

Development of the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards A Historical View Focusing on the Department of Public Instruction Involvement

By Jill Haglund
June 14, 2005

Introduction

This paper was written for the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) train the trainers course offered through Viterbo University. The author is the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) Early Childhood Consultant that had the initial lead role in the DPI's development of the WMELS. The author's intent is to provide an overview of the process generally and specifically of the DPI involvement in the creation of the WMELS. This paper provides highlights and summarizes select information about the processes and issues during development and implementation. While this paper recognizes the interagency nature of the WMELS, it does not provide details on the process or issues from the perspective of the other agencies. Specific WMELS content, related resources, and train the trainer information can be found at www.collaboratingpartners.com.

Background and Climate

In the early 1990s, more and more Wisconsin public school districts moved from part day to full day five-year-old kindergarten. There was concern among the early education community that the curriculum was becoming more academic and less appropriate for the younger learners. As a result, the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) engaged in an initiative to promote developmentally appropriate practices in five-year-old kindergarten.

In the mid 1990s, the national kindergarten-grade 12 (K-12) education community promoted the importance of learning standards. In Wisconsin, the DPI created the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards. In 1998, state statutes were created that required Wisconsin school districts to utilize academic standards and learning benchmarks. Many districts adopted the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards. If districts did not utilize the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards, they create their own standards and benchmarks. While all districts had academic standards, their utilization for kindergarten and early childhood programs varied. Some districts simply applied the academic focus to kindergarten. Others more appropriately benchmarked the academic standards for kindergarten and/or early childhood special education with a more developmental focus. Still others did little to apply the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards to early education programs.

In the late 1990s, the issue of appropriate practices for young learners again became an issue in Wisconsin. As more school districts began to implement four-year-old kindergarten, the discussion began anew about appropriate curriculum for four-year-old children. This also coincided with the national pre-kindergarten movement. Across the nation, other states began to create standards for the early learning community.

In Wisconsin in the early 2000s, the issues related to academic standards and appropriate kindergarten curriculum were typically not being addressed in the same arenas. The K-12 community focused on academic standards. The relationship with kindergarten and early childhood was discussed primarily on a limited basis with local teacher and principals. Discussion of appropriate kindergarten curriculum was also occurring in the early education and care community. This discussion frequently recognized the similarities and differences of curricular approaches among the various providers of programming for young children including child care, Head Start, public and private kindergartens, as well as early childhood special education. While there was some awareness about the increasing "rigors" of

kindergarten and the practice of developmentally appropriate learning strategies, there was no demand from the K-12 education community for the creation of standards that applied to the younger grades. These discussions coalesced in 2002 and created the climate for DPI's interest in early learning standards.

What Started the Discussion for Early Learning Standards

In 2002, the US Department of Health and Human Services' Regional Office advised the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development (DWD) that the new federal Good Start Grow Smart legislation required states to develop early learning standards as a requirement for the Child Development Funding. DWD child care staff brought this requirement to an intradepartmental early childhood staff meeting for discussion. Staff from the DWD, DPI, and the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) discussed potential implications for Wisconsin. Based on prior collaborative efforts, the group decided that a reasonable approach for Wisconsin would be the creation of early learning standards that could apply to child care, Head Start, and school programs that serve young children. This interdepartmental staff group identified key rationale for broad-based cross-program standards including:

- The Child Development Block Grant already addressed several areas of collaboration between the agencies.
- The three state agencies were actively involved in early childhood partnerships through the Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (WECCP), and this effort would align with those WECCP initiatives.
- A common set of standards would support state efforts to expand four-year-old kindergarten and the development of community approaches that would align child care, Head Start, four-year-old kindergarten programming, and early childhood special education.
- Both DWD and DHFS were involved in efforts to improve child care licensing and quality. Child care licensing regulations impacted on child care as well as some Head Start and school programs.
- The development of early learning standards would help provide a foundation for quality developmentally appropriate practices among all programs. These standards could address the various quality concerns among the various provider programs.
- The Departments and WECCP were actively involved in joint professional development strategies that would support a cross-program community approach to provider/teacher training on standards.
- The pooling of resources would provide a stronger initiative.

Getting the Department of Public Instruction On Board

Once the interdepartmental staff group made the decision to promote the development of cross-program early learning standards, support from respective departments was needed to enable the effort to move forward. Within the DPI, this meant that the specific implications for the school districts needed to be defined and the appropriate DPI personnel needed to buy in to the effort.

