

**10/6/2008 Compilation of Rating Scale for Review of Proposed  
RI Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (RIDE) High Quality Early Childhood Education (ECE) Standards**

**Respondents with "code" in bold:**

- National Expert on Preschool Programs for Children with Disabilities (**CWD**) - Vicki Stayton, Ph.D., Western KY University
- State Preschool and/or 619 Staff
  - Ginger Huffman, **WV** Department of Education
  - Nancy Vorobey, **MD** Department of Education
  - Norma Donaldson-Jenkins, **SC** Department of Education
- US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Head Start (**HS**) - Michele Plutro, Ed.D
- **NAEYC** - Barbara Willer
- National Institute for Early Education Research (**NIEER**) - Steven Barnett

**Comments:**

- **CWD** - Thank-you for the opportunity to participate in this review process. It is evident that the early childhood community in RI has spent a great deal of time and thought into the development of these standards and indicators.
- **HS** - I applaud the hard work that clearly shows in this document. It is concise, updated, and written in primarily plain English. Thank you for the contributions to moving the field forward. Thank you for all the discipline you have demonstrated to keep this document brief in the world of standards. Thank you for pushing forward with the critical markers of quality care and education. And thank you for allowing me to be of service to your community.
- **MD** - Maybe I'm not critically-minded enough, but I think these standards are pretty darn good. I had just one content comment for Standard area 2. Thanks for the opportunity of being a reviewer. It's always good to see what another state is doing.
- **NAEYC** - These are very well done; generally consistent with NAEYC's Early Childhood Program Standards and Accreditation Criteria.
- **NIEER** - Unclear about (1) whether adequate screening for vision, hearing, health and developmental problems required and (2) requirements relating to nutrition.
- **SC** - Thanks for the opportunity to review and let me know if you have any questions about my comments.
- **WV** - I thought it was very good and easy to follow and use. Good job RI. ☺

**Comments on First Two Sections of Standards Document**

Applicability

Question: Do you consider this appropriate? \_\_\_ No (not at all) \_\_\_ Somewhat: **\_6 of 6\_ Yes (to a satisfactory level).**

Comments:

**HS** - I not only agree, but also think it's prudent and wise.

**NIEER** did not rate this item. Their input started with Comments on Standards (see below).

#### The Approval Process

Question: Do you consider this appropriate? \_\_\_ No (not at all) \_\_\_ Somewhat: **\_\_ 6 of 6\_ Yes (to a satisfactory level).**

#### Comments:

**HS** - In the end I said yes. I was leaning toward somewhat as I am not certain of the relationship of these standards for Head Start programs in RI, though they are mentioned in the introduction. I think it will need to be clear during the post adoption process. For example, how will the “authorized” representatives interface/conduct on-sites with Head Start programs and will others be included?

**NIEER** did not rate this item. Their input started with Comments of Standards (see below).

**Comments on Standards:** Participants responded to the following 5 questions using a rating scale and provided comments related to each of the five standards.

<u>Question 1:</u> Is standard understandable to any reasonably knowledgeable ECE professional?	<u>Question 2:</u> Is standard specific enough that any person knows what is to be done and what is not to be done?	<u>Question 3:</u> Is standard enforceable, in that the indicators are generally capable of measurement?	<u>Question 4:</u> Is standard consistent with evidence-based effective practice for high quality ECE programs?	<u>Question 5:</u> Is standard adequately comprehensive in scope?

#### **Standard 1: Physical Facilities**

<b><u>1: Under-standable</u></b>	<b><u>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</u></b>	<b><u>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</u></b>	<b><u>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</u></b>	<b><u>5: Adequately comprehensive</u></b>	<b>Comments</b>
No (not at all)  Somewhat  <b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b>	No (not at all)  <b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b>  <b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b>	No (not at all)  Somewhat  <b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b>	No (not at all)  <b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b>  <b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b>	No (not at all)  <b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b>  <b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b>	<p><b>CWD</b> - Indicator 1.6 seems to be the only one that could be open to interpretation of terms such as “good repair,” “clean,” etc.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - What about diaper changing stations/sinks separate from children’s space not just kitchen/food. Do you want children washing their hands in diaper changing sinks?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - Playground safety is much bigger is it sufficient to reference the “Handbook for...”</p> <p><b>WV</b> - We have had folks ask for a definition of usable space but have decided not to define.</p>

