



**Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Personnel Standards,
Birth Through Eight Years;
The Development Process (2018-2019) and Next Steps**



Data Report 5

Early Childhood Personnel Center. (2020). *Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Personnel Standards: The development process (2018-2019) and next steps* (Data Report No.5). University of Connecticut Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities. <https://ecpcta.org>



The contents of this report were developed under a cooperative agreement #H325B17008 from the Office of Special Education Programs, US Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the US Department of Education, Project Officer, Tracie Dickson, PhD.

Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Personnel Standards, Birth Through Eight Years: The Development Process (2018-2019) and Next Steps

The field of Early Intervention (EI) and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) currently has no Personnel Standards. Developing a distinct set of standards is critical to the field of EI/ECSE in order to impact educator preparation, influence state licensure frameworks and permit DEC and ECPC II to be on equal footing with other professional organizations seeking to improve the outcomes for infants and young children. CEC and DEC have developed an Initial Specialty Set of discrete knowledge and skill items that are specific to EI/ECSE. However, although these are helpful for program development, they are not written as standards and are thus very limited in their usefulness in the current policy context.

Currently, all special education programs reviewed as part of the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) accreditation process are evaluated against the CEC Special Education Personnel Preparation Standards. This single set of standards covers all disability areas and all age ranges, birth through 21 years. In the past, reviewers were familiar with the EI/ECSE Specialty Set, and would use it to help inform the review process. CEC is in the process of revising its initial Personnel Standards and has stated that when the new standards are approved and implemented, Initial Specialty Sets will no longer be used as part of the review. Therefore, it is unclear as to how, if at all, Specialty Sets will be used in the future to inform the preparation and licensing of early interventionists and early childhood special educators.

The Early Childhood Education (ECE) field and all the related disciplines (e.g., speech/language therapy, physical therapy, occupational therapy) have Personnel Standards that are used for accreditation of higher education degree programs and for licensing. Only EI/ECSE does not have a set of distinct personnel standards. Without these standards, EI/ECSE is hampered in its ability to collaborate as an equal partner including ensuring that EI/ECSE issues are effectively addressed in state licensure frameworks.

The development now of EI/ECSE Personnel Standards is critical for the above reasons and also because of recommendations generated by the National Association of the Education of Young Children's (NAEYC) Power to the Profession initiative for which both ECPC II and DEC are collaborative partners. NAEYC is revising its Personnel Standards, Birth – 8 Years adhering to the CAEP process as part of this initiative. In addition to the ECE role, the Power to the Profession task force has identified specialization roles with EI/ECSE being one of those. Like the ECE role, these specialization areas require that personnel roles, qualifications, and standards be clarified as part of this unifying framework. Thus, the expectation is that there be a companion set of ECSE professional Standards.

Therefore, ECPC II began a collaboration with DEC of CEC in Winter 2018 to request approval to develop practice based Early Intervention (EI)/Early Childhood Special Education Standards (ECSE), Birth through 8 years (B-8). Approval was granted by the CEC Board of Directors (BODs) in May 2018. These Standards when approved will be used as part of the CAEP

accreditation process for schools and colleges of education at Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) across the U.S. and its territories, to guide development of IHE and professional development curricula internationally, and to inform certification policies. This approximate 2 ½ - 3-year process is being facilitated by a Standards Leader Team that includes representation from ECPC II and DEC. A 15-member Standards Development Task Force (SDTF) chaired by Dr. Eva Horn is responsible for drafting standards and related products. Before each major task, the Standards Leader Team meets one or more times to plan the agenda, develop needed materials, and determine facilitation roles.

Much of the product development is being completed using an iterative process implemented by writing teams of SDTF members with input from the full group and informed by current research and evidence-based practices, the DEC Recommended Practices, and the CEC High Leverage Practices. Each writing team completes assignments between virtual and/or face-to-face meeting. This work must adhere to CAEP guidelines and timelines and is being completed parallel to CEC's Standards Development Work Group (SDWG). The process that has been implemented through April 2019 is described below with major accomplishments and products identified. Table 2 highlights the development process yet to be implemented with timelines, major tasks, a description of what is to occur and resources/products to be developed.

Proposal Requesting Approval to Develop EI/ECSE Standards

The Standards' Leader Team (Margie Crutchfield, ECPC Consultant; Eva Horn, SDTF Chair; Peggy Kemp, DEC Executive Director (ED); Vicki Stayton, ECPC Liaison) met face-to-face and virtually from late February to early April 2019 to draft a proposal for the CEC BODs to request approval to develop EI/ECSE Personnel Standards, B-8. The proposal was submitted to the CEC BODs in April for inclusion on their May 2018 agenda, at which time approval to move forward with Standards development was approved. A Memorandum of Understanding was finalized in June 2018.

