

## Head Start Program Performance Standards October 2016

Ann Linehan: Good morning, and good afternoon. Did we start already?

–:Yep.

Ann: Thanks. Terrific. Alrighty. This is Ann Linehan, the deputy director from the Office of Head Start. And I understand we have well over 1000 participants today. Our webinar today is going to focus on two major areas. Governance and education services. And we hope to run smoothly today, and get to some critical questions that you have submitted to us in advance of today's live webinar. I'd first like to introduce Colleen Rathgeb, and Colleen is going to cover our hot topics.

Colleen Rathgeb: Alright. Hi, everybody. Welcome to, I think, our second OHS Wednesday. So, we're going to to just talk through the agenda of what we're going to follow here. As Ann said, we're going to talk about governance and education. Primarily, I'm going to talk a little bit about some questions that we've been getting. And then, Alana Buroff is going to walk folks through what is currently up on the ECLKC to support your implementation of our new Standards.

So, and then we'll get into the governance and education talk, as Ann has said. So, the hot topic that we wanted to address today, and we're going to try on each of these OHS Wednesdays, you know, reflect back some of the things, or concerns, or questions, that we've been hearing. Things that, again you know, seem to be hot. And so, we wanted to talk in general around questions. So we have been getting some questions in through the website. We have gotten questions and also through the webinars. And we've been working through a process here to figure out the best way to be able to get definitive answers back out to the field. I think that we've talk a lot the initial webcast, and last week about the paradigm shift that we're really trying to to not get into a level of prescription beyond what is in the Standards.

And again, focus on your work as, thinking about your work in the program, how the Standards, as they are written, can be best implemented. And so, I think while we are working through ways we can share individual answers, and then, questions that we're getting repeatedly with everyone to be able to get answers. One thing that we really want to make clear is the most important thing that you can do to be able to answer the questions that you are having, and your staff are having is to read the Standards. So, there's a lot of questions that we have been getting in that if folks just look at the relative – the Standards that is on the topic you're asking about, it will give you the information you need. So, we really want to encourage – we know that a lot of times listening to webinar people have questions when they are something.

And so, they're shooting it in, and that makes a lot of sense. But we really want to make sure that the first person or definitive source – and even more definitive than if you hear one of us talk about something at a conference or on one of these calls. And if it's not reflected in exactly what the language is in the standard, it really is the definitive source for folks to go to. So, that being said, I do want to one – We also think the questions that we're getting are helpful as a source of data for us to see where the are areas that are confusing, areas that people are concerned about. And, the definitely the largest area that we've heard questions and concerns has been coming around the background check requirements. And particularly, the check that has to be done prior to hire, which we've been doing since the 2007 Act

change, a background check prior to hire, either the federal, state, or tribal. But, with the explicit addition of the fingerprint check has raised, reasonably, a concern for folks about the timeliness to be able to do those for new hires. Again, only for new hires, once the the regulations become effective on November 7.

The second background check requirement with the 90 days is, has a delayed effective date until next August. So, we have heard the concerns about the fingerprint being more of a lift than, than the background check requirements that had been in place with the Act. And so, we are exploring possibilities here. If there is any flexibility or relief, we can provide on that. At this point, we want people, just you know to continue to work through there processes. You know, remember, this is only for folks that hire, for new hires --that's also to know that we are looking to see if there's anything that can be done to relieve the concerns around the November 7 date. And so, as soon as there is more information about that, we'll certainly be getting communications out to you through the list serves and the ECLKC, and the blasts.

So, we hear you, and so thanks for giving us that information. So, related to that, to kind of all of the materials that are available on ECLKC, I'm going to kick it over to Alana, who is going to walk through some of the materials that are up, just to make sure people know what's available to help you and your staff as you work through the Standards. And I guess make one more plug, like, these are great resources, helpful things, some videos, some webcasts. The most important thing is, you know, 115 pages that are the regs. And so to the degree that you are able to really spend some time on reading those, that's going to be one of the best things, the best thing that help.

Ann: I don't know. Do they have monarch notes still? [Inaudible]

Colleen: Cliff notes, I think you mean.

Ann: Cliff notes? [Laughter] Is there a Cliff note? No there's no cliff notes. I mean, some of the things could be, just seen as Cliff notes to help you, but really it's the reading. So, do they have Cliff notes anymore?

Colleen: It's something called the internet now. [Laughter]

Alana Buroff: But --Thanks, Colleen. If you go onto the ECLKC right now under "About Head Start," we have a section called "Presenting the Standards." And from there you can find a lot of the materials that we've presented and put together for you. Clearly there's the Performance Standards. And we have those translated into Spanish if you go onto "Policy and Regulations." There's the "Principle" PDF, the "Principle" PDF with an appendix, and the "Principle" PDF in Spanish.

We know people have been clamoring for that, so we're happy to have that out for you. We also have something called the "Showcase." The Performance Standards "Showcase" is a series of videos we've put out on some of the main topic areas of the Standards. And again, like Ann said, it's sort of the Cliff notes version of what's in the Standards for that area that you really want to know that deeper, you got to read the Standards. The "Preamble: Part I" has the, the comments and our responses to the comments that came in to the Final Rule. And it kind of informs why and how we came up with the rules, the regulations that are. And, the research that backs that up. We also have a "Fact Sheet" and a questions and answers document that might be handy if you kind of brief your board or other stakeholders.

The "Program Instructions," table of effective dates that talks about when different parts of the regulation will become effective, and the re-designation table, which is a real high-level walkthrough of the old Performance Standards compared to the same parts that you might find in the new Performance Standards. I'm finding a lot of people are saying, "Oh, I can't quite find this. Is it still --" And, we're really encouraging people to go to the ECLKC, use the search function within the "Regulations" section, and search for topics that you're looking for. If you're looking for information about buses or disabilities, or tooth brushing, then search for those words, and it will pull up all the places in "Regulations" that we talked about those things. And if it's not there, then it's not in the regulation. Right?

Ann: Alana, even the index in the front of the Performance Standards. It's so easy. And even if you, you don't want to do the search on ECLKC. I mean, I don't think anyone could not find something that they were looking for, because it's laid out in format that I think is very user-friendly.

Colleen: I think that that Table of Content that, in the very beginning that people really, to look. You know, where would this be? Is there one or two logical places where this would be? But I think also, we got that search function that can also be a second check.

Alana: Yep. So, we also have a timetables document on the "Presenting the Standards" page, that talks about not just what what part of the law becomes effective, but we've gone through the whole rule and found, in the talk about 45 days or the 30 days, the different timeframes that happen in Head Start. So you can get a sense of the newer requirements around the timeframes. So, we really hope you find these helpful. We know our people have.

Ann: Great. So, why don't we move on. I know we have a lot to cover today. And I'm going to start out with our Program Governance. And my colleague Kate Troy is going to take part in this presentation with me. So, I'm going to begin. And, as you can see – Can we have the next slide please? The program at 1301 outlines the requirements for Program Governance and it's organized into six sections. And again, as Colleen reiterated, our goal today is to provide really a high-level overview of the requirements in these six sections, and address some of the questions that have come in in advance of today's webinar.