**Standard 2: Health and Safety**

<b>1: Under-standable</b>	<b>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</b>	<b>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</b>	<b>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</b>	<b>5: Adequately comprehensive</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 2 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 5 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p><b>HS</b> - If it these are to apply to Head Start in RI...should DHHS be referenced as well explicit to HS?</p> <p><b>HS - 2.2</b> and 2.4 BRAVO. I hope other states will follow. Much needed. Much appreciated.</p> <p><b>CWD</b> - Some EC educators may require additional training on indicator 2.4.</p> <p><b>MD</b> - 2.4; how do providers attain skills in this critical area? Did not see PD for social-emotional addressed in document, so am concerned about capacity of providers to effectively intervene.</p> <p><b>CWD</b> - Should indicator 2.6 identify what should be done if consent is not provided?</p> <p><b>MD</b> - 2.6; starting with 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, the tense is inconsistent with rest of standard and document as a whole.</p> <p><b>SC</b> - There is no statement regarding the cleaning and sanitizing of the diapering area after each use; only "at least nightly" (<b>Indicator 2.10.f.</b>) This would be more consistent with effective practice.</p> <p><b>SC</b> - Indicator 2.19 g might prove difficult to carry-out and monitor.</p> <p><b>WV</b> - Good, clear and linked to ECERS</p> <p><b>HS</b> - <i>Children with health needs are included – what about children with other needs?</i></p>

					<p><i>HS - What does it mean? Monitorable?</i></p> <p><i>HS - Drinking water available to children throughout the day? Everything from fountains to Cups and pitchers Ok?</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

**Standard 3: Children's Age Requirements**

<b>1: Under-standable</b>	<b>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</b>	<b>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</b>	<b>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</b>	<b>5: Adequately comprehensive</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p><b>HS</b> - 3.1 / 3.2 under what conditions can a child be retained at 5 and no go to K. or does this not happened? i.e., parent requests, space, etc. Head Start has a lower ratio for a class that is predominately 3 year olds. (15 rather than 18) And for 4 year olds we like to see less than 20.</p> <p><b>NIEER</b> - Unclear is there is a maximum age.</p> <p><b>WV</b> gets question about early entry if child turns 4 on Aug 28<sup>th</sup>.</p>

**Standard 4: Staff-Class Sizes, Staff Adult/Child Ratios**

<b>1: Under-standable</b>	<b>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</b>	<b>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</b>	<b>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</b>	<b>5: Adequately comprehensive</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 6</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 6</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 6</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 2 of 7</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 5 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p><b>CWD</b> - Indicators 4.1 – 4.4 are clearly articulated &amp; would receive a rating of yes for criteria. Indicators; 4.5 &amp; 4.6 seem open to interpretations. Quantitative guidance is needed for indicators 4.5 and 4.6.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 4.6 – MORE APPLAUSE</p> <p><b>NIEER</b> - 1:24 for kindergarten does not qualify as high quality based on TN STAR experiment</p>

**Standard 5: Staff Qualifications and Requirements for Ongoing Professional Development**

<b>1: Under-standable</b>	<b>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</b>	<b>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</b>	<b>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</b>	<b>5: Adequately comprehensive</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 2 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 5 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 2 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 5 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p><b>HS</b> - Is a four-year degree in ECE implied here? Can it be a 2 year? With additional experience?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - Ongoing P.D. may need more said. Currently it's not even assigned a number and it is important. Do you want to suggest topics?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - As for the "evidence" base this may overstate the "value" added by a degree if you mean a 4-year degree.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - More applause for Assistant teacher requirements – clear with multiple options for qualifying.</p> <p><b>NIEER</b> - Teacher qualifications - Unclear what column C.4 permits. 5 years to get AA? 5 years to get to column A or B? Can programs continue to hire under C.4 so they never had to reach A or B? Only A and B are <u>high</u> quality.</p> <p><b>SC</b> - Not sure if the instructions mean that community programs must have to staff in columns A, B, and C; or if these columns are options.</p> <p><b>WV</b> - You may want to link PD plan to ECERS too if it is completed.</p>