Identification of Standards Development Task Force and Advisory Group Members

In May 2018, the Standards' Leader Team identified questions and materials to be submitted by applicants for membership on the Standards Development Task Force (SDTF). The online application process was announced via email from DEC to the EI/ECSE field in early June 2018 with repeat email reminders. The email contained the link to the on-line application form which was open until July 2018.

Fifty-four applications were received for consideration for the SDTF. The Standards' Leader Team developed a rubric to review the applications. Each Team member reviewed the applications using the rubric, discussed their reviews in a conference call in early July 2018, and selected 14 applicants in addition to the previously appointed Chair (n=15) to be members of the SDTF. The remaining 40 applicants were contacted by the DEC ED and asked to serve on an

Advisory Group to review drafts of the Standards and other products. The SDTF members and their affiliations are in Table 1. Table 2 depicts the SDTF support staff and affiliations

Table 1
EI/ECSE SDTF Members and Affiliations

Name	Title	Affiliation
Erin Barton	Assistant Professor	Vanderbilt University
Susan Connor	Director	Early Intervention Training Program at the University of Illinois
Natalie Danner	Assistant Professor	Western Oregon University
Lorraine DeJong	Professor	Furman University (representing NAEYC)
Christy Hooser	Professor	Eastern Illinois University (representing CEC)
Eva Horn, Chair	Professor	University of Kansas
Jennifer Kilgo	Professor	University of Alabama, Birmingham
Hailey Love	Assistant Professor	University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Jeanette McCollum	Professor Emerita	University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Ann Mickelson	Assistant Professor	University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
Megan Purcell	Clinical Assistant Professor	Purdue University
Sandra Robbins	Associate Professor	University of West Georgia
Cynthia Vail	Professor and Department Head	University of Georgia
Serena Wheeler	Early Intervention Specialist Coach	University of Louisville for Kentucky Early Intervention System
Hasan Zaghawan	Associate Professor	University of Northern Colorado

Table 2
EI/ECSE SDTF Support Staff and Their Affiliations

Name	Title	Affiliation
Diane Alexander	Associate Executive Director	DEC
Jennifer Bullock	Director, Education and Professional Standards and Practices	CEC
Margaret Crutchfield	Consultant	ECPC II
Peggy Kemp	Executive Director	DEC
Megan Shea	Manager, Professional Development & Standards	CEC

Name	Title	Affiliation
Jami Swindell	Doctoral Student Intern	DEC
Vicki Stayton	Associate Director	ECPC II

Orientation of SDTF Members

An initial meeting of the SDTF was held virtually on July 18, 2018 to identify the CAEP process to be used for development of Standards and other products and the role of the SDTF. The Standards Leader Team (SLT) met twice by conference call to develop the agenda and identify roles for the meeting. Individual members of the SLT developed materials for use in the meeting and shared facilitation responsibilities.

Virtual and Face-to-Face Meetings to Draft Standards and Other Products with Related “Homework” in Preparation of External Review and as Follow-up to External Review

As previously stated, an iterative process was implemented in which drafts were developed initially by the entire SDTF with individual or small group review and feedback. As the drafts began to be edited into Standards language, initial work was completed by SDTF writing teams and then reviewed by the entire SDTF with revisions being recommended. Review, feedback, writing, and rewriting occurred in each face-to-face meeting with the meeting ending with recommendations for each writing team to incorporate into their respective Standard area to be submitted for review at the next virtual or face-to-face meeting. Review and feedback of writing teamwork occurred by the entire SDTF in the virtual meetings with recommendations for edits by each writing team prior to the next face-to-face meeting. The SLT met virtually one or more times prior to each SDTF meeting to plan the agenda, other materials to be developed, the activities to be implemented, and determine roles. Each SLT member developed support materials for the meeting as needed. In addition, Drs. Crutchfield, ECPC Consultant, and Stayton, ECPC Liaison served in a resource/advisory role to the writing team between meetings. The primary goals and outcomes for each meeting leading to external review of the Standards document draft are summarized below.