The DPI early childhood consultant from the Bright Beginnings/Family/School/Community Partnerships Team within the Division of Libraries, Technology and Community Learning was involved in the initial interdepartmental early childhood staff group. There were a number of other important consultants, teams, and administrators that needed to be brought on board. The State Superintendent would need to approve the effort. While this was not a linear process, the discussion and decisions in generally the following sequence:

- A new early childhood special education consultant had just been hired. This position became vital in order to take a comprehensive approach and involve early childhood special education programs. It was also anticipated that Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

Preschool funding from the Special Education team would play a key role in planning and implementation. This consultant and team are in the Division for Advocacy and Equity.

- With the two early childhood consultants taking a lead role, the Division of Libraries, Technology and Community Learning and Advocacy and Equity would be the two lead Divisions to make the implementation early learning standards a reality. Team leaders and division administrators were advised of the project and related issues. A consensus of approach began to form.
- Division administrators took the concept to the State Superintendent's Cabinet meeting. This facilitated discussion among all divisions and resulted in the "go ahead" to identify key strategies and continue to work with interagency staff team to develop a plan.
- Once the State Superintendent and the Cabinet agreed to move ahead, specific positions related to the impact on schools and alignment with the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards were identified through further meetings with the administrator for curriculum and assessment.
- Issues were shared with the State Superintendent and decisions were made on the general approach and next steps working with the other departments. The issues are described in the following section.
- The proposal was shared with the State Superintendent's New Wisconsin Promise - Early Learning Opportunities Team, comprised of consultants from the Child Care Food Program, Even Start Family Literacy, Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE class size reduction), and others.

Throughout the decision making process, proposals from within DPI were taken back to the interdepartmental staff group for input and agreement. Positions and concepts developed by the interdepartmental staff group were taken back to the various departments for consensus. Work plans and discussion papers facilitated consensus building and lead to the final principals, approaches, and format that became the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS).

Key Issues That Framed the Department of Public Instruction Position

The Department of Public Instruction considered a number of issues before they decided to proceed with the creation of early learning standards. The key issues related to (1) alignment with the existing Wisconsin Model Academic Standards, (2) scope of proposed early learning standards, and (3) potential implications for testing. As each issues was clarified, a position was developed, approved, and forwarded back to the interdepartmental staff group including:

- Should DPI work toward interagency early learning standards or simply promote more appropriate use of the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards for young learners? The climate was ripe for the DPI to consider a new focus on standards for school district early childhood programs. The first decision was if DPI should simply focus on the utilization of the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards or if they should take the approach of the separate, interagency early learning standards. The rationale for interagency standards developed by the interagency consultant committee provide a strong argument for the separate set of standards specific to young children. The DPI quickly decided that separate standards would be the best approach.
- Would districts be required to adopt specific early learning standards? Wisconsin is a local control state. State education requirements are very broad and school boards have significant control over school district operations. While the state does have the requirement for academic standards, school districts can use the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards or create their own standards and benchmarks. The DPI decided that school districts would be allowed the option of using the new early learning standards, the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards, or create their own.

- What age span would the early learning standards address and what school programs would be directly impacted? After considerable discussion, there was a decision to create early learning standards that would initially focus on children from age three to age six. Beginning at age three assured that early childhood special education was included in the targeted population. From the perspective of DPI, age six was grounded in the desire for dialogue about appropriate kindergarten standards. It assured that five-year-old kindergarten was included in the target population. It also recognized that age six is the state's mandatory school age and that first grade is the start of mandatory school attendance. It also was an attempt to provide some consistency between the many different public and non-public kindergarten programs.
- What role would student testing play in implementation of early learning standards? The DPI had a longstanding commitment to appropriate use of testing for young children. For the past 15 years, the department had promoted community-based developmental screening for young children, as opposed to the traditional kindergarten readiness testing. The discussions of appropriate testing for young learners had also occurred during the creation of the Wisconsin Student Assessment system. This state wide student assessment system did not begin formal testing of students until the 3rd grade reading test. This was followed by 4th, 8th and 12th grade testing in language arts, math, social studies, and science. Issues of appropriate testing of young children were again coming to the forefront as the federal Leave No Child Behind legislation brought increasing requirements for student testing beginning in kindergarten and as the national Head Start assessment system was implemented. It was clear that as implementation of early learning standards occurred, issues of testing would not be far behind. After careful consideration, the DPI decided to continue the emphasis on community-wide developmental screening rather than kindergarten screening and developmental assessment to support curriculum development. The DPI determined that if a statewide testing system were developed in the future for young learners, it would not begin until 1st grade. This would support more appropriate practices of testing of young children, as well as align with the mandatory school entry age and the state testing system.
- What specific format should guide the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards and align with the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards? Once the DPI made the decision to join the other state agencies in the development of early learning standards and set the general framework, decisions needed to be made on the specific format. While the vision was for a separate set of early learning standards, the DPI wanted these standards to closely align with the Wisconsin Model academic standards. This would support districts' utilization of separate standards and still allow consistency in approaches. The DPI asked the interdepartmental staff group to align the two standards in format and content areas. After considerable discussion among the DPI and among the interdepartmental staff group, there was the consensus to utilize developmental domains rather than the utilization of the academic areas in the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards. The domains would be further described in a similar format and structure as the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards. While the categories were to be similar, considerable discussion occurred in determining the name of each category, its distinction in terms of early childhood philosophy, and alignment with the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards. It was this discussion that lead to the name Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards and to the format that included developmental domains, expectations and performance standards.

