrounds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In general, data is a challenge in this section because child level data is limited. Most data is collected at a household level and data is typically collected differently by different sources. This is the reason for the “Note on Data” at the beginning of the section. o We want to provide specific data on children who are participating. o More subsidy data was recently found, so that data will replace some of the charts currently in the section that refer to ESIT and other program data that aren’t as present throughout the report. o The plan is to show ECEAP and Subsidy data in this section and include ESIT and other program data (including Head Start/Early Head Start) in an appendix. The program chart will similarly reflect the program data in for ECEAP and Subsidy in section 5 and for other programs in the appendix. o Group participants appreciated the parenthetical additions and examples included about working collaboratively with organizations. It was suggested that if there isn’t room for the full example in parenthetical additions, to say “see page___” to guide readers to that information. o There was a question about whether it makes sense to list all of the tribal participation information in one place or section by section. It was suggested
------------	---

that tribal participation information could also be made into a separate report which might be better for the presenting to each of the tribal councils.

- It was mentioned that tribal participation in ECEAP should be added to this section.
- There was a wonder expressed about data community colleges have collected on pathways to early learning careers. There is some data in workforce charts included on page 2 and 3. This is based on data on race, ethnicity and languages of registered professionals from the merit data system. The analysis used is from 2013, but there is no more recently analyzed data.
- Accomplishments (page 6)
 - There was a suggestion to clarify the information about increase in staff/providers to indicate more specifically who is being referred to.
 - If we are talking about numbers, it would be helpful to show the impact if you can show those numbers.
 - We are not sure we are ready to present the numbers because there is a challenge in understanding gaps of data we have and do not have. We are also challenged with a lack of consistent data.
- Challenges (page 7)
 - The accreditation pathway is a challenge.
 - Parents' lack of awareness of EA is a challenge.
- Recommendations
 - Outreach is recommended to increase parents' awareness of EA.
 - There was discussion about including working with human rights commissions to create policies around recruiting program staff who are culturally connected to the community but may not yet have the required early learning experience or training without being discriminatory.
 - There was discussion about how parents are represented in these indicators of increased cultural competence and special needs. It was recommended that we start to collect data on this area so that we can report back on it.
- There was a request to the group to please think about more recommendations for this section and send them to Luba.
- **SECTION 6** (page 9) How Early Achievers has Changed and Developed
 - There was discussion about the tone of this section. The intention is to show the historical perspective about how it got started and what learning has taken place since it was launched. This is to address concerns that have been raised early on in implementation, and to show that we have learned and improved, just like we are working with providers to learn and improve through this process.
 - In the chart on need based grants, it was suggested that we include number of educators who have received the grant.
 - There was a question about the graph on page 12, on why graph uses number vs percentage. The chart is intended to show that when EA was rolled out, there wasn't really anyone who had capacity reliability on ERS. And it is not necessarily the goal for everyone to have that reliability. There are some variances in this regionally. Some want everyone to have ERS reliability, some prefer to have a few specialists. The reason we didn't provide percentages is because it would be hard to decide the number it is out of. Would it be all

providers or just specific providers? There was some discussion about clarifying this by adding text to explain the low reliability before and that now each region has a slightly different plan to reach full capacity on ERS reliability. It was also suggested that we specify that the reason behind the push for more reliability is that first batch of ratings saw lower ERS scores than anticipated. The push to increase ERS reliability was in response to that, to help get more success in ratings going forward.

- There was a question about whether it is possible to separate tribes from the county/region where they are located. In some cases it may be, it can be tracked by tribal authority type. However, for some the program is through a subcontractor organization. It is also important to keep in mind that if the number is small in the region the information could be identifiable. It was mentioned that it would be helpful to have the information for the tribal directors to show the low numbers to their council so that they can increase support to improve the numbers.
- There was a question about the Childcare Quality Baseline (CCQB) on page 14 on whether there is data on how many were rated prior to that opportunity described? For almost all of them it was in response to ratings, there was limited scale implementation focused on providers already in rating readiness and getting close to rating. We are trying to move it earlier in the process.
 - On the CCQB table, 982 refers to classrooms—recommend we include some title words on the chart to clarify.
 - 450 or so unique providers have had at least ones.

SECTION 7 (page 17) Promoting Quality Expansion of ECEAP

- We are attempting to write this section from the perspective that ECEAP has grown over time and to show that in order to meet the entitlement ECEAP has to double. It has to grow a lot more, a lot faster, and include a lot more kids.
- On page 20 there are two graphs that tell the same story about how many ECEAP providers are at what stage in meeting goal in two different ways. There was support for each of the graphs. The plan is to try and include both so that people who read data in different ways will understand at least one of them. Later, we may need to choose just one for executive summary, presentation, etc.
- There was a question about the narrative on page 20 and why we do not talk about why they didn't reach level 4. It was discussed that there weren't many in this circumstance and there wasn't a pattern on why they didn't reach level 4. We will add an additional sentence to clarify this.
- Accomplishments (page 24)
- Challenges
 - There was some discussion about the expansion challenge of low requests for part-day slots.
 - There was a question raised about whether increased diversity is a challenge to ECEAP. Balancing achieving the level of instruction that meets the cultural, language and types of instruction that meet the needs of children in the program and finding the staff to make that happen.
 - Another challenge mentioned was the alignment of ECEAP and School district requirements, school district run programs. This includes challenges in funding levels for 6 hour day and extended day. There needs to be an increase in order to support building a workforce that will stay in ECEAP. It is a retention issue—

	<p>not just attracting staff. This is very evident in school district programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The report should elaborate on the subtlety that part day ECEAP does not need to be licensed is both a challenge and a benefit. ○ A wonder as raised about whether there is consideration of the transition of care from ECEAP to K-12 for children and families as the program grows. How are children and families prepared for that transition? How can it be more seamless? Perhaps now there is a lack of cross-sector collaboration in the transitional time so families are not as well prepared to know about the next step after ECEAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SECTION 8—Next Steps for the Agency. ● This is still being developed. We are waiting on a letter from the director that will formulate his vision and help finalize this section. We hope to have in draft at next meeting.
Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Continue refining questions and definitions on an ongoing basis. ● Read the full draft report and submit additional suggestions directly to Luba at luba.bezborodnikova@del.wa.gov

Next Meetings:

- **November 17** from **8:30 – 10a** to discuss the pathway to recognize national accreditation and the subcommittee objectives, annual deliverables, timeline, meetings, key context and considerations
- **November 30** from **1 – 2p** to review the final full report
- **December 4** from **11a – 12:30p** to define committee composition, structure and stakeholder engagement
- **December 15** from **2 – 3:30** to discuss and adopt the charter, pending ELAC and DEL approval.

Participants: Lois Martin, Bethany Newby, Sandy Nelson, Chris Rosenquist, Jan Thoemke, Tiffany Stutesman, Deborah Sioux Lee, DeEtta Simmons, Angelica Gonzalez, Wysteria Oliver, Grace Ssebugwawo, Iftin Iftin Hagimohamed, Nancy Spurgeon, Karen Sampson, Dan Torres, Luba Bezborodnikova, Valisa Smith, Carrie Wolfe, Ashley Palar, Deanna Stewart, Evette Jasper