July 25-26, 2108 SDTF Face-to-Face Meeting. The SDTF met in Washington, DC for 1 ½ days. The primary goals for the meeting were to: (1) review expectations for Standards development via the CAEP process, (2) brainstorm knowledge and skills essential for beginning early interventionists and early childhood special educators based on SDTF members’ professional expertise and knowledge of current research and evidence-based practices, (3) group the knowledge and skills into broad categories, (4) divide into writing teams by category. By the end of this meeting, a list of brainstormed knowledge and skills was grouped into eight broad categories (i.e., families, assessment, teaming/collaboration, professionalism, child development and theory, instruction/interaction, environment, and curriculum) and SDTF members volunteered to be on a writing team for at least one category. The assignment for each writing team was to review relevant literature/documents (e.g., DEC Initial Specialty Set, DEC Recommended Practices, CEC High Leverage Practices, Elementary Education Standards) to

identify any essential knowledge and skills that might be missing and further edit and convert the brainstormed lists to performance-based statements.

September 29-30, 2018 SDTF Face-to-Face Meeting. The SDTF met in Washington, DC for 1 ½ days. The primary goals for the meeting were to: (1) provide an overview of expectations for writing Standards using examples, (2) review the performance-based statements for redundancy across categories, and gaps, (3) reorganize the performance-based statements into a maximum of seven categories (4) draft Standard language for each of the categories, (5) introduce expectations for writing Component statements, (6) review, edit, and group list of knowledge and skills that might be combined into component statements. By the end of this meeting, performance-based statements were edited, recategorized as appropriate, and grouped to become potential Component statements. The broad categories which would become Standards were narrowed to six (i.e., curriculum, child development, families, assessment, teaming, instruction/interaction) and drafting of Standard statements was initiated. The writing team assignment prior to the next meeting was to edit the Standards statements and begin drafting Component statements for the teams respective Standard.

October and November 2019 Listening Sessions at DEC and TED Annual Conferences. A listening session was conducted by the SLT at both the DEC and TED annual conferences to obtain input into the Standards development work. Approximately 60 individuals attended the DEC session and 12 the TED session. After a rationale of and overview of the Standards development process was presented, participants in the DEC session divided into small groups and comments were recorded by SDTF members. At the TED session, feedback was provided as a large group. Table 3 presents the questions used at each session to obtain feedback. Table 4 includes the notes from the DEC session and TED sessions. Feedback was obtained on the broad topical categories/areas since drafting Standard and Component statements had just begun.

Table 3
Listening Session Questions for Feedback – DEC and TED Annual Conferences

Addressing the Challenges with the Current System	
Current Initial CEC Standards	Questions for You
1. Learner Development & Individual Differences 2. Learning Environment 3. Curricular Content Knowledge programs? 4. Assessment 5. Instructional Planning & Strategies 6. Professional Learning & Ethical Practice 7. Collaboration	1. What have been your challenges in using the CEC Standards for ECSE programs? 2. What have been your challenges in using the ECSE Specialty Sets?
Ensuring that Critical Competencies are Reflected	
EI/ECSE SDTF Draft Topical Areas	Questions for You
1. Curriculum 2. Child Development	1. Can you think of any critical competencies of beginning early childhood special

3. Families 4. Teaming, Collaboration & Professionalism 5. Assessment 6. Instruction/Interaction	educators that would not fit into one of these topical areas? 2. What are critical competencies that should be reflected in each of the topical areas?
---	---

Table 4

Feedback from DEC and TED Listening Sessions (n=72)

Responses: Addressing the Challenges with the Current Initial CEC Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEC Standards do not address families sufficiently • Really hard to deal with CEC, NAEYC, and DEC Specialty Set when developing curriculum, preparing for state and/or national approval • Too many people do not know about the Standards/Specialty Sets now • Focus more on ECSE than on EI
Responses: Ensuring That Critical Competencies Are Addressed in EI/ECSE Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Love that Families is its own standard! • Combining teaming, professionalism, leadership, and collaboration into one standard seems to be too much. • Shouldn't professionalism and ethical practice be a separate standard? • How will you ensure that there is full coverage of B-3, 3-5, 5-8? Such different needs, service delivery models, etc. • Where will transition be placed? It should be its own standard • Where do emergent literacy and STEM fit in? • Multiple comments about the differences between curriculum (the what) and instruction (the how). How do you deal with separating/combining the two? • What about health and safety? • How will the component of care be a part of the standards? Early education and care. Framed different in P-12 pedagogy. Are you defining models of care, or childcare, or being a caring professional? Should be all of them. • Another thing not really reflected in just these category titles is play. That is another area where instruction and curriculum is overlapping. • How do we ensure that the standards adequately address cultural competencies/responsive and equity – embedded throughout, not a separate competency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Cultural responsiveness cuts through all ➤ Cultural competency\Equity across cultures ➤ Recognizing access issues and inequity in EI • What will be relationship of DEC Recommended Practices and DEC Standards and CEC's HLPs? • Programs will need guidance in how to apply standards to different state licensure frameworks