If you go to the first section, Purpose 1301.1, if we could flip to the next – Thank you. Really, the Purpose requires agencies to establish a formal governance structure where the governing body and the Policy Council have distinct roles. We've listened to the field's comments in the NPRM, and we restored the requirements that the programs must have a parent committee as part of the formal governance structure. We want to reiterate parents are and have always been foundational for Head Start. And, we never intended to minimize that with our NPRM proposal not to require parent committees. We have restored them in the final rule, and we will discuss, Kate will discuss that a little more shortly. In section 1301.2, this really aligns with the Act.

And, many of you will note that the Governance section in the Head Start Performance Standards seems really small. It's only a couple of pages. And that's because we chose not to reiterate the Act, but frequently site the Act in the regulatory text. So, this section cannot be read in isolation. This section must be read in content with the Head Start Act in hand. Advisory committees, similar to the NPRM, we just the governing body's discretion establish advisory committees. The rationale for this language in the final rule is that we had received request requiring vacation from advisory committees from the field. Note the language in the final rule is simplified from the language in the NPRM because comments thought that our proposal in the NPRM was overly prescriptive. There are two things to highlight about

advisory committees. They can be established on a range of topics. Like mental health, services for – mental health services for children, audit fiscal issues. But the focus of this section – and this is important – are those advisory committees, the governing bodies establishes to oversee key board responsibilities. That is the only thing that this speaks to. The only other advisory committee that is required is the health advisory committee. And what we want to say is that any other advisory committee that a program chooses to have, they are not bound by this, by these requirements. So in establishing this advisory committee, again, we are talking about one that is directly connecting to the governing body, to oversee key responsibilities, the rule just requires that the governing body notify the responsible HHS official. And in the Regions, that would be your program specialist.

And you're notifying them not for permission, but for just informing them of your intent to establish this advisory committee. It does not require approval, it just requires notification. But also note, that the governing body must always maintain its legal and fiduciary responsibility. They can never delegate those, although, we know for many agencies, these advisory committees to the board will be extraordinary helpful, just with the whole workload. The other thing that's important, both in the governing body, and you'll see this also referenced in the Policy Council regs, is that the cross reference to the use of data, and it's in 1302.102. Again, I would ask folks to take a look at exactly what it says under 1302.102. But we added this responsibility for the governing bodies because we understand how important data is for both the Policy Council and the board to conduct its responsibilities. The rule requires that these entities use the results of ongoing monitoring, data on school readiness goals, and the data included in 1302.102, which is the section that outlines the requirements of achieving program goals.

This is not your typical credit card reports, food nutrition reports. This is data that programs would be collecting ongoing, analyzing, and making it useful, presenting it to the board in a useful fashion so the board can, again, fulfill its responsibilities. When we talk about in the, in the Act, I also, with two words, informed and engaged boards. And I think a board cannot be informed or engaged unless it's using its data. So let's, we did get a question on advisory committees. We have received lots of questions about the scope of what governing bodies can delegate to advisory committees, and what are the additional guidance will be provided. First, as I just mentioned, governing bodies must retain legal and fiscal responsibility for programs. But the list of responsibility, it can be delegated in broad. The final responsibility rests with the governing body. Second, we see advisory committees as an area where we can have additional guidance to support grantees. But we are not going to be prescriptive. This is really something that grantees need to sit back, make a determination. Is this an option that we would want it, to exercise? And if it is, what are the responsibilities that we would want to delegate? And again, this I think underscores the flexibility that grantees have which I think is pervasive throughout these requirements. We also, a few questions – And again. How often do we have to give the board information?

Again, we're going to get, we're going to reflect back to the grantee. How large are you? What are the issues? What is your ongoing data that you are collecting? What is reasonable in terms of frequency? And again, this is something that gets to be answered. If you're going to have an informed board just think about what you would need to share with the board so the board is informed about the progress the children are making. What do you need to share with the board? If you had a strategic plan to improve facilities, how often would the board need to be involved? Again, we're not going to prescribe, but the, the frequency, and the amount, and the way it's presented, it's got to be usable, that is the

responsibility of the grantee. And Kate, if I am missing anything here, please interject. My other colleagues, also. Let's take a look at 1301.3. Let's go on to the next slide. Okay, there we are. I'm sorry. What did I just do? Oh, I'm sorry, we're into the, the Policy Council. I was just thinking this was the boards slide because these are similar. Thank you. So again, this is talking about the Policy Council and the policy committee.

Again, it aligns with the Head Start Act. That's why I was thinking that we were looking at the board slide. Section 1301.3 basically aligns with the Act's requirements for composition, duties, and responsibilities, and conflict of interests. The use of data is exactly what I just described for the board. And sometimes the board, again, we know that the Policy Council is meeting, most of them is meeting every month. I would start out with the question is, what, why would the Policy Council need to meet on a monthly basis. A lot of information that needs to be, again, shared with the Policy Council in a usable form. One thing that is new in terms of service for the Policy Council and the policy committee, is we propose in the NPRM, the final rule allows Policy Council and policy committee the option of establishing in their bylaws that members can serve five one-year terms. Which is up from three one-year terms in the previous Performance Standards. What I think is important is members, to remember, it's not a five-year, you're elected to a five-year term. Members must stand up for re-election every year. And again, people said, "How come you made that change?" Well, I think, one it's something that the field has asked for.

But I think when you think about it gives us, gives you flexibility now to align with the birth-to-five approach. And the five-year grant cycle. It supports continuity and increases the understanding of the complexities of Head Start program and regulation. And again, we did receive overwhelmingly positive comments about this during the NPRM process. The last thing I want to touch upon is the issue of reimbursement. We added low income in the final rule to clarify that programs may reimburse for reasonable expenses if necessary to ensure that low-income members can fully participate in the Policy Council or policy committee. And again, low income members is the not the same as the income-poverty guidelines. It is the grantee's responsibility to determine what low income means within their community. And we have a couple of questions on the roles of the Policy Council. And again, the first one, the role of the Policy Council in approving, and hiring, and termination. Again, we want to reference using section 642(c)(2)(D) in the Head Start Act for direction. The Policy Council shall approve and submit its decisions on personnel matters to the governing body. In turn, the governing body must take into consideration the decision of the Policy Council before making final determination. Operationally, we encourage programs to specify the role of the Policy Council. And again, we encourage programs, we are not requiring, but we are encouraging programs to specify the role of the Policy Council in the hiring and termination of program staff in their personnel policies and procedures.

Again, in the Act, for both the Policy Council and the board, it talks about the, that they must review and approve the pol – the personnel policy and procedures which cover the hiring and termination. So we cannot stress how much, how important it is that those two, the Policy Council and the governing body really are thoughtful, and review and approval. That's what the role of the Policy Council is going to be defined in those policies and procedures. And again, people say, well, "Is the Policy Council reduced to an advisory?" And we're saying no. The Policy Council has an important role. Again, we, when you look at the words of the Act, the Policy Council shall approve and submit to the policy, to the board its decision about a range of activities. And aligning with the Act, the final rule maintains the role for the Policy Council. Also, the Act, requires impasse procedures. And we really think, these procedures

wouldn't be necessary for Policy Council were solely in advisory nature. And yes, someone asked, "Is Policy Council, committee still required?" And this is where we're going to say, "Read the regulation." Absolutely. This requirement is noted in both sections 1301.1 and 1301.3(a) in the final rule. And someone asked also: "Can we start, begin our process of electing parents, Policy Council members with the frame of the five-year, new five year one-term, or do we have to wait until November?" You can absolutely, positively start the process now. So I think, does that take us, Kate, to parent committees.