Key Considerations in the Development of the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards

Once the three departments were on board with the key philosophy and framework, it was time to move ahead in the development of the standards. Key considerations included: involving the stakeholders, funding, contracting with a consultant, and representing the interagency nature of the initiative.

To ensure consensus throughout the process a number of strategies were used. First and foremost was an approach to communication that kept the interdepartmental early childhood staff group, the departments,

and other stakeholders involved in the process on a continuous basis. The interdepartmental staff group's membership was expanded to include representatives from several key associations. The group became known as the State Standards Steering Committee. Regular meetings of the State Standards Steering Committee provided the framework for issues clarification and policy development. Work plans and decision making documents continued to assist in sharing the issues, defining the answers and obtaining agreement. Appendix I provides an example of one of the work plans that was used during the development phase.

As agreement was reached about the framework for the standards, the departments knew that some funding would be necessary to move the WMELS forward. Funds would be needed to actually create the standards (for printing, dissemination and initial training on the standards). Three sources of funding were identified that could contribute to the effort: the Department of Workforce Development Child Care and Development/TANF funds, the Department of Public Instruction Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Preschool Discretionary funds, and the Wisconsin Head Start Collaboration Project. These funds were included in a braided funding account that initiated through the Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners and was managed by the DPI. A budget was developed and revised as necessary throughout the process. While this braided funding account would allow the maximal use of funding, it also stressed the state accounting system due to its innovative and complex nature.

The next step to move the development forward was to contract for a consultant to develop the actual Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards. It was clear that the early learning standards needed to be based on research and best practices in child development. Various models existed in other states, and these approaches needed to be explored. The consultant's roles included reviewing the literature and early learning standards from other states. The consultant created the standards format, drafted the standards document, held stakeholder focus groups, and worked through the Steering Committee to develop the actual early learning standards.

Since the standards were to address child care, Head Start, kindergarten, and early childhood special education, there was a wide range of stakeholder groups that needed to be involved in the development. Key representatives from these program areas were identified and invited to participate in focus groups. The focus groups reviewed materials created by the consultant and gave input to a variety of issues. These comments were then used to create the introduction to the WMELS document. Appendix II shows one version of the document that was used to organize comments from focus groups and individual comments.

Throughout the development process, great care was taken to maintain the interagency nature of the initiative. The communication systems and focus groups assured interagency representation. It was important to also visually demonstrate this interagency commitment. A seemingly small, but extremely significant, visual representation was the creation of a letterhead format that include the logos from the three departments and the signature of the three department heads. A second visual representation of the interagency nature was the utilization of the Think Big Start Small (TBSS) 'Invest Early in A Child's Future' public awareness campaign. Rather than using the graphics and layout style from one of the departments, these messages visually carried the interagency nature of the campaign and linked it to a number of other interagency initiatives, providing a recognizable brand.