November 16-17, 2019 SDTF Face-to-Face Meeting. The SDTF met in Washington, DC for 1 ½ days. The primary goals for the meeting were to: (1) review the feedback from the DEC and TED listening sessions, (2) in writing teams revise the Standards and Component Statements, (3) conduct a large group discussion/review of the revisions, (4) begin making revisions to Standard and Component Statements, and (5) identify next steps with the public

webinars and survey. At the end of the meeting, listening session and large group feedback was incorporated into revisions to the Standards and Components. Based on feedback drafts were expanded to include a seventh Standard (Professionalism and Ethical Practice was separated from Teaming and Collaboration) and 28 Components. Writing teams were asked to continue to edit their respective Standards and Components in preparation for the December virtual meeting.

December 13, 2018 SDTF Virtual Meeting. A virtual meeting of the SDTF was held to review the revised Standards and Components. Each writing team reported on primary edits and the large group provided feedback. Small groups were asked to make any revisions within a week so that the most recent revision of Standards and Components could be included in the public webinar and survey.

Public Webinars and Survey

January 23 and 28, 2019 Webinars. Two 1 ½ hour webinars were conducted with the primary goals of: (1) providing an overview of the SDTF work to date, (2) introducing the draft Standards and Components, (3) introducing the public survey and requesting survey completion, and (4) responding to participants questions. Two hundred individuals registered for each webinar. The webinar power point slides were developed by the SLT who also facilitated each webinar along with support from Megan Shea, CEC.

Public Survey. The public survey which included both quantitative and qualitative items was developed by the SLT. The survey included 6 demographic items, 3 likert-items per each of the 7 Standards rating the Standard as a whole, the clarity of the Component statement, and the feasibility of implementation of each Component in a preparation program on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. Open-ended qualitative responses included an explanation of the quantitative ratings, identification of any critical Standards/Components not included, the degree to which the respondents' area of practice was reflected, and additional things for the SDTF to consider in the development process.

Email notification that the survey was open for completion were sent multiple times. The Advisory Group was sent separate emails with a link to the survey. The response rate was as follows: Advisory Group (n=14), public group (n=117), and total responses (n=121). Total responses to the demographic items was 128, however, 7 of those individuals did not respond to the quantitative and qualitative items.

This is the link for the survey with demographic, quantitative, and qualitative responses to the survey for all respondents <https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-DR6WMGFVV/> . Table 5 contains a summary of the responses to the item for each standard asking for an explanation of the respondents' ratings on the likert-scale questions.

Table 5

Summary of Explanation for Ratings on Quantitative Questions for Each of the Seven Standards

Overall Takeaway:

- Standards are comprehensively written, include essential content and skills, and can be assessed

Standard 1 Child Development and Early Learning Takeaways:

- Standard 1 Child Development and Early Learning:
 - The emphasis that development within the context of culture is important within this standard
 - Addresses theory to practice
 - Standard and components are comprehensive, include key content needed by EI/ECSE professionals, clearly stated, and measurable
 - However, more than one comment suggested that components are vaguely stated and would be difficult to assess
 - Inclusive of B-3 and Part B professionals
- Need to ensure that the range of disability conditions, including low incidence disabilities are addressed in wording of standards, components, and supporting explanations

Advisory Group Responses (n=10/14):

- Comprehensive and includes theory to practice
- Necessary basic skills that can guide training and be assessed
- Specific comments about Components:
 - Component 2 and 4: wording that differentiates individual differences
 - Component 3: add ECSE after EI as some states have very different systems

Public Group (n=62/117):

- Specific comments about components:
 - Component 1 – Add “relationships” to assessment, curriculum
 - Components 1 and 4 - Consider changing “demonstrate an understanding” to recognize
 - Component 2 – Separate cultural and linguistic diversity into a separate component
 - Component 3 – Include “interactions with families and assessment” to plan and implement...
 - Component 4 – Include family dynamics/systems theory and impact on development
- Comments to consider in supporting explanations:
 - Component 1 – Provide examples of theories and philosophies
 - Component 2 – Include a focus on functional outcomes/goals, emphasize need to understand typical development first
 - Expand on cultural context, including poverty and bias
 - Discuss medical/genetic diagnoses and other etiologies and impact on development
 - Address infant mental health, adverse childhood events, toxic stress, trauma informed care, and substance use and recovery
 - Include an emphasis on communication and language development for all children
 - Discuss examples, differences, etc. by age range