Kate Troy: That's right. Thank you, Ann. So I will pick up 1301.4, which discusses the requirements for parent committees. So, we received many, many comments objecting to our NPRM proposal to no longer require parent committees. And the majority of commenters really supported the restoring the requirement, and said very articulately the many benefits of parent committees, and reiterated our long-haul view that parents are our cornerstone of Head Start. So, I think the key take away with 1301.4 is to, really, we restored the requirement. It has to be the same as it is in the previous Performance Standard. We did make a few additions in response to themes that came through very clearly in comments. So the first thing is that programs must ensure that parents of currently enrolled children understand the process of election to both Policy Council and policy committee, and other leadership opportunities. And, similar to the previous Performance Standards, we really outlined minimum requirements for the parent committee.

So, we also in the final rule are explicitly supporting program's flexibility to determine the best methods to engage families using strategies that are most effective in their communities. And we also changed one of them in the requirements to require that parent committees have a process for communication with the Policy Council or policy committee, which was something we heard about frequently in the comments. Great. The next, the next section is 1301.5. 1301 – yeah – .5 on training. So the training requirement is another critical piece of ensuring governing bodies, advisory committee members, and Policy Councils really have the tools and information they need to carry out their responsibilities effectively.

The final rule requires agencies provide training for the governing body advisory committee members, and the Policy Council, including training specifically on the Performance Standards. And the reason for that is we think it's so critical these different groups have an understanding of broader program requirements. And the other thing I just want to draw your attention to is this is another area where we cross reference another section of this, of the Performance Standards. You'll see this. There's no 2.12(m), which is related to eligibility determination. So, in that section of the final rule, there are some requirements around training related to eligibility. So by cross-referencing, we're just picking up that those training requirements, and making sure that they are noted in the training of the governing body, Policy Council, and advisory committee members. So we did a question, again, folks are interested in knowing what frequency they need to do things. And so, we did get another question related to the frequency of training. How often do programs need to train governing body, advisory committee members, and Policy Council?

So, in 1301.5, which is where the training requirements are, it does not specify a frequency. It really requires that the agency provide appropriate training and technical assistance, or orientation to ensure members understand the information they receive and participate in the programs and the Head Start agency. So programs would really have to determine frequency that enabled the board, the Policy Council, and the advisory committee members to meet this requirement. But I do want to note the

inclusion of taking the 2.12(m), which is eligibility determination training, the cross reference, that does specify a timeframe. So the governing body and Policy Council members must be trained on the eligibility requirements within 180 days of the beginning of the term of a new governing body or Policy Council. So, while the broader training on the Performance Standards does not specify a timeframe, the cross-reference to the eligibility requirements do. So, I just wanted to note, note that one. The last section of 1301.6 on the impasse procedures. The final rule requires that each agency, governing body, and Policy Council jointly must establish written procedures for resolving internal disputes that include impasse procedures.

So, you will notice that the final rule really differs significantly from the proposal in the NPRM. This is another area, like parent committees, where we received many comments about the proposed impasse procedures. Many of which stressed that we had to really minimize our lower tents by giving the governing body the final decision, which in term makes the Policy Council more advisory. And that's certainly not our intent. And in response to comments, we have established impasse procedures that are much more balanced between the governing bodies and the Policy Council. And we also incorporated suggestions we heard during the comment process for mediation and arbitration.

The Standards require the use of a third-party mediator, of a mutually agreed-upon third-party mediator, and if the impasse persists, an arbitrator to assist should the decision-making agency should not result in resolution. And if the impasse procedures include an arbitrator, then note that the arbitrator's decision does stand and it is final. So the other thing that I just wanted to touch upon in the impasse procedures is that the impasse procedures allow for programs to use decision-making processes that have worked for them.

We figure quite a bit in the comments from grantees that said, you know, "We had impasse procedures that really work for us. We've, you know, they've been tested a couple of times on different issues, and they are really successful for us." So, wanted to mention that the procedures listed here in the final rule are not intended to supersede what's working for grantees, but our intent was really to build out these procedures, and include next steps to an agency decision-making process not resulting in a resolution. So many of you may not, may have to make very minor changes to your existing impasse procedures. But, our intent was not to, kind of, overrule the thing that you already had in place, but rather build them out, and add some back stop to breakdown. So we thought, we just wanted to highlight one last question.

Ann: We received a question about whether grantees would be in compliance if they maintained their formal governance as were required by the formal regulations. And in fact, I think they used this term, shared governance. Right? And, we didn't want to shy away from the question. But as asked, it's really too tricky to answer this question, I suppose. You know, in part, we really have no way of knowing whether this grantee has personnel policy and procedures that cover what is required in the Act, and that they have been approved, reviewed and approved by the board and PC, and aligned with the Head Start Act. And having said that, we want to emphasize that since 2007, grantees have had the flexibility in determining their governance structure, complicit with the Head Start Act. And although the previous Performance Standards do not apply, that is not to say that a grantee could not have a governance structure that is more reflective of the old way, so one that is consistent with the Head Start Act in Part 1301. And I don't know if, Colleen, you want to expound on that more? Because I know that we have been consistently trying to answer now for probably a couple of months.

Colleen: Yeah. I mean, I think that's right. That I think, I think we understand that it's confusing. you know, that the old regulation were still, kind of, in the volumes that people had. And so, if you people, some people, we're assuming they were in place until something replaced the system. But I think the Act, when it was passed in 2007, was not in the Act before, was very explicit, you know, the roles and responsibilities of the governing body, and this is the role ad responsibilities of the Policy Council, and the policy committee at the delegate level. And so, while, you know, it will take them a while to redo the whole full body of regulations to align with that, it is true that those changes were made based on the fact that the Act the always trumps regulation. So, those are, or the definitive word on it, that a law passed by Congress is always a higher authority than a regulatory passed by the Executive Branch.

Ann: And I think, really, since working since 2007, we've seen lots of variations across programs, where some are more reflective of the old way, and some are very different, and much more effective [Inaudible] and probably that the Policy Council has less of a role in every step of the processes. But it's worked. So, I think this is good to have the flexibility, and we hope, we hope programs embrace it. But again, the policy and procedures, and the review and approval process are really critical.

Colleen: And the clear, like you said, clear that, that in that procedures that we strengthened here, that this is not in any way making it advisable [Inaudible] you couldn't come to an impasse, you wouldn't have to go to mediation and arbitration. And I think that the question about flexibility also makes me think – I know we've gotten some questions in governance and other things saying, "Can a member be on a Policy Council and on a parent committee? And could they be in both, both entities? And I think, kind of as we really talked about in the beginning, that really to read the Standards and to reflect it, and say, "We're really purposefully trying to give programs more flexibility across the full set of standards." If the Standards don't say you can't, then programs can establish their own policies and procedures around that. Do you think that's a fair thing to say? Like, to read it, just if it isn't in there, then there's no federal rule around it. And programs should determine what makes sense in their community, in their program. We, you know, we say from the beginning, we talk about, we thought about maybe giving the flexibility to say parent committees were complete choice for programs, or not at all.

