File Naming Convention: Session ID – Title of Session Date
Example: Plenary 1 **-** CCDF Reauthorization and HS Notice of Proposed Rule Making 12.2.15

1. Descriptive Information

Workshop C-4 *(Independence H & I)* *Infant/Toddler Workforce Preparation and Competencies* **Description** *This workshop discussed different efforts to link higher education and degree programs with States' infant/toddler workforces within ECE PD systems. The presentations explored the importance of developing career pathways and preservice and in-service PD efforts that are specific to infant/toddler content and competencies as they relate to quality and child outcomes within the context of Head Start and other early childhood settings.*	**Facilitator** • Tamara Halle, Child Trends **Presenters** • Rebecca Madill, Child Trends • Dale Epstein, Child Trends • Rachel Chazan Cohen, University of Massachusetts, Boston • Martha Buell, University of Delaware **Scribe** • Nadia Orfali, Child Trends

2. Documents in Session Folder
A PowerPoint presentation for this session is saved on the flash drive distributed to participants.

3. Brief Summary of Presentations

Summary of Presentation #1: Describing the Infant/Toddler Workforce by Rebecca Madill

- The purpose of this presentation was to try to paint a picture for the center-based and home-based workforce caring for infants and toddlers and set the stage for the next two presentations. We used data from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE), which was an integrated set of 4 surveys conducted in 2012.
    - We looked at center-based staff assigned to infant/toddler classrooms and home-based providers providing early care and education to children under 13. We only included those who care for children under 3 exclusively for center-based, but for home-based teachers and caregivers we couldn't exclude those who served older children because they tend to serve a variety of ages. Home-based caregivers were listed, paid, and had no prior relationship with at least 1 child in their care.
- Describing center-based I/T teachers and caregivers
    - Most center-based I/T teachers and caregivers had some exposure to college coursework
    - CDAs and other credentials were especially common among I/T teachers and caregivers with an AA degree in ECE or related field
    - Most I/T teachers and caregivers have been caring for children under age 13 for fewer than 10 years
        - Only 8% of I/T teachers and caregivers had 25 years of experience or more
    - 90% of I/T teachers and caregivers had experienced any kind of professional development (PD) in the past 12 months. Most I/T teachers and caregivers (81%) attended workshops in the past year, but more intensive forms of PD (such as coaching) were uncommon.
        - 21% had experienced some kind of coaching. However, I/T teachers and caregivers with higher education were more likely to have coaching.
    - The main topic of the last PD experience attended in the past 12 months for I/T teachers and caregivers tended to focus on health and safety and social-emotional learning.
        - 24% of PD topics were on health and safety
        - Only 6% of PD topics focused on working with families

- 39% of I/T teachers and caregivers received assistance with direct costs, 32% received release time from work, 12% received assistance for other PD costs (such as travel or child care), and 80% had an annual formal review and performance feedback
  - This was more common with I/T teachers and caregivers with a higher level of education. So, it seems like those with the most preservice are getting the most in-service support to further their PD
- Home-based I/T teachers and caregivers
  - Most I/T teachers and caregivers have had experience with college coursework. Only 32% had a high school diploma or less.
  - Endorsements (credentials such as state certification or CDA) were especially common among those with an AA degree in ECE or a related field
    - 51% with a high school diploma or less reported they had endorsements. This might be because they are looking for a license for their home based care.
  - I/T teachers and caregivers had a wide range of experience. Only 15% of teachers and caregivers had 5 years or less, 17% had greater than 25 years of experience.
    - Perhaps being a home-based provider is a more consistent career than being a center-based provider? Or, they have a broader definition of experience when answering this question.
  - 95% of I/T teachers and caregivers had any PD experiences. Most (80%) I/T teachers and caregivers attended workshops in the past year, but more intensive forms of PD were uncommon (such as coaching, at 27%).
    - There were slightly more PD experiences at higher levels of education.
  - The most common topic for the most recent PD activities were about health and safety, and curriculum or teaching method
    - Only 4% of the most recent PD activities were about cognitive development
  - Only 15% of I/T teachers and caregivers received supports for PD, but for those with a BA degree this jumps up to 26%
- Summary and next steps
  - The workforce is very diverse in both preservice and in-service PD
  - Difficult to link preparations to outcomes, how do we interpret these data
  - Need more financial support for home-based providers to participate in PD
  - Need to encourage more intensive PD activities, where appropriate (i.e., Not just first aid training)
  - Need to focus on I/T teachers and caregivers with less ECD-specific education

Summary of Presentation #2: Findings on State Infant/Toddler Certifications by Dale Epstein
- Research Question: Is there agreement across states in what states require to earn certifications for I/T teachers and caregivers? We looked at publicly available documents from the PDW Center that identified 28 states with I/T credentials and created a summary.
- Method: We examined core competencies and demonstrations of practice. Looking at what was already specified and getting feedback from experts in the field.
  - Grouped into three different themes
    - School readiness domains
    - Program structure
    - Cross-cutting domains
- Findings
  - There is great variation in how stringent the requirements are in each state
  - Numerous choices in how to obtain the credential vs. a narrower pathway
    - Four main ways
      - Higher education coursework only (10 states)
      - Training only completed outside of higher education (3 states)
      - A combination of higher education and training (10 states)
      - Higher education or training (5 states)