Hot topics in development of the standards

Throughout the process of developing the content of the standards, many issues generated considerable discussion. In most cases overall consensus was not difficult to obtain. One of the topics that generated the most discussion and took the longest to reach consensus was how to best represent the intention for these standards to address children with disabilities. The extent that this issue should be represented in

the standards and the specific wording perhaps received more discussion and more “word-crafting” than any other topic. The final decision resulted in a footnote that was placed on every page of the document

A secondary ‘hot topic’ was the decision not to have separate development domains for art, music, and dance. Many stakeholders felt that these areas needed to have their own separate domain. After reviewing other state standards and carefully considering the alignment to the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards, the decision was to include art, music, and dance as components of the other domains and not as a stand alone domain. This is still one of the most common questions asked about the format of the standards. In both cases, an inclusive philosophy guided the development of the WMELS.

Key Considerations in the Implementation of the WMELS:

Once the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards were developed, key efforts in the implementation included distribution of the WMELS, development of infrastructure, statement of the interagency vision, ongoing communication, and plans for staff development.

The first concrete action in implementation was the actual dissemination of the WMELS document. The Steering Committee considered who should receive the document. There was concern that sending the printed document to all early childhood, kindergarten, Head Start and child care teachers was an ineffective use of resources. Yet sending the document only to administrators and trainers did not assure access to those in the field. An approach was adopted that utilized distribution at teacher conferences, direct mail, email and web-based information and access. On October 2003, the first copies were disseminated at the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association/Wisconsin Division of Early Childhood (WECA/WDEC) conference, early childhood program support teachers meetings, department meetings, regional video conference, and other locations. Direct mailings occurred to child care resource personnel, Head Start directors, school early childhood program support teachers, school principals and superintendents. Email messages were sent through the listservs of the departments, WECCP, and the various associations. By October 2004, presentations were occurring at conferences including WECA/WDEC and the Wisconsin Education Association Council. A standards web page was created on www.collaboratingpartners.com. The Wisconsin Child Care Information Center became the “home” for distributing the copies, and a small fee was instituted to establish funding for the second printing. The Department of Workforce Development then arranged for Spanish and Hmong translations of the WMELS.

In order to support implementation, the State Standards Steering Committee worked to build an infrastructure for creating buy-in, providing professional development, and assuring statewide interagency implementation. To this end, the State Standards Steering Committee was formalized by linking to the Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (WECCP) Action Team. Connections to WECCP linked the effort to the larger state collaborative structure. Another step in creating the infrastructure was to connect the effort to the WECCP Community Collaboration Coaches initiative. This provided six regional Collaboration Coaches to promote the WMELS in their region. They brought the WMELS to regional networking meetings and served as a state, regional, and local link to implementation efforts. By linking to the coach initiative, four of the coaches (Standards Coaches) were also utilized to develop a professional development plan that took advantage of the regional networks and interagency nature of the coach’s initiative. Even though the Coaches’ contracted time was limited, this infrastructure expanded the ability to promote and implement WMELS statewide. Appendix III provides an example of the braided funding and infrastructure with the Coaches initiative.

The interagency nature of WMESL continued to be important throughout implementation. Since the WMELS were designed for child care, Head Start, and public school early childhood special education and kindergarten, care was taken to ensure that the professional development plan involved the various

systems. To further involve stakeholders, the WMELS document also included a feedback form that provided another level of input from around the state. These comments were then used to create the question and answer document that was made available through the website.

The standards coaches considered a variety of professional development approaches before they eventually made recommendations for a 'train the trainers' model. Ongoing communication and dialogue took place between the Standards Coaches, the WMELS Steering Committee, the WECCP, the departments, and other stakeholders. Again, work plans and decision papers facilitated the development of a final plan that utilized a train the trainers' model. The interagency focus was incorporated into the training content. Appendix IV is an example of how decision papers were used to identify issues and generate decisions around the training plan. As training occurred at the regional level, trainers were asked to work in teams representing at least two of the three program areas.

Ongoing communication, problem solving, and information sharing was an important consideration throughout the implementation process. Several issues were identified during implementation that needed immediate attention. The Standards Coach's role was refocused so there was support for the trainers and a mechanism to adapt the training materials. The Collaboration Coaches' role was expanded to facilitate coordination of the regional trainings. The web site was expanded to become a focal point for information and for trainer support. This included the creation of a listserv for the approved trainers and the Standards Process Coach took on more of a role as a resource/mentor for the trainers.

Impact on Schools

The impact of the WMELS is beginning to be felt by Wisconsin public schools. On an informational level, many administrators, principals, teachers, and support staff have received information about the WMELS through DPI listservs, direct mail, meetings, and conferences. Several school districts and Cooperative Education Service Agencies (CESA) were interested and wanted their personnel to become WMELS trainers. The upcoming trainings will provide information and content to additional school personnel.