Standard 2 Partnering with Families Takeaways:

Advisory Group (n=9/14):

- Global, reflect key aspects of partnerships and family-centered practices, and supported by DEC RPs
- Specific comments about Components:
 - Component 1 – Expand to emphasize that work with families is collaborative and reciprocal
 - Component 2 - Add “access, participation, and equity in natural, inclusive environments”; the word “necessary” infers required, replace with “available”
 - Component 3 – Wording infers expert model, use wording such as “reciprocal sharing of information”
- Comments to consider in supporting explanations: Opportunities for candidates to develop relationships with families may be difficult to include in a degree program, therefore, need to include examples of how relationship skills may be developed and practiced in supporting explanations (e.g., case scenarios)

Public Group (n= 58/117):

- Important to have a separate standard that focuses on partnering with families
- Comprehensive, yet open-ended, so lends itself to different kinds of assessments
- Consider modifying the standard’s title to include some of the ideas in components
- Seems to be missing language of family-centered practices
- Adult learning principles seem to be missing
- Specific comments about components:
 - Component 2 – Possibly address evidence and research-based information
 - Component 3 – Consider dividing this into 2 components. Possibly end one component after “development and learning”. Then, the 2nd part of the component would be a 4th component.
- Comments to consider in supporting explanations:
 - Component 1 – Discuss the partnership as two-directional, considering what parents bring to the partnership; discuss candidates’ self-reflection on their family systems and how this informs/influences development of relationships with families
 - Component 2 – Elaborate on “objective information” – “comprehensive, accurate, current, understandable, presented without bias” and provide examples of what students might do
 - Component 3 - Include examples of optimizing learning opportunities in the home
 - Include examples specific to teaching/coaching
 - Examples of attributes or actions, refer to DEC RPs
 - Add wording that recognizes “families’ strengths”, emphasize strengths-based

Standard 3 Collaboration and Teaming Takeaways:

Advisory Group (n=8/14):

- Globally stated and includes key aspects of collaboration – families, other professionals, models, technology, and transitions
- Specific comments about Components:
 - Component 1: Consider dividing into 2 with one focused on benefits, challenges, and implementation of trans, inter, and multidisciplinary team models

- Component 3: Add wording “entry into services and transitions” to emphasize program entry as a transition
- Comments to consider for supporting explanations:
 - Technologies to be used
 - Examples of transition strategies
 - Examples of collaborative strategies
 - Specific discussion of transition for each age range
 - Discuss role release in both home and classroom settings

Public Group (n= 54/117):

- Aligns with CEC, NAEYC, and CAEP
- As stated, focus seems to be on collaboration to support transitions. Should collaboration and teaming to support assessment and intervention also be stated?
- Specific comments about components:
 - Component 1 – To be more inclusive of professionals who work with children with low incidence disabilities, consider changing “multiple professionals” to “professionals representing multiple disciplines and roles”.
- Comments to consider in supporting explanations:
 - Examples of what candidates will do to demonstrate culturally and linguistically responsive practices. Culturally and linguistically responsive practices are not included in any of the components.
 - Should adult learning principles be addressed?
 - Component 1 – Examples related to specific teaming, include specific examples to further define “processes of teaming”, consider addressing team challenges
 - Component 2 – Include specific examples of what candidates might do related to transition.
 - Component 3 – Discuss strategies to mentor families in how to be a part of the team; include examples of coaching, provide specific examples of collaboration strategies; discuss service coordination and supervision of other adults (e.g., paraprofessionals, volunteers)

Standard 4 Assessment Takeaways:

Advisory Group (n=12/14):

- Clear and comprehensive, includes families and formal and informal assessment
- Consider splitting the last component into two—to make it clear that goal development and services are developed in collaboration with families and team members (see suggested language)

Public Group (n=77/117):

- Many positive comments: standard is critical, clearly and comprehensively written
- Informal measures and authentic assessment may need to be move explicitly included
- May need additional language about reporting results to families and about making data-based decisions
- Specific Comments about Components
 - Component #1 should include “medically” appropriate
 - Component #3: use “communicate” as verb instead of “share”