And we heard loudly from the community that was super important to be, kind of, the way people first enter, and that we really have it at every local, local level, and that was really important. And so we said yes. We're not giving that flexibility. We're saying, you have to have parent committees. They have to do certain, do certain roles and responsibilities. But beyond what is in the regulation, and in the law, programs need to, can have the flexibility to figure out what works for them.

Ann: Can I just make one other point. Because it's interesting that in a couple of questions about, because of flexibility, how often do I have to show the data with the Policy Council or the board? How often do I have to have training? And I think that there is a distinction between what programs need to think about during the implementation of the these regulation, versus what is appropriate frequency for ongoing. Kind of think of, you know, the board and now that I have to absorb and understand there are much more information than they ever got before, and much more different kind, different subtle kind of information, a lot around child outcomes. Well, maybe the board is going to need to talk about it a lot before they can really understand it, and maybe it's going to require more training in the upfront than it will on ongoing places. So I do think when we answer these questions about frequency, and we say there's flexibility. There is. But, people also need to, you know, [Inaudible] particularly, need to think about during this implementation phase, what is the training, and the support, and the frequency that



staff, parents, and Policy Council, and board are going to need to fully become immersed in the Standards.

Kate: I think that's right, and I think that it goes to people really thinking about in their program and at this time, at this point in the year, at this point in orientation, what do they need to do in order to build those roles and responsibilities. But I think another question, not one hire for this one, but come in, that has said, you know, is there still a standard around that we have to meet, that our Policy Council has to meet nine times. And you know, when there's not, and our Standards now, there actually never was, and before either. But I think a lot, I think this is a great opportunity for programs with the, with the fore vision of the Standards to take a look at what they're doing. I think many times, and all of us [Inaudible] the things you do because that's the way they've been done last year and the year before, people begin to believe that is the way they have to do them, either because it's in their program's policy and procedures, or they believe that it is the federal regulation, you know, or somewhere else that it is coming from, and I think it gives people a fresh look to say these are things that are being required from the federal level, and let's look exactly at how we're doing things, and make sure that meeting nine times, is meeting the needs of the program to be able to do their job. That's great. If it needs to be more frequently or less frequently at certain times, that is what the programs can, can figure out, and, and determine.

Ann: Thanks. Important. I think you're going to pick up on –

Colleen: Education! That's right. Okay. So, we're going to go to the, to the next slide, because we're going to talk about education and child development. This is Colleen Rathgeb and Beth Meloy, also from the policy shop is here with me to talk about this section. We're really excited about how the new education section, we think really does really nice job of laying out what we know from research. What we know from best practices in programs. What really a high-quality early learning environment, birth-to-five classroom settings, hope to, family child care, home-based settings, what we, we what really needs to be happening to support the incredibly important work of children's development and early learning just exploding from, in this period of time.

So, I just want to walk you through the structure. And again, Ann, kind of just putting a plug in for the Table of Content, when you look at the Standards online and, and in hard copies that hopefully will be, we'll be getting out more to programs. We think it's just nice way to frame it, to look at the organization, and to see that everything is in there. So, we want to just, we start the Education and Child Development Program Services section with laying out what the purpose of these section is. So really talking about providing high-quality education and child development services for all children that really imbed in responsive and effective teacher-child interactions, or for home-based programs, to promote secure family-child relationships, and to help parents provide that high-quality interaction, talking about everything, really is a nice articulation of the purpose of what we are doing in high-quality education programs.

The next section and to get, we're going to start saying the numbers to get people used to the numbers. So that's 1302.30 is the Purpose. 1302.31 is the Teaching and Learning Environment. And in this section, we're going to walk through the Standards, general education, and then also like Kate and Ann did, take some questions that were provide before the webinar. in some of the areas. And we particular got most questions around curricula, training and assessment, and dual language learners. And so, a lot of the questions will be on that, but the teaching and learning environment also really important, that we have

four main sections in, in the Teaching and the Learning Environment. We're talking about effective teaching practices, how, you know, nurturing and responsive high-quality interactions the going on, the effective teaching aligned with the Framework. We're going to talk more about that. Talking up the learning environments. So, how well organized learning environments have developmental schedules and lessons plans, indoor and outdoor experiences. You know, allowing lots of opportunities for choice and play, and exploration, and experimentation. Really, really important. And how the material and space for learning are developmentally appropriate, have lots of physical space, materials that are changed intentionally and periodically as support kids' interest, and their development and learning. And then, in the last section here in the Teaching and Learning Environment, we're talking about really the important routines that go on in classrooms, and have all their opportunities for learning.

So, an intentional, age-appropriate approach to accommodating children's need to rest and nap, how meals and snack times are really used to support development and learning. So this is change that people can use to see the, looking the meals, and the mealtime and nutrition, but we really think it's important it is moved into the Teaching and the Learning Environment where the meals are opportunities, as folks know, for, for, important development and supporting teaching, supporting high-quality teaching and child, staff-child interaction, and communication, and really important. Same thing with routines. This infant and toddlers, incredibly important that also opportunities for, for lots of high-quality interactions going on in the routines in the classroom.

And taking the, with everything that we've learned over the years from I Am Moving, I Am Learning, talking about how we, physical activity is so important to be, to learning and integrating movement and physical activity into the curriculum activities. And so, that's really laying out everything that is super important about the teaching and learning environment. And I'm not going to get into, fill in the sections as much now. But then we walk into curriculum. We've talked about curriculum more as we move on, and then the next section is how you use child screening and assessment, and how these are all connected. The teaching, the interactions, the curricula, the screening and assessment are all integrated to really build that high-quality classroom that is intentional, but individualized. And then, how professional development really informs and supports teachers in all of that work. The next section in Education and Child Development is specifically around how we engage parents and families in education and development services. And folks know there's another section, another subpart specifically on family engagement, but this is really about how we are engaging families in the education services themselves, in the classroom or the home-based setting. And then, the final section, 1302.35, that is about, explicitly addressing education and home-based programs. And this is specifically that we really didn't have in a clear way, articulated in the former Standards.

And so, we think this is really taking what we, what we, we've been talking about in TA, and really have been doing but lays it out clearer in, in one place. And so, it's about the design of the home-based programs, the home-visit experiences themselves, what goes on, and the home-based curriculum, as well, food socialization in the home-based. And then, the last section in education that we're also really excited about this, here in the final rule is 1302.36, which is laying out around how American and Alaska Native programs may integrate efforts to preserve, or revitalize, restore Tribal languages. This can include actual immersion in some cases. And so, we think that this is a building on the strengths of what many say and programs have done, but making it very clear that this is something that we think is, is a, is a, can be a really positive approach to education. So, that is the, kind of, laying out, orienting you to the

structure, what's in there. I'm going to turn it over to Beth to start talking about the key themes. in education around our birth-to-five approach.