The greatest interest among school districts has been in districts with close ties to CESA Early Childhood Special Education Program Support Teachers and by school districts looking at 4K community approaches. In both cases, their interest is because programs and services are being delivered in partnership with child care and Head Start. There is an expectation that these partnerships are more effective, higher quality, and easier to sustain if they are build on a common philosophy for service delivery. The WMELS provide an excellent mechanism to create shared views on early education. Communities exploring community approaches have been the first to seek out WMELS training and are committed to bringing school, child care, and Head Start to the table.

Some school districts have already developed early learning standards using the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards or their own district standards. In many cases, special education accountability or collaborative programming with Head Start motivated their efforts. Few of these districts appear interested in adopting the WMELS at this point. Some districts are showing how the WMELS align with their districts efforts. Some have reference the WMELS to reinforce best practice and generate discussion between district and/or community. Many of these districts are expecting that future training on curriculum will be relevant for their personnel.

Clearly, there is a lot more work needed before the WMELS will have a large impact on Wisconsin schools.

Future Considerations and Next Steps

Wisconsin is in the initial phases of the train the trainers plan. Trainers in each region have developed individual training approaches that include full session training, partial sessions, and orientation sessions. The Standards Coach is overseeing these plans, supporting the trainers, collecting feedback on the success of the training activities, and becoming aware of additional issues that need to be addressed.

While the first year of implementation is still underway, the WMELS Steering committee is beginning to discuss next steps. The first discussion will focus on training for the second year. Key questions will include if the training will continue under the current regional train the trainers approach, how feedback will be utilized for future revision, and if additional trainers are needed.

While WMELS were developed specifically to establish broad philosophical standards, the Steering Committee is aware of increasing demand for more emphasis on curriculum and assessment information. Feedback indicates that many teachers feel that the training is too general, noting a desire for specific ideas and activities for classroom implementation. Many have suggested that training needs to differentiate between the different types of programs and the education levels of the teachers. Recommendations for second year training will, in part, provide guidance for the next steps of the State Standards Steering Committee.

The need to continue to get the message of the WMELS to a larger audience will also shape future actions. It is clear that more school administrators and teachers need to be aware of the WMELS and to be part of discussions about what is appropriate early education for young children. Department consultants are aware that there are more structures in place to reach early childhood special education than there are to reach 4- and 5-year-old kindergarten teachers. A variety of new approaches will need to be identified and strategies implemented.

The WMESL Steering Committee has already made a commitment to expand the focus of WMELS to children from birth to age three. This will require the committee to expand to stakeholders from programs serving children from birth to three. It will require a whole set of new issues for consideration. The committee will need to decide if they will focus only on group-based programs or if they will include group- and home-based. They will need to decide if the WMELS format and domains are appropriate or if they will need a new but aligned approach. Decisions will also need to be made about the professional development approach and if it will be interagency vs. programmatic specific or if it will target only birth to three or be developed as a birth to six approach. Throughout the development of the WMELS, information for families has been a concern. This will be another potential expansion as standards for birth to six are explored.

All of these steps will require continued and expanded commitment by the state departments. Interagency commitment and additional funding will be critical in maintaining current efforts and expanding this initiative.

Summary

From discussion, to plan, to a document, to training, Wisconsin has moved quickly ahead with efforts to establish Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards. Much has been accomplished and there is still much to do in order to make the WMELS the basis for our state's early childhood education and care. The Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards are poised to play an important role in shaping early education for Wisconsin's four- and five-year-old kindergarten and early childhood special education programs.

The WMELS represent a partnership of early childhood stakeholders on the state, regional, and local levels. This partnership mirrors the vision of quality programming and the team work necessary to provide a comprehensive array of services to Wisconsin's young children and families.

Appendix I

Wisconsin Early Learning Standards: Proposed Work Plan for Development, Statewide Stakeholder Review, and Application

- Tier 1 stakeholders – Represented by state and local administrators of programs, organizations and/or institutions serving children and responsible for implementing state and local programs.
- Responsibilities* – Review materials and provide feedback; share information with Tier 2 stakeholders and give their feedback. Apply Early Learning Standards through program standards and curricula.
- Tier 2 stakeholders – Represented by direct providers of childcare/early education services across all settings (home, school, centers, home care providers), interested community members, parents.
- Responsibilities* – Review materials and provide feedback to Tier 1 stakeholders.