- Edit component #4 to include “fidelity and monitoring progress”
- Mixed concern about ability to assess components
- Comments to Consider in Supporting Explanation:
 - Add ‘work appropriately with cultural interpreters and cultural brokers when needed’
 - Components seem doable but it will be important to see guidance to further clarify what is expected
 - Describe using on-going information assessment for instruction, monitoring goals, and engaging families
 - Make it clear that some assessments are not accessible for all children and that some must be administered by a specialist

Standard 5 Curriculum Takeaways:

Strong thread of comments asking to change the name of the standard. Concern that “Curriculum” focuses too much on school-based academic curricula. Prefer the language in the standard and components “Curriculum and Frameworks”

Advisory Group (n=12/14):

- Generally positive comments, like the inclusion of UDL
- Missing the explicit importance of play
- Add accommodations in additional modifications
- Consider adding “early childhood content standards and developmental domains:
- In Component #1, add “unique strengths and needs”
- In Component #2, using “academic” is of concern

Public Group (n=77/117):

- Concern that there should be more focus on 0-3
- Appears to be too focused on 3 - 8
- There are a few specific suggestions for wording in components—see list-- as well as quite a few suggestions for additional information that could be included in the Supporting Explanations

Standard 6 Interaction, Intervention, and Instruction Takeaways:

- Language is strong, clear, and concise
- Positive comments but numerous comments about needing more clarity about what is meant, some terms that are vague, etc.
- Component 3: Concern about noting social/emotional competence without addressing all areas of competence

Advisory Group (n=12/14):

- Specific Comments about Components
 - Why is social-emotional competence a stand-alone component, what about academic goals?
 - See long comment about modifying component language
 - Not sure what is meant in Component 4
- Comments to Consider in Supporting Explanation

- Need to clarify why you have separated instruction and intervention as two separate strategies
- Could be a good place to discuss embedded learning opportunities within inclusive environments and using these with fidelity.

Public Group (n=77/117):

- This standard does not explicitly address cultural and linguistic issues
- Some verbs are vague, e.g. “promote”
- Many suggestions for word changes and for additional information that would be helpful in supporting explanations
 - Specific Comments about Components: There are many suggestions for word changes and additions, too many to summarize here.
 - Comments to Consider in Supporting Explanation:
 - Explanation of what we mean by function-based interventions; brief explanation of responsive interaction and instruction; explanation of environmental arrangements

Standard 7 Collaboration Takeaways:

- Clear, well-written, comprehensive
- Unclear about what “engage with the field” means
- Is Component #1 necessary? Is redundant and included in other components. How will that be measured?

Advisory Group (n=12/14):

- Specific Comments about Components
- Suggest changing professional development to effective PD, dynamic PD, or evidence-based PD
- Comments to Consider in Supporting Explanation
 - Add information about specific codes of ethics, DEC Recommended Practices, and other professional guidelines including those from other disciplines, etc.

Public Group (n=78/117):

- Many suggestions for word changes and for additional information that would be helpful in supporting explanations. I have included a few below, but see entire list
- Specific Comments about Components
 - Component 1 is vague and perhaps redundant, what does “engage with the field” mean? Could be hard to assess
 - Add “ongoing” to Component 2
 - Does Component 3 imply a compliance mindset?
 - In Component 3 include “using ethical and culturally/linguistically responsive” practices
- Comments to Consider in Supporting Explanation
 - Confidentiality, explanation of ‘reflective practice’, knowing one’s limitations, working within one’s scope, impact of the individual mentoring process, how candidates can access appropriate and effective PD

February 23-24, 2019 SDTF Face-to-Face Meeting. The SDTF met in Washington, DC for 1 ½ days. The primary goals for the meeting were to: (1) review the survey data, (2) revise Standards and Components based on survey results and record how survey results were addressed, (3) review expectations for Supporting Explanations with examples, and (4) begin converting Supporting Explanation outlines into narrative form. Prior to a March virtual meeting, SDTF writing teams were asked to make any additional edits to the Standards and Components, and in preparation for an April face-to-face meeting continue to convert outlines to narrative Supporting Explanations.

March 22, 2019 SDTF Virtual Meeting. A virtual meeting of the SDTF was held for the writing teams to present the revised Standards and Components and to obtain feedback from the entire SDTF on those revisions in order for the writing teams to make any additional edits prior to submission to the CEC PSPC and BODs for their review.