- Wide range of credit hours or number of training hours required, anything from 3 credits/45 hours - 20 credits/300 hours
- There were also differences in the amount of specific coursework or trainings that must be taken as a requirement for these domains
  - Most states only cover half or less of the core competency areas identified in evidence-based frameworks or from experts in the field
  - There was some consensus among states in which core competency areas to cover as part of I/T credentials or certificates
    - Just over half have a requirement for social-emotional development, 50% for health and or physical development, 82% have requirements for general child development, 89% have requirements specific to infants and toddlers
  - There is a fairly even split among states in terms of their requirements around demonstration of competency
    - Defined as a requirement in which a student is observed in an early childhood setting and is given feedback (i.e. an evaluation).
    - Nine (9) states explicitly described having a required demonstration of competency through a practicum, experience, or examination. Nine (9) states had no specific requirement, and the rest are somewhere in between.
  - Implications and next steps
    - Are the core competencies emphasized by states associated with quality and child outcomes?
    - Conduct state studies to use a common measurement

Summary of Presentation #3: Influences of Federal and State Policies on Higher Education Programs Training the I/T workforce: Lessons from CUPID (Collaborative for Understanding the Pedagogy of Infant/Toddler Development) by Rachel Chazan Cohen and Martha Buell

- CUPID is made up of 50 scholars from 25 U.S. universities who have joined together in an effort to better understand how institutions of higher education are preparing the I/T workforce.
- Research question for this paper - what contextual factors, including state and federal policies, influence how IHE prepare the I/T workforce?
  - Competencies (knowledge, dispositions, and skills) needed by the I/T workforce are:
    - Unique from those working in pre-k
    - Under-valued by society
      - We are asking I/T teachers and caregivers for a lot, this is not an easy job
    - Under-emphasized in higher education programs preparing the early childhood workforce
- Methods
  - Chose 9 CUPID institutes, all state universities across the country and did in-depth qualitative interview of CUPID members at the 9 sites
- Results
  - Variation between the nine IHE programs
    - Auspice: half of the programs were in colleges of education, others in colleges of agriculture, science or social science, or health and human sciences
    - 7 out of 9 programs offer a certificate or degree that covers 0-3.
      - All 9 offered 2 tiers: certificate and non-certificate.
    - Found less variation in content. All 9 offered specific I/T courses and content in methods courses. Most faculty teaching I/T development courses were trained in psychology or family study
    - Only 6/9 required an I/T placement/field experience
  - Themes: National and State Pressure
    - Programs respond to:
      - Teacher licensure requirements
        - To be certified (praxis)
      - State child care regulations
      - Market factors

- For example, educational requirements for pre-k and early head start
- Established tiered degrees: non-certificate programs are often more flexible and have fewer requirements including fewer hours of field experience
  - Often the people in child care programs take this route because they can't give up the time to do student teaching because they already work in a child care center
- National professional organization
  - How a program gets accredited, CAPE
  - State influences
    - Age range influences coursework and practicum
      - Most common are 0-8 and 0-5
  - Pipe-line issue with field experiences
    - Problems in finding high quality I/T settings that embody the competencies they try to teach
      - Shortage of instructors to teach practicum courses
      - Larger programs have an especially hard time
  - Themes: institution-specification factors
    - ECE transitioning identity from care to education and care:
      - Auspice of programs influenced by history of the discipline within the institution and by leadership and faculty
      - Budgeting constraints, new budgeting models in IHE
        - In the post-2008 world it is hard to have small class sizes
- Things are changing nationally for ECE across the board
  - CCDBG authorization will have special ramifications for I/T because there is a new set-aside specifically for this purpose.
  - Should we be more consistent with the system for ECE in IHE? How do we ensure that 0-3 not get lost and maintain or increase quality and access?

4. Brief Summary of Discussion

- Q - Since 2008, higher education is about graduation rates and end salary now. How are we going to change that? There is going to be more money for coaches but what good is that if there are no teachers. Universities need to see that this is for the public good.
  - Rachel - universities are struggling with messages from the government. Right now, evaluation based on the scorecard takes into account graduation rates and salaries, but this is getting pushback.
  - Q - The conversation about I/T terminology is just beginning. For example, Nebraska has a 0-8 certification and I/T teachers have to take the entire thing. The teachers and the students and the certifications are not separate which means that the teachers don't have the in-depth knowledge and the cycle continues. It would be nice to have document sharing between states to see how other states handle this issue.
    - Rachel – Yes, a document like this would have to have the pros and cons of different age groups for state's certifications. 0-8 means more opportunities to grads to have a better job eventually in their lives and make more money at some point. But the ramifications for I/T teachers (often I/T field places not required in these programs) are not discussed. It would need to include the experiences of different states that have chosen different options. Maybe the government needs to be firmer on recommendations.
- Martha - most 0-8 programs have pressure from K-2 government requirements that squeeze out ECE issues. We need to focus on family engagement in younger years but that's not even included. Mostly math and science for the higher years, Can we push up somehow?
- Q - What are the pros and cons of infant toddler programs being affiliated with schools? A pro seems like the continuity of children's experiences, same database, teachers know 0-8 and where the kid is going. Or is it just seen as a money-making source (tuition based pre-k).
  - Like the idea of aligning it to the schools because family engagement could become easier, but pre-k needs to be different

- o Martha - we could look internationally, lots of countries have younger kids in public systems earlier. But even where these are formalized as low as 18 months, there are still informal things happening before that and they continue to be in other care there will still be a gap that has the same issues that we have in the U.S.
- Q - What is the plan to share these competencies with higher education programs?
  - o Rachel - We are publishing reports soon and will eventually have a website, research connections.

5. Summary of Key issues raised

The facilitator raised the following discussion questions for the session participants:
- Should we work on some form of standardization across education between states?
- What are the implications for demonstrating competencies in light of the wide variability across states and universities in workforce preparation?
- What are the implications for mobility of the workforce across states?
- What are the implications for research models?