Objectives & Strategies	Responsibility	Timeline	
1. Develop Draft Early Learning Standards			
A. Background Research			
Research and review early learning standards (ELS) in place in other states	Consultant	December 2002	•
Research and review national and regional association recommendations for ELS	Consultant	December 2002 – early January 2003	•
B. Develop Framework			
Articulate purpose and anticipated applications for ELS	Advisory Committee w/ consultant	December 2002	•
Develop guiding principles for standards	Advisory Committee w/ consultant	December	•
Review principles, purpose and uses with Tier 1 stakeholders – revise as needed	Tier 1 stakeholders	Week of January 6, 2003	•
Select “best practice” standards based on guiding principles and stated purposes/applications	Consultant	Week of January 6	•
C. Initial Draft for Review			
Draft standards, using best practice examples and aligned with WI K-12 standards	Consultant	Week of January 13	•
Disseminate standards for review by Advisory Committee	Consultant	Week of January 20	•
Revise standards based on initial review	Consultant	Week of January 27	•
D. Draft Standards adopted by Advisory Committee	Advisory Committee	January 31	•
2. Obtain Tier 1 and Tier 2 Input via Statewide Stakeholder Review			
Develop protocols for obtaining stakeholder feedback	Consultant/Advisory Committee	March 2003	
Recruit additional advisors for materials development (from Collaborating Partners membership)	Advisory Committee	March 2003	

Objectives & Strategies	Responsibility	Timeline
Develop materials (format & content - FAQ sheets, brochures, etc.) for intended Tier 1 and Tier 2 audiences	Consultant/ Advisors/ Advisory Committee	March – April 2003
Disseminate standards for initial review by Tier 1 and Tier 2 stakeholders	Consultant/Advisory Committee	March - May 2003
Hold 4-6 regional meetings with Tier 1 and Tier 2 stakeholders, targeted audiences	Advisory Committee	April – May 2003
Incorporate feedback into revised standards and submit Draft Standards with CCDF State Plan		June 2003
3. Standards Applications - Professional Development Plan for Educators in a Variety of Contexts: Tier 1 & Tier 2 Stakeholders		June - December 2003
A. Select Professional Development Steering Committee members	Advisory Committee	
B. Develop training module on Early Learning Standards	Steering Committee	
Develop training module on selecting Program Standards based on Early Learning Standards	Steering Committee	
Develop training module on selecting curricula to Achieve Early Learning Standards	Steering Committee	
4. Standards Applications - Parent Manual Development		
Recruit Steering Committee		
Develop and pilot draft manual		

Appendix II

Issues Raised for Draft Early Learning Standards

Note: Content suggestions made by focus group participants have been integrated into the revised Draft Early Learning Standards. The following address more generic issues raised by focus group participants.

ISSUE	RESPONSE
Age Span Covered - through second grade or K completion? Transitions? Another comment: add “children between age three and kindergarten”	Used end of Kindergarten for Performance Standards, in introduction added question regarding age range covered in standards. In Standards, added footnote, that standards reflect expectations for a “typically developing child at the end of Kindergarten.” Suggestion for a transition period in early elementary school, from ELS to WMAS, covered in overview.
Guiding Principle mention of do no harm – take out and put in introduction	modified Guiding Principle language to reflect Code of Ethical Conduct principle from NAEYC
Gender as factor in diverse patterns of learning and behavior	Not supported in literature the way the other qualifiers are, so not included.
Language relates to all children – include word “typically” in standards	Did not incorporate, see next item.
Footer reflecting individual rates of development	Inserted; added line that standards reflect expectations for a “typically developing child.”
Keep in same tense	Will try!
Special needs children not mentioned throughout Add in language about accommodations	Addressed in Q & A in Introduction, and in footer
List of references/resources needed	References consulted added; Resource list needed from Jill H. to add in
Add children’s emotional goals from Greenspan’s book, <i>The Essential Partnership</i>	Goals integrated in social/emotional domain
Essential areas of development as related to art include self-expression, intuition, problem solving, comfort with use of different materials, ability to work with others.	Self-expression, problem solving and working with others included; intuition as a performance standard not supported; working with materials is a program related issue.

Appendix III.