April 5-6, 2019 SDTF Virtual Meeting. The SDTF met in Washington, DC for 1 ½ days. The primary goals for the meeting were to: (1) complete the review of draft Standards and Components from the March virtual meeting, (2) make any changes to Standards and Components, (3) provide large group feedback on draft Supporting Explanations, (4) revise Supporting Explanations, (5) introduce expectations for writing a knowledge base for each component. Writing teams were given until April 8th to make any additional edits to Standards and Components. They were asked to begin drafting knowledge base statements in preparation for the July 17-18, 2019 SDTF meeting.

Review of the Draft Standards, Components, and Supporting Explanations by the CEC BODs

The CEC BODs reviewed the draft Standards, Components, and Supporting Explanations at their April 13, 2019 meeting prior to submission of the draft to CEC's PSPC for their review and feedback with any edits to be made by the SDTF in order to submit to CAEP by July 1, 2019 for review and feedback. The SLT participated in this meeting virtually to respond to any questions from the BODs.

Continued Responsibilities of the SDTF and SLT Leading to Standards Approval by CAEP and Use by the Field

Table 6 identifies the major tasks to be implemented by the SDTF and with support of the SLT between May 2019 and Summer/Fall 2020. The complete Standards package will be submitted to CAEP by July 1, 2020 for their review and approval. If approval is granted, additional resources to support their use will be developed and dissemination activities will begin. Programs will then have the Standards for optional use in spring 2021 and required use in spring 2023. A conditional approval will require revisions by the SDTF and/or the SLT.

Table 6

Projected Standards Development Timeline and Products, May 2019 – Fall 2020

Date	Projected Task	Summary of What Will Occur	Products to be Developed
May 2019	Review of draft Standards, Components, and Supporting Explanations by PSPC	The PSPC will complete a substantive review of the Standards package and provide comments and feedback to the SDTF.	Draft Standards document
May – June 2019	Revise draft based on PSPC feedback	SDTF writing teams will review PSPC feedback and make changes as needed.	Revised draft
June 2, 2019	Conduct Standards listening session at NAEYC-PLI	SDTF members will present Standards, Components and Supporting Explanations and seek feedback from attendees	Power Point slides
June 3, 2019	Conduct roundtable sessions on Standards for NAECTE members at NAEYC-PLI	SDTF members will present Standards, Components and Supporting Explanation and seek feedback from attendees.	Power point slides Hand-out
June 3 2019	Provide overview of Standards work for NAECTE and ACCESS Executive Boards at NAEYC-PLI	SDTF leadership will present overview of the Standards, the development process, and future opportunities for input.	Hand-out
June 5, 2019	Final draft set of Standards submitted to CEC staff for editing and inclusion into the CEC Standards submission	CEC staff will edit the Standards, Components and Supporting Explanations based on the above feedback and prepare additional information on the development of the draft standards.	
July 1, 2019	Submit draft to CAEP	CEC will submit one application package to CAEP that includes both draft CEC Initial Standards and the EI/ECSE draft Initial Standards.	Draft CEC and DEC Standards with supporting information
May-July 15, 2019	Draft knowledge base – SDTF small groups	SDTF writing groups succinctly describe the knowledge base for each of their Components. The knowledge base will include empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice appropriate for EI/ECSE.	Draft knowledge base for each component

Date	Projected Task	Summary of What Will Occur	Products to be Developed
July 17-18, 2019	Revise knowledge base and begin work on performance indicators in SDTF face-to-face meeting	SDTF writing groups will review and refine the knowledge base descriptions and develop examples of candidate actions that would provide sufficient evidence that a standard component is met.	Agenda Revised knowledge base Draft performance indicators
August 2019	Conduct virtual meeting of SDTF to finalize knowledge base and review draft performance indicators	SDTF teams will share final drafts of the knowledge bases with the entire SDTF for review and editing.	Agenda Draft knowledge base Draft performance indicators
Early September 2019	Submit knowledge base and performance indicators to leadership team for review	SDTF writing teams will incorporate feedback from virtual meeting and submit final knowledge base and performance indicators to leadership team. Leadership team will edit final drafts for consistency, clarity, and accuracy.	Draft knowledge base Draft performance indicators Written feedback from leadership team
September 2019	Conduct virtual meeting to begin work on guidance on assessments and assessment rubrics	Small groups of the SDTF will work on two additional resources to be used by programs and reviewers: guidance on the types of assessments that would be appropriate to evaluate candidate mastery of the EI/ECSE standards and a rubric programs and reviewers can use to evaluate their assessments to ensure the assessments are adequately addressing the EI/ECSE standards.	Agenda Power point slides
September 2019	Conduct webinar and public survey for field input	SDTF will conduct a public webinar to present the current draft and to seek feedback through an on-line survey. The webinar and survey will be publicized by ECPC II, CEC, and DEC.	Webinar power point slides Survey Email announcement about webinar and survey
October 2019	Analyze and summarize survey results and feedback from TED and CEC meetings.	SDTF leadership will prepare data summaries from all feedback opportunities in preparation for February meeting.	Data reports