Beth Meloy: Sure. And that was a lot of information, and Colleen, we're going to spend a little bit more time on this slide, as well, and then we'll be addressing the questions, and going over some of more particulars around curricula, and screening, and assessments, and some of the other areas we got some questions in advance of the webinar on. So, we just wanted to cover a couple of key themes globally in the Education and Child Development section. One of which that we're actually quite proud of is a new focus on a birth-to-five, birth-to-five approach. So, folks who are comfortable with our previous, or Performance Standards know that the Performance Standards really started at being focused on Head Start, and the education standards were like that, as well.

And when we layered Early Head Start on, it ended up being a little bit piecemeal and not always clear what applied to preschoolers, what applied to infants and toddlers, and what applied to both. And so, we really took the opportunity with this overhaul and expansion of the education section to be really clear that, we really see education as being a birth-to-five, and that almost all of the requirements that you'll see are applicable to these infants and toddlers, and preschoolers. And when it's necessary to differentiate for developmental reasons between the two, we do that explicitly in the Standards now. In addition, in terms of our birth-to-five approach, one of the ways that we've really integrated that is that two years ago now, we were able to revise our Early Learning Outcomes Framework. That also used to be focused solely on preschool, and it now encompasses the entire birth-to-five age range.

And, what we've done is we've very intentionally linked many of our requirements related to your curriculum, your assessments, your school readiness goals are all linked to the birth-to-five Early Learning Outcomes Framework. And we really relying on those requirements to bring that Framework to life in the classroom, and really help us focus on accomplishing our learning environments that are content-rich, and provide adequate, really rich and in depth learning experiences, in all of the domains in the Framework for children and all the way from birth-to-five. So, Colleen, you want to talk about some of the other key themes?

Colleen: Yeah. So, we're going to talk about a little bit about curriculum, and then a little bit more as we answer some questions. But, we know programs have [Inaudible] 2007 that have been requirements around research-based curriculum. But we're building on that in these standards. So, we do continue to have, need to have curriculum that are based on facts, and through valid research, that they are aligned with the Early Learning Outcomes Framework, which very exciting, our birth-to-five Early Learning Outcomes Framework is being built throughout the education section, how intertwined that is, and clearly is in assessments. But we also are saying that those curriculum need to be content-rich enough. It needs to be enough content in those curriculums that they really would be able to promote measurable progress on those areas in the Framework.

And, that they have what we call the developmental scope and sequence. So, there not a random set of activities put together, but they follow a trajectory of how children learn skills and they build on those skills. We know all children learn at different rates and different ways. But, that there's a lot that we can learn about how things build on each other and make sure that is imbedded in our curriculum so that there is the, the real support for children, and that, that the programs really support effectively implementing these curriculum to make sure these are implemented we call it with fidelity. So, we'll talk more about what that means. But, but making sure that they're really being implemented in the

classroom as the way they are intended to. So, we don't want is the curriculum that sits on a shelf, and people really don't know how to make it alive and in the classrooms. And so, really think the curriculum is important. We also think the assessment system is incredibly important and has to be linked. So, how we're making sure that the assessments that we all use, and we know teachers spend a lot of time doing assessments, to make sure that the tool is providing useful information to be able to individualize for kids, and that it's really informing the whole process, and it is linking with this, the curriculum, the assessment to be able to individualize that curriculum, and really delivering it through effective teaching practices. So, we talked a little bit about that on the last slide about all of the effective teaching practices, and the things that go on in in the learning environment, and how that these three pieces, all really build together [Inaudible] from the effective teaching, on the assessments systems. That they work together to support the highest quality education that we can provide in our center-based program. And –

Beth: And then, we also have a section, and Colleen covers this fairly extensively on the last slide, but, around parent and family engagement, and child development and education. And this reflecting in addition to the family engagement services provided and described in the family engagement section that, family engagement really is everyone's business, and so we want, wanted to be clear about family engagement both related to education and child development, here, as well as related to our health program services in the health section. We also are incorporated throughout this section, and throughout the Standards what we're calling a strength-based approach to serving dual language learners. And generally, as always, culturally and linguistically responsive processes, we're going to cover some in a lot more detail at the end of the presentation today. We also throughout tis session and the Standards are supporting the full inclusion of and support for children with disabilities, and children with delays. So that is an addition that, although we've always done individualized services for all of our children, that may strike some folks as new, and that Colleen is going to cover in a little more detail, as well. Colleen?

Colleen: Yes. So, I mentioned when we were doing the overview the structure that we have a section that is explicitly laid out the requirement for home-based program. And so, this is in 1302.35, and it is really about the quality and the experience of what goes on in the home visits. As folks are getting used to the, the structure of the Standards yet, you'll remember that in programs structure, so in 13 – in Subpart B of the regulation, Program Structure, we have a section on home-based, the home-based option. 1302.22. And that really lays out things like, "What's the number of visits we need? What's the hour, the length?" It has to be an hour and half. They have to provide this many, this many home visits over the period of the year. This many group socializations. It's really about the, the structure. This is really an education about what's going on in that home visits that supporting the children's education. Folks know families in home-based programs get the same health services, the same family engagement services as every other option. But obviously, the education is provided in a really different way than in what is provided in center-based.

The education provided to rule those home visits, supporting the parents' ability to support their child's learning and development. And so, here in the Education we lay out that they, that they must ensure that all this are, used information from ongoing assessments, that they are able to reflect the critical role of parents in children's early learning and development, that they have sufficient time for all enrolled children. We've gotten a question sometimes. If you have two children that are in the home-based option, do you have to provide 90 minutes for both of them, or is the 90 minutes that's required

in program structure enough for both. What we say here is, you have to ensure there's sufficient time to support all of the enrolled children. Well, it might be looking very different if you have two children, and that are close to the same age, versus you have a baby and a preschooler. So, programs really need to visit, again, is again the quality that's going on. So what are you, what are the experiences that happen in the home visits, and then what about the home-based curriculum, and so, we make it very clear that the home-based, the home-based curriculum also has to be researched-based, and really needs to be about promoting the parents role around, aligned with the Framework, as well. So that it is able to really support that role. And then, finally, talking about the group socializations, and what needs to happen from a quality perspective in those socializations.

So let us kind of, keeping , like to highlight in the Education and Child Development section is throughout the standard, it's really about how do we, how is the program need to support the education staff to be able to deliver these high-quality services. So we want to make sure that the professional development that's being offered is really linked with the curriculum, and the assessment systems to promote those effective practices of, for example. But we're really, we're looking, again, around – we're going to talk a little bit about this – implementing fidelity. That's it about how the teachers, we make sure, our teachers get the training on the curriculum. And then, the supervision and support come so that's going on in the classroom. We really want to make sure, and we talk a lot about family engagement being everybody's business, we want to be very clear in this. We wouldn't want to see this Education section as you hand it to teachers, and this is what they are supposed to do. It's really about how the program is able to support this high-quality learning environment, and that, that are so critical of the business that we do.

Ann: Instead, I was thinking in how important it is that the board and Policy Council understands these things are critical to that quality, the quality of services.

Beth: You're absolutely right. So, if we go ahead and move on to the next slide. We are going to just like Ann and Kate did, we got some questions in advance, and we want to walk through some of the specifics around the Standards related to those questions. So, just going to read off the questions that we received. So, we've received questions around what are the curriculum means, compared with specifically with what a curriculum enhancement might mean. So, thinking about what we mean by comprehensive curriculum. What we mean by curriculum enhancement, and those requirements that both of those need to meet. Also, how does that – How does that interact with the requirement around, around what you have to do if you're significantly adapting a curriculum, which is the requirement in 1302.32(b)? And, we're going to talk a little bit about that.