2005 Coaches Braided Funding By Days 3/28/05

Category	Detail	Funding Sources *1									Total
		TEE 8448	DPI		DWD CCDF 8457	WHSCP 1526		ECCS 8455	Coach Total days		
			IDEA 2266	Homeless		WECCP	Suppl				
			Nov '03 Dec 31 '05	Jan 1 June 30 '05		Jan 1 June 30 '05	Jan 1 June 30 '05				
Regional	Collaboration Coaches: (Boisvert, Rose, Zosel, Hurst, Chvojcek, open) 6 @ 9 Days x \$250		1 day each = \$1,500	2 days each = \$ 3,000	1 day each = \$1,500	1 day each = \$1,500		4 days each = \$6,000	*3	9	\$13,500
Community Approaches	Process Coach: Community Approaches (McCoy) 1 @ 34 Days x \$250	18 days = \$4,500	15 days = \$4,000					1 days = \$250			\$8,750
	Collaboration Coaches: Community Approaches: (Boisvert, Rose, Zosel, Hurst, Chvojcek, open) 6 each @ 17 days Days x \$250	7 days each = \$10,500	6 days each = \$9,000		1 day each = \$1,500	2 days each = \$3,000	1 day each = \$1,500			17	\$25,500
Standards	Process Coach: Standards (Wright) 1 @ 36 days x \$250 planning = 5, TOT = 3, implementation = 28	2 days = \$500	19 days = \$4,750		12 days = \$3,000	2 days = \$500		1 days = \$250			\$9,000
	Collaboration Coaches: Standards Content (Hurst, Chvojcek) 2 @ 9 days x \$250 planning = 2@4, TOT = 2@3, implementation = 2@2		6 days each = \$3,000		3 day each = \$1,500						\$4,500
	Collaboration Coaches: Standards (Boisvert, Rose, Zosel, Hurst, Chvojcek, open) 6 @ 8 days Days x \$250 implementation = 8		4 days each = \$6,000		2 day each = \$3,000	2 day each = \$3,000				8	\$12,000

Category	Detail	Funding Sources *1									Total
		TEE 8448	DPI		DWD CCDF 8457	WHSCP 1526		ECCS 8455	Coach Total days		
			IDEA 2266	Homeless		WECCP	Suppl				
		Nov '03 Dec 31 '05	Jan 1 June 30 '05	Jan 1 June 30 '05	Jan 1 June 30 '05	Nov '04 Jan 31 '06	Jan 31 '05	Jan 1 Dec 31 '05			
Homeless/ Poverty	Process Coach: Homeless + Collaboration Coach (Hurst) LTE @ 16.345 for 130 days/1040 hrs			\$16,999			TBD			\$16,999	
	Collaboration Coaches: Homeless/Poverty (Boisvert, Rose, Zosel, Chvojcek, open) 5 @ 4 Days x \$250			4 days each = \$5,000			1 day each = \$1,500		4	\$6,500	
	Subtotal	\$15,500	\$28,250	\$24,999	\$10,500	\$8,000	\$3,000	\$6,500	38	\$96,749	
	Subtotal	\$15,500	\$28,250	\$24,999	\$10,500	\$8,000	\$3,000	\$6,500	38		
Training			\$500	\$500		\$1,500		\$50		2,050	
Supplies 3	Mileage, travel, supplies and phone	\$1,500	\$7,250	\$500	\$500	\$500		\$450		\$10,700	
Publication	National Principals Assoc	\$4,000									
Standards Training and Supplies	Train/Trainers (Waisman) Posters (CESA 4) Website (CESA 5) Software Bookmark		\$9,000 \$1,300 \$2,000		\$3,000	\$3,000					
Regional Activities	Mini-grant (IDEA) Regional ECCS		6 at \$2,000 = \$12,000					6 at \$500= \$3,000		\$14,400	
Totals		\$17,000	\$48,000	\$25,999	\$14,000	\$12,000	\$3,000	\$9,400		\$129,399	

Notes

- *1. Additional personnel with coaches' functions may be provided by TEE, IDEA, and WHSCP but are not reflected in this budget.
- *2. Each funding source over \$5,000 is encouraged to contribute a minimum 10% to supplies, travel, and training or more based on the nature of the functions.
- *3. Various conferences waive the registration fee for coaches.