Date	Projected Task	Summary of What Will Occur	Products to be Developed
October 2019	Receive feedback from CAEP	CAEP's SPA Standards Review Committee will provide substantive feedback to CEC on both sets of standards. Feedback will indicate any concerns the Committee has and any changes they would require in the final set of Standards.	CAEP feedback report
October 2019	Conduct listening session at DEC annual conference	SDTF members will present Standards, Components and Supporting Explanation and seek feedback from attendees.	Power point slides
November 2019	Conduct listening session at TED annual conference	SDTF members will present Standards, Components and Supporting Explanation and seek feedback from attendees.	Power point slides
November 2019	Revise Standards, Components, and Supporting Explanations based on CAEP feedback and survey results; continue work on assessments and rubrics – SDTF face-to-face meeting	A face-to-face meeting of the SDTF will be conducted to: (1) review CAEP feedback and survey results, (2) make changes as needed to Standards, Components, and Supporting Explanations, and (3) continue work on assessments and rubrics.	Agenda CAEP feedback report Survey results Revised Standards draft Revised assessments and rubrics
Early February 2020	Revise Standards application documents for submission to CEC PSPC and BODs – virtual or face-to-face SDTF meeting	SDTF will complete final review of Standards, Components, Supporting Explanation, knowledge bases and all ancillary documents and submit to CEC.	Agenda Revised standards application documents
February 2020	Complete copy edits – CEC staff	CEC staff will copy edit entire package and submit to PSPC.	Copy edited document
March 2020	Review by PSPC	PSPC will review Standards, provide feedback to SDTF, and make its recommendation to the CEC BOD	PSPC feedback report
March 2020	Edit document based on PSPC feedback	Leadership will make any final edits based on PSPC feedback.	Edited document
April 2020	Submit to CEC BOD for final review	CEC BODs reviews final Standards and Components and determines whether to approve Standards.	Complete standards application document

Date	Projected Task	Summary of What Will Occur	Products to be Developed
			Summary report
May-June 2020	Complete any final edits and final CEC copyediting	CEC staff, with support from the Standards Leader Team, prepares final package to be submitted to CAEP.	CAEP application document
June 2020	Update sessions at NAEYC-PLI	Standards Leader Team will provide information about the status of the standards development process.	Power point slides
July 1, 2020	Submit to CAEP for formal review.	CEC will submit one application package to CAEP. The package will include both the CEC Initial Standards and the EI/ECSE Initial Standards.	CAEP application document
July – September 2020	Develop resources for IHEs and strategies to roll-out Standards and supporting documents to the field	Leadership will develop a plan to publicize and disseminate final Standards once approved by CAEP. SDTF members, DEC work groups, and ECPC II will prepare materials and resources to help reviewers and programs implement the new Standards.	Resources and strategies - TBD
October 2020	Receive approval and/or requested edits from CAEP	CAEP will submit a report of their findings and decision to CEC.	CAEP report
October 2020	Conduct update session at DEC annual conference	Standards Leader Team will provide information about the status of the Standards development.	Power point slides
November 2020	Conduct update session at TED annual conference	Standards Leader Team will provide information about the status of the standards development.	Power point slides
November – December 2020	Complete any revisions based on CAEP report	SDTF will make revisions, if necessary, based on the CAEP report.	Revised document as needed
Winter 2021	Conduct webinar to introduce Standards and resources to field	Standards Leader Team will conduct a public webinar to formally introduce the final Standards and resources to the field.	Webinar power point slides
Spring 2021	Disseminate Standards for use by programs – optional	During this two-year transition, EI/ECSE programs submitting for CAEP SPA review can choose to	Standards and resources for use

Date	Projected Task	Summary of What Will Occur	Products to be Developed
		use the 2012 CEC Initial Standards or the new EI/ECSE Initial Standards.	
Spring 2023	Disseminate Standards for required use	EI/ECSE programs submitting for CAEP SPA review are required to use the new EI/ECSE Initial Standards.	Standards and resources for use