And also again, what do we mean by curriculum fidelity? How is the program going to go about implementing that requirement to make sure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity? And then, finally, the concern that we've gotten with the home-based curriculum, as Colleen said, this is the first time that we've put into regulation, education requirements for home-based programs. And that does include a requirement that you implement a home-based curriculum for children in Early Head Start and in Head Start. And so, we're going to talk about that, and a little bit about how you might find some resources. So, moving now to the next slide, Colleen is going to walk us through some of that information.

Colleen: We want to just again remind people, kind of, what these a little bit, we just talked about the curriculum, so we're not going to get in too much. But again we've got, you know, it's really important

thing. We want to make sure that we're always remembering about curriculum, that it's comprehensive, that it's content-based, that it's researched-based, and that it follows the scope and sequence, linguistically, and cultural and developmentally appropriate. All of these things are incredibly important. It's aligned with the Framework. And then, we have this new, the new language around that the curriculum, the – When I say exactly how we say it in here. It's always like, it's always remind people that, that – go back and look at the standard. But they, the programs must monitor the curriculum, implementation and fidelity. So what does fidelity mean? Fidelity means, basically, how true, the trueness with which the curriculum is implemented, or how much the curriculum – If you, it see in the classroom, it's being implemented the way the designer of the curriculum meant it to be implemented. And so, it certainly requires that people get training on the, on the curriculum. And that's explicit in the standard.

What we don't want to get into this idea that you buy your curriculum, it's on your shelf. But what's actually going on in your classroom, if someone knew that curriculum well, or if someone designed that, had signed this is, is why it's researched-based, and this is why it's content-rich, and this is all the things that – it's not actually being what you're experiencing. So, you really want the kids to be actually experiencing the curriculum as it was intended. And so, that is what fidelity of, of, of curriculum [Inaudible] mean. There are some curriculum that have what they call it, whether fidelity checklist, or a fidelity kit, that someone can go and use it to say, "Am I seeing these things that are critical to parts of the curriculum?"

That is a way that programs could do it. It is not necessary. So, it is not in our requirements that you use a tool for that. We do have a requirement that the curriculum have set training. That it needs, and training procedures that will support that implementation. That's critical to getting to that fidelity. That the teachers have the training about how to do it. But there's other ways. You could observe, there could be observations, to see that what's going on equates with what the Ed manager, or [Inaudible] specialist knows what should be going on with that curriculum. So, that what's we really want to make sure that it's not just an exercise in find the curriculum, or paperwork, but it really and truly reflects what children are experiencing in those classrooms.

But also, there's a question that Beth had asked about, that folks have ask, and Beth has outlined, around the difference between – We talked about s curriculum, like the regular curriculum. And then we talked about some enhancements, and curricula adaptations. So, many programs already use and may find very useful to use, what again, are called curriculum enhancement. So you may have a base curriculum, a base comprehensive curriculum that you've been assessing your school readiness goals over the last number of years, and seeing, your children are really having difficulties in math. And so, they're really not making the progress until you would like to see in math. And so, maybe you say, the curriculum that you use, it doesn't have enough math activities. It doesn't go deep enough in some of the areas that are in the Framework. You're checking and you're seeing what's in the Framework and seeing what's in your curriculum, and it's really not, it's not strong enough.

And so, you may just add an enhancement to your base curriculum that is focused on math, or is focused on science, or focused more on literacy, or social-emotional development. So, you're taking an add-on to a curriculum, and that is something that is absolutely allowable in the new Standards. It may be a really important thing for programs to consider if they are ways to meet the new requirements around the content-rich, and making sure that we will be able to make progress in all of the domains in

the Early Learning Outcomes Framework. That they may want to do that. And there are no additional requirements if you do that. That is something that programs can do. If however, programs really want to do what we're calling course adaptation, so they really want to make major changes to a curriculum, because they think to meet the illicit needs of their children, or for cultural relevance that they really want to really change a curriculum to meet their local needs, we are then do have a requirement that kicks in, in 1302.32 Curricula, the last section 1302.32(b) which is called Adaptation. And, if a program really says, "There isn't a curriculum that really works for my population, either with enhancements. I really want to make major changes. Then, they need to use an outside education content, or curriculum expert to make those changes. So, it is allowable. We're not saying you have to use, of course the available curriculum. But if you're going to make adaptations really specific adaptations, then you need to do that with an outside early childhood curriculum or content area expert to develop that.

Beth: And I think, Colleen, this is actually a perfect place to address a question around home-based curriculum. So, we've gotten a lot of questions that indicate that in the some home-based program, or perhaps more commonly in preschool home-based programs, where folks are only offering a small portion of their enrollment as home-based services, that folks have been working to implement their center-based curriculum, and adapt it themselves for home-based. And, that is something that we're saying explicitly is not allowed anymore. Right? So, requirements in the home-based education section really, very clearly states that you need to be implementing a home-based curriculum. There are research-based home-based curricula available for infants and toddlers, and for preschoolers. And we are, we have, we do realize that we have lots of resources around center-based curricula, and that we are going to be looking to working on similar resources for home-based. But, just to highlight those absolutely are available, that many programs are already implementing those, and that definitely is the process that we want to see in our home-based programs.

Colleen: And to really, I mean, just to think how fundamentally different is if the goal is you're really home-based is really about how you teaching, working with parents in developing their skills around how they can support their child is really, it's not, very different then, you know, an hour and a half where you are trying to smush in a classroom experience for the child. That's obviously not [Inaudible]

Beth: Right. We really are trying to support the parents' ability to support the child's progress, and that, that areas, the domains of the Framework, as opposed to the teacher directly providing those, those learning activities and scaffolding that development in the classroom. So, the next set of questions, was – So, we got some more questions related more explicitly to screening and assessment, and to children with disabilities or delays, and I'm just going to, again, cover these questions. So, we got questions about the 45 days of enrollment for screening, that they must be conducted or paved within that. And just trying to understand whether or not obtaining a record within 45 days – how, sort of, old or, shall I say to reflect the Standards current is that screening needs to be. So, we're going to address that. We also got questions about what it means to conduct assessments with sufficient frequency. The Standards say that it must be conducted with sufficient frequency to allow for individualization within the program year. So, we're going to discuss that a little more in depth, as well. And then, we also got a questions about what we can do to best serve children with delays who are not eligible for IDEA. And we do have, we're requesting that there are some requirements in the Standards around serving those children, and then asking how we do we meet this requirement while balancing other expectations and limited funds. And we're going to do, discuss that in a little bit, as well. So Colleen, do you want to –

Colleen: Sure, to go on to the next slide. In the screening, in just to keep [Inaudible] the Standards. 1302.33 is the Child Screening and Assessment section. So, screening is here for the developmental, motor, language, cognitive screening. So, the health-vision screening is in the health section. So this is now the screening in – here. As folks will say very quickly, the screenings have to be valid a reliable. They need to be obtained, conducted or obtained, or in within 45 days. And, the purpose of them, want to make sure people are clear, the purpose of screening versus the purpose of assessment. The purpose of screening is to determine that there is need for evaluation. If the child should be referred for further evaluation because there may be a delay that requires further intervention.