Appendix IV

Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards Training “Roll-Out”

WORKING DRAFT OF DISCUSSION AND DECISION POINTS

11/17/04

ELS Statewide Training Goal:

- Develop common knowledge of standards across early childhood education and care (ECEC) programs with special emphasis on child care, school 4/5 year old kindergarten, and Head Start.
- Provide Early Learning Standards (ELS) training to child care, Head Start, kindergarten, and early childhood special education teachers across the state.
- Provide an ELS training package that utilizes consistent content modules through a variety of formats.
- Provide cross program training that provide at least two trainings from differing agencies and for mixed audiences from different programs.
- Develop a cadre of ELS trainers consisting of 8-10 trainers from each region plus Milwaukee.
- Provide training at minimal cost to trainers.
- Implement training through a regional approach with regional liaison teams determining their approach

A. Considerations for the Approach to Implementation of ELS trainings

1) Sustain Regional Implementation:

- a) Maintain the standards process coach position funded to coordinate roll out, provide the “Train the Trainers”, and provide follow-up mentoring to trainers.
- b) Provide ?x days for community collaboration coaches in each region to serve as a point of contact for ELS training “rollout” in each regions
- c) WECCP/DPI regional grants may be used by regions to support ELS training. If additional mini-grant funding is available, provide them to the regions directed to ELS activities.

2) How are trainers determined:

- a) Identified:
 - i) Each region will be asked to identify potential trainers.
 - ii) The Standards Committee will review regional recommendations to assure inclusion of all disciplines and my offer additional suggestions for regional teams.
 - iii) The Standards Committee may also develop a state level team of trainers that can be a resource for future local training events.
- b) After completion of training, trainers will receive a document indicating they have completed the “approved” training.

3) Trainers Qualifications and Commitment:

- a) Suggested qualifications for trainers will include:
 - i) prior experience as a trainer,
 - ii) knowledge of child development, etc.
- b) Adhere to other guidelines as developed by Standards Management group:
 - i) Do at least one complete 13 hour training locally (in parts or as a whole)
 - ii) Adhere to the goals and format of the ELS training including using materials created by the Training Development Team and approved by the Steering Committee.
 - iii) Provide information to central point on local trainings offered, participant listing, and evaluation
 - iv) Participate in trainer mentoring (if provided)
- c) Trainers will clarify commitment of any employing agency:
 - i) Trainers employing agencies will agree to allow trainer to conduct training.
 - ii) Trainers employing agencies will agree to allow trainer to conduct training and will support (in-kind or financially) implementation of ELS training sessions such as staff time, printing, room use, meals, substitute costs, etc.

- iii) Trainers employing agencies makes no commitment to ELS training
- d) Guidelines will be developed for cost charged to local training participants

4) How to cover training requests for state conferences

- a) Seek additional funds/time for process coaches and or other regional trainers to make presentations.
- b) Work with the conferences at the teacher's colleges and associations to provide training at regional conferences.
- c) Trainers self identify for presentations at conferences they already attend.

5) Training Session Costs:

- a) Guidelines will be developed for charging participants.

6) Training Sequence

- a) DWD/DPI will continue to explore software to support consistent use of training materials. It will include requirements for content within various training formats (1 hour, 2 hour, half day, 1 day, 2 day.)
- b) Waisman/SIG project will take the lead on exploring university for credit for completion of full 15 hour training.

B. Train the Trainers

1) Logistics:

- a) A Regional Train the Trainers was considered but rejected based on cost and desire to provide a standardized training.
- b) The train the Trainers will be a 3 day event from February 7 – 9, 2004. The event will tentatively begin at 1 PM on the 7th and end at 1 PM on the 9th.
- c) The event will be held in a central Wisconsin location

2) Lead for registration/planning

- a) Waisman/SIG project will take the lead on hotel arrangements and registration exploring collaboration with CESA 9 and/or WI Head Start Collaboration Project/WECCP.

3) Fiscal Estimates and Coaches Role - DWD/DPI will continue to coordinate– See Separate Page

C. Other ELS Promotional Material

- 1) DWD will work with CCIC to establish policies for reprinting ELS (est. 6,000 left)
 - a) Institute a fee for more than 10 copies (requests may be reviewed on a case by case basis if necessary, with approval provided by Steering Committee Members)
 - b) Process for reprinting
- 2) CESA 10 will work with TBSS to finalize the ELS poster.
- 3) Explore printing of ELS bookmarks

D. Future Considerations

- 1) How to sustain enough trainers at a local level
- 2) Second level of trainers beyond the original cadre (turnover issues)