

October 9, 2009

Dear Melody and everyone else who came to the HCYC meeting on Thursday:

I wanted to capture from my memory what seemed most significant about the meeting this week and provide information that I promised you.

You agreed HCYC is one element of the overall early learning system, which also includes quality rating and improvement (program standards and supports and incentives to meet them), and early learning outcomes for young children. These three must be in alignment and mutually reinforcing.

You agreed that the overall outcome of HCYC, with these other system elements, is expected to be higher quality programs for children and better child outcomes. Program quality can be measured eventually with the Quality Rating Improvement System and in the meantime by increases in numbers of programs with national accreditation. Child outcomes will be defined by the content of the Early Learning Standards for young children birth to five, which are being constructed from Learning to Grow (birth to three) and the PreK Content Standards with the addition of outcomes for three-year olds. A common assessment measure(s) will need to be identified/developed and then implemented to track child outcomes.

You agreed that a comprehensive EC data system will both support HCYC implementation and provide a way to track progress on the impact of its elements. This will enable documentation of the impact of HCYC.

The elements of HCYC and their expected impacts are:

Core competencies – is expected to influence the content of all professional development, the structure of the Registry and the content of qualifications.

A measure of whether higher education has incorporated the core competencies is national accreditation of higher education programs (by NAEYC for associate-degree programs and NCATE for bachelor and advanced degree programs).

Professional development (higher education that leads to degrees and training that counts) – is expected to match the core competencies and be *accessible* in the sense of delivery methods (e.g., online, etc.) and in the sense of being available/affordable.

Registry – is the workforce data system. It is expected to have data for all professional development (higher education programs and trainings coded by the areas of the core competencies). It is expected to have data for all practitioners, essentially their professional profile (qualifications, credentials, degrees, successfully completed trainings, etc.). Each practitioner will have a unique identification number, so that workforce data can be connected to program data and child data.

Qualifications – are the entry requirements for various roles in early learning settings, in particular the qualifications of trainers? (my memory is not clear on this element...)

Next steps

You agreed that connecting to the folks in DOE who are writing the federal ARRA grant due 11/19/09 for the P-20 state longitudinal data system (SLDS) is a next step. (Just FYI, Hawaii DOE received a grant that began in May 2009 of \$3.5 million over 3 years; the focus appears to be modernize and increase usage of its K-12 data system. Knowing how this work is going might also be helpful information for EC data system construction.) See for info <http://nces.ed.gov/Programs/SLDS/state.asp?stateabbr=HI>

You agreed that looking more closely at the structure and function of the PATCH Registry is a next step. The primary purpose of the Registry now is to inform and facilitate DSHS licensing [and other DHS programs?]. DHS agreed to engage PATCH in the HCYC work via its contractual relationship with PATCH. Guidance on best practices and data sharing and other aspects of early childhood workforce data systems is available from the National Registry Alliance at <http://www.registryalliance.org/> (members only, PATCH is a member). More guidance will be forthcoming in the next 6-8 months from the UC Berkeley Center for the Study of the Child Care Workforce via a grant from the Birth to Five Policy Alliance at <http://birthtofivepolicy.org/index.php/about/> There is not info on the new grantees up yet. (Laura Sakai will know more about this.)

Guidance on early childhood data system more generally may come from the early childhood work now being done by the Council of Chief State School Officers with the Data Quality Campaign.

State Longitudinal Data Systems

<http://nces.ed.gov/programs/slds/>

Data Quality Campaign

<http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/>

<http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/survey/elements> 10 Essential Elements

<http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/resources/478> Connecting the Dots: Making Longitudinal Data Work for Young Children

You can also look into the EC data system work being done in Pennsylvania. The child data system is called the Early Learning Network and links to the PELICAN that I mentioned which is Pennsylvania Enterprise to Link Information for Children Across Networks. For more info, see <http://www.pakeys.org/docs/ELN%20Update%206-15-09.pdf>

You agreed that modest “field testing” of the core competencies will make them more useable and introduce them to those in the field who are meant to use them (e.g., higher ed faculty and trainers). You also agreed that field testing other elements might be useful.

You urged those working on the child outcomes (Early Learning Standards for young children birth to five) to as quickly as possible constructed them using Learning to Grow (birth to three) and the PreK Content Standards with the addition of outcomes for three-year olds.

That’s all I can remember. Do not let the best be the enemy of the good. Go forth and act.

Cheers,
Anne