Beth: So, the screenings are really a snapshot in time to identify potential concerns, and then lift those children up for evaluation.

Colleen: Exactly right. And, as Beth said, the, the, [Inaudible] does say that they need to be completed or obtained, a current screening within 45 days. So, would most programs conduct their own screenings? It is not a, you know, huge lift. You have [Inaudible] teachers can be trained for them. There is the the possibility that you could, a child could already have a screening, already had a valid, reliable screening that a program can use to determine if they need evaluation. And if, that is standard language that we had before, that they could obtain them, but it does have to be current. If you had a child that had a behavioral screening, a developmental screening conducted, and it was a two-year-old, and it was conducted six months ago, that's not current. So, that, we are not saying it has to be the day before they enroll. But again, programs need to make a determination, or based on the age of the child, based on the, the, how current that is, if they should do screening themselves as opposed to relying on something they have obtained. And so again, it's about, so on the programs, we make sure it's valid and reliable. Like, it's not just a checkmark the doctor said they did that. You absolutely need this screening, you need the information from it to determine also if there's need to evaluation. So, we think in most cases, most programs will continue to conduct their own screenings within the 45 days.

Beth: And I think there's one more thing to highlight here that we've heard from some other sources, as well, is that we do require that you get that screening, even if the child has IFSP, or an IEP. And that was very intentional on our part because while a child might have an IFSP, and have an identified, let's say a speech delay, for example. If that, if the child hasn't had a current screening, they may not have been able to identify that the child may now be experiencing fine motor delays. So, we really think that it's important to have that full screening, sort of, regardless of whether or not the child already has an ISFC or an IEP, so that the child can, we can ensure that the child's services are up to date, and that they're getting the certain services that they need.

Colleen: And that's another example of where we got really valuable input from the field, and the MPRM, and final rule to the process. We had proposed in the MPRM that you wouldn't in those cases need to do the screening again. And we thought that, again, was flexibility that would be appreciated by programs, and we heard from many, many disability managers, from program staff that you really didn't want to do that because of just what Beth had raised. That it could be, you could lose a delay in another area, and again, because of this is not an overly burdensome testing of children, or an overly burdensome use of tax, teaching time, that that, it would be better to air on the side of screening again. So again, where we heard from the experts in the field, that really helped us with a stronger final rule. The next slide talks about assessment, which is different than screening. Still needs to be valid an reliable, and needs to be standardized. By standardized, we do not mean that that needs to be direct. It



does not mean it needs to be a test. It is not the see thing as a standardized test, that skips that there are standard procedures. It's not just a teacher scribbling on their own notes, and not, without any, without any script, or standardization to it. It can absolutely, though, be observation. It can be, there are many systems, generalize systems that are observation-based that programs use, and those are still absolutely used, can be used. The data that is, has gotten through these assessments should be analyzed so teachers can better individualize for kids.

So know where kids are, they can look at, they can individualize, they can use it to assess progress, and they can also use it to see if maybe there's a need for evaluation. But again, only one of the purposes, as opposed to using an ongoing basis to make the learning environment and the learning activities that are targeted for kids. We only want to highlight what we talk about in the, in the final rule is that, it provides usable information for teachers, for home-visitors, for parents. We don't, we're not just collecting data, and document for the purposes of being able to say, "Well, we're documenting." We want it to be usable, we want it to be useful for teachers, and for education staff broadly. We also think it's incredibly important, and this is linked with the fact that we have had for some time now more requirements around how you aggregate that data, how programs aggregate that data, and analyze it for program improvement, and progress towards roles.

So, I think the one of the questions was, you know, you say we have to do this assessment with the – bring it back again. A little bit – use it with sufficient frequency to be able to be useful to the for program. And we have a question of what is sufficient frequency. Does that mean three times a year? Because of that, the requirements to aggregate and analyze the data three times a year. It does not mean three times a year. It does not mean, it means with sufficient frequency, to be able to provide the usable information for, for teaching, and individualizing. And so, programs need to determine for them, what is the sufficient frequency that the need to do. And so, it may be different whether you are using a direct, direct assessment as opposed to observation assessment. It will be different depending on how long your program is. If it's a year-long program versus a migrant program that is only open for a few months, or the, the age of the children that you are, the classroom is. So, I think we really want programs to think about, we have just, we're not going to give a greater level of prescription to programs, then they need to do to determine for their programs, for their tools, for their teachers, what is that, the frequency needed to be going on in their classrooms.

Beth: And then, just to pause here, again, there's not a slide to address this question. But, we did just want to revisit the question that we received around children with delays who are not eligible for IDEA. And this is something where folks will recall that in their previous Standards, there was a lot of requirements in the 1308, the old 1308 around, you know, Head Start really creating their own IEPs and IFFCs. That changed in the 2007 Act, where we're really now are relying fully on IDEA. At the same time, we do recognize that our country went through a fairly significant recession, and as result, some states moved the targets in terms of what qualifies children as having a disability and receiving services under IDEA. But we've gone in the Standards, which we have included some of requirements. We've always expressed that individualization would be happening for all children, including children who may have delays in one area or another.

We have included some specific requirements around what you need to do for a child who has a delay, who may not qualify for services under our IDEA. For example, the state has set that you must have two standard deviations delay in more than one area. The child has a two standard deviations away in one

area. We still want to see that child receiving services to the extent possible. What we say in the Standards is that programs should link with other potential resources, like Medicaid, and SCHIP, and other potential available resources, to try and access those services for children. We do also, again, that it state very clearly that those are allowable costs for Head Star funds. But we're not saying that the Head Start has to provide all of the services. Simply that they should be working to ensure that the child has the services that they need in order to fully participate and benefit in the programs.

Colleen: And that's really the balance that programs have to determine, and make it out on a case-by-case basis, about the child's need at a basic level, the, the requirements that we individualize for all children that are absolutely there, we do want folks to explore what other resources, particularly lining them where children do have this issue of a delay but not delayed enough to el – But we're also not saying that Head Start programs need to use their limited budgets to replace what IDEA had determined is not necessary in that space.

So, we want to both explore other options to figure out what is, what's truly necessary for that child to be able to support their school readiness. But we're not at the Head Start programs to, in all cases, kind of, fill the gap that is, is maybe there. I also want to just make sure the question around the sufficient frequency of assessments, and make sure that it is clear. So, because I think the requirement we've had in place for some time that we've talked about, but programs aggregate and analyze the data at least three times a year does mean there has to be data that can be aggregated at least three times year. But if a program is using an observation-based assessment, they may be doing that many more times than three times a year. And only roll it up at that point. Or if a program is only using direct assessment, they may say, "We still need to do it. We believe in order to instill our teachers with useful information, we need to do it a certain number of times."

But certainly, they have to have enough data that they can actually analyze and actually aggregate it, at least, three times a year. So, you would have to be doing it with sufficient, with the baseline of sufficient frequency is that you're having enough data to roll it up three times. But, it may be when ordered individualized in a classroom, and depending on the tool you're using it, that you're doing it, you're doing something more than that.

Ann: [Inaudible] wanted more towards the individual child, and how often you need to do the direct observations, or, and the other one is, if that information all of the frequently needs to be, needs to be available to – [Inaudible] make that distinction from me, not an education person per se, to understand the distinction that you're making between the child, the individual child and the program needs.

Colleen: And there may be problems that never use a direct observat – you know – a direct assessment. That they are only using observation-based assessments, and that is not again, still completely, as long as they can get enough information, that they can, again do the observation at least three times a year.

Beth: Okay. Next slide.

Colleen: So, we got a couple of questions that we'll wrap up today with around assessments, around dual language learners. So, we really are, we think we got a lot of good input through our programs, and experts, and research has really been moving around the importance around how dual language learners learn, and again, through the input we got from the MPRM, we can do even further strengthen. So, again, thank you to the whole field that really has helped this so much, and in this area. But, we've

gotten some questions about, particularly, what does the thing on assessing dual language learners really mean. Does it apply to Head Start and Early Head Start, or just one, and other resources? When I can learn more about supporting children. So I know, some programs are out on the cutting edge of what they do with dual language learners. Other programs have not had as much experience with dual language learners, and there may be a growing group of children in their programs. But, they are looking for help and resources, which is great. And so, Beth's going to talk a little bit about the assessment requirements themselves, and then resources that are available to help support.

Beth: Sure. So, next slide. To just, quick step back around dual language learners. We wanted to just discuss, just a little bit about our overall approach to strengthening services for children who are dual language learners in these new Standards. So, we really have intentionally incorporated recent research that is continued to highlight that taking a strength-based comprehensive approach to dual language learners is the best way to support their development. And, we've really made very clear, we want to be seen teaching practices in the classroom, and screening the assessment, and work with families that promote bilingualism and biliteracy as a strength. That children who are bilingual often have more cognitive flexibility, there's all kinds of research showing us that dual language learners really have a step up if we can support them in their development.

And so, we've included some requirements around the effective teaching practices that are differentiated for infants and toddlers. And for preschoolers, and for infants and toddlers to the extent possible that programs will be supporting both the home language, supporting the home language development for infants and toddlers, and providing experiences in English. And that in preschool settings, that the programs will be supporting both home language development and English language development. We also have requirements around the screening and assessment dual language learners, which we're going to get into more in depth in the next slide. And then we have what's called coordinated approach to serving dual language learners.

So, that is in Subpart J, the Program Management subpart of 1302. That's going to really look a lot, we'll get into this later, like the planned language approach that you may have seen in some of our TA resources. And it's really about looking at all those requirements across the Standards related to dual language learners and their families, and having a plan through your management system in terms of, the data that you have about your community, about your pass enrollment in your program and your services, and thinking about how you're going to go about meeting these different requirements based on your community needs and resources. And then finally, of course, we maintain the requirements that when the majority of the children in a class or home-based program speaks the same language, at least one class staff member must speak that language. And that's going to be found, again, in part 1302 Subpart I, which is our Documentary Resource section.

So next slide. Okay. Alright. We had a question that really asked us to lay out what is the requirement for assessing children's dual language learners. And we talk about how it applies to both Early Head Start and Head Start. So what you see on the slide here is the language of the requirement, which is that every "program serves a child who speaks a language other than English, a program must use qualified bilingual staff, contactor, or consultant to: Assess language skills in English and in the child's home language," and assess the child's progress in other domains in the home language. Oh. Sorry. In the home language as well as, or English depending on what language best captures the child's develop, child's development skills. So, essentially we're asking for the programs to assess language skills in both

languages, and to assess other skills in the language, languages that best capture the child's development. You know, of course programs are thinking about for, for younger infant and toddlers, this may look a little bit different than for preschoolers. You might be assessing languages that are very different way. We also include in these requirements some flexibility for programs in terms of really starting at the highest bar.

That if you have a qualified staff person, or bilingual staff person that you really should, and a tool, that in the language, that you really should be doing that in the, in the home language if that's the language that best captures the child's development. But we also understand that if that is not possible in your community. Either there is not a tool, and you have to use an interpreter tool that is not in the language, in order to access the child of the home language, then that would be the next step, the next tier. And then if neither of those are possible, we don't say you shouldn't be assessing the children at all. Instead, we say you should really work to observe the children. Think about communicating with the family as much as possible, and really trying to get a picture of how that child is doing on the different domains so that you can individualize, even if you are unable to do assessments in the home language. So that, I hope, answers that question. And then, the next slide, we're really trying to talk about some of the tools that we have to help programs as they are working through these requirements. So, we would have folks revisit the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework, which really, we think does a very good job of interweaving dual language learners throughout, and talking about different ways that you can support them, and things to look for. And maybe you're a little bit different for folks, for children who are dual language learners.

Ann: And I think that Sharon asked us, to remind us that the National Center on Development, Teaching, and Learning is developing a resource on discussing children who are dual language learners.

Beth: Oh, wonderful. And also, and obviously the stuff that's already on ECLKC.

Beth: That's right. So, that's great. We're, there are some resources already on the ECLKC, but we are working on adding more. And that's really important. There is a DLL Toolkit already on the ECLKC. And in particular, there are tools related to the planned language approach, which is next slide. We can show you. And you'll see that a lot of the, the components of the planned language approach, and the language that we use to talk about dual language learners in both places are, is really reflective of the, the coordinated approach that programs are required to have in Subpart J. So, it's really an important resource for folks as they think about how to implement that, especially if their programs serve a lot of dual language learners. And then, also, of course, as we have been saying throughout the presentation, please read the Head Start Performance Standards. So that's the best place to start. Read the sections related to dual language learners in details, and really try and get a good conceptual understanding of what they say, and then look to the tools in terms of how you want to be implementing that in your programs.

Ann: So when I think about the two minute section that we focused on today, I think, phew, governance is a breeze. This is, this is what I think for people who are not steep, steep, steep in early childhood education, it feels like, [Inaudible] in some way. On the other hand, many programs are doing probably 98 percent of what you're [Inaudible] today, with the [Inaudible] laid out, and the intentionality, it just feels so good. And I know that this is just the flavor. But I really, I really hope that this, you know, spurs on lots of conversations within grantees. Not only within the education staff, but it, and I think, and we both kept saying, to, to produce this quality environment, it takes a lot more than the direct teachers. And,

you know, and the supervisors, and more. So, we're going to bring today to a close. You know, we welcome your, your continuing questions, and we hope you continue to use responses. We're also excited that on next Head Start Performance Standards. Our OHS Wednesdays for our grantees will be November 16, same time, from 2 -3:30 PM. And the focus will be on human resources. We've gotten lots of questions. And obviously, we will be including background checks, standards of conduct, qualifications and coaching. We've got a lot of questions on our qualifications. We'll hopefully, we're going to spend entire 90 minutes to, on that. So, we really hope that, as the association that is collecting questions for, that you really get your questions in ahead of time. It's so helpful for us to have them so we can be responsible. Our presentation is about to end. And we really thank you for hanging in. And we hope today was helpful. And any feedback is always welcome. We can take the constructive feedback, too. So we wish you well, and we will have a new [Inaudible] to talk on our webinar.

Colleen: Alright. Thanks, everybody!

[End video]