**Standard 6: Administration**

<b>1: Under-standable</b>	<b>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</b>	<b>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</b>	<b>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</b>	<b>5: Adequately comprehensive</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p><b>CWD</b> - 6.3b. Would this wording be more clearly stated as, "For programs with 2-3 classrooms...?"</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 6.4 what does insurance for personnel mean? The others are clear. Does this mean workman's comp? or that the program would provide life and health insurance?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 6.6 Bravo – for including self-assessment.</p> <p><b>CWD</b> - 6.10 – Are <u>all</u> teaching team members paid for 2 hours planning time per week?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - Comprehensive. Many valuable markers including 6.8, 6.12, And criminal records check (deserves it's own number assigned.)</p>

**Standard 7: Curriculum**

<b>1: Under-standable</b>	<b>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</b>	<b>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</b>	<b>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</b>	<b>5: Adequately comprehensive</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7 (HS - mostly)</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p><b>HS</b> - Thank you for including this. Some barely mention it. I wonder if you might make a distinction between curriculum and curriculum is a framework. Simple if your label MATCHES your definition – curriculum framework. Otherwise I don't see them as the same – not synonymous necessarily.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - Seems like you would want more attention to goals for children, the quality of the experiences to implement the curriculum and some reference to explicit statements about outcomes for children.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - Here we see a new term - Practitioner. Would be nice to have a parallel in each of the 10 dimensions...something to say to the front-lines, the implementers of day to day programs.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 7.7 deserves more attention.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 7.8 ++ great consistency to include language here as well as earlier.</p> <p><b>CWD</b> - It seems that 7.11 &amp; 7.16 could be combined.</p> <p><b>CWD</b> - With the focus on literacy, should a writing center be included in 7.12?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 7.18 “proactively prevent potential bias.” Choose one word...proactive? or prevent potential?</p>

**Standard 8: Child Assessment**

<b>1: Under-standable</b>	<b>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</b>	<b>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</b>	<b>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</b>	<b>5: Adequately comprehensive</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7 (HS &amp; mostly yes)</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7 (HS - Looks like it creates a lot of paper review.)</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p><b>HS</b> - Once again I must say thank you -for including this important dimension.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - Try to avoid using Framework here. That term is key to your approach to curriculum.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - Can you say child assessment procedures? Or tools and procedures? Or system as you use later in the definition of this standard. Or you might talk about a curriculum and ongoing assessment framework as an integrated construct?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - BIG JUMP form 8.1 to 8.2. I respect the movement forward it may be too much of a jump with too little explanatory information.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 8.3 use of word choice could be mis-read by some to think they will frequently choose, rather than have to explain their choice.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 8.4 align assessment? Same for curriculum?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 8.6 outreach for screening? When? How often?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 8.10 absent child outcomes and goal attainment for children. Reads like only patterns and trends from year to year? What about period progress of children?</p>

**Standard 9: Differentiated Teaching and Learning**

<b>1: Under-standable</b>	<b>2: Specific what is/is not to be done</b>	<b>3: Enforce-able, can be measured</b>	<b>4: Consistent evidence-based practice</b>	<b>5: Adequately comprehensive</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p><b>Somewhat 1 of 7</b></p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7 (HS - primarily)</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p><b>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</b></p>	<p><b>HS</b> - BRAVO. Now can you add a teacher-friendly description?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - Here we have the “problem” with Framework again.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - If you want to keep it with curriculum then find another way to define or describe this part.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 9.10 may not be specific enough to reinforce “legal” requirements for special education, .i.e. IDEA, etc.</p>

**Standard 10: Family Engagement**

1: Under-standable	2: Specific what is/is not to be done	3: Enforce-able, can be measured	4: Consistent evidence-based practice	5: Adequately comprehensive	Comments
<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat</p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 7 of 7 (HS - Is this moving the bar too high too fast for some? Many? Or few programs ??)</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat 1 of 7 (HS - This may be the most challenging to measure and to measure consistently)</p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat 2 of 7 (HS - I think it is in keeping with some of the evidence just harder to identify.)</p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 5 of 7</p>	<p>No (not at all)</p> <p>Somewhat 1 of 7</p> <p>Yes (to a satisfactory level) 6 of 7</p>	<p><b>HS</b> - Please only say family if you mean family and are not later going to say non-custodial family members or extended family are not a welcome part of the process. I think you primarily describe outreach and engagement of parents...though some others may be welcome partners in the child's education.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 10.2 Do you deal often with governing structures ??? only in parent engagement? Would this move to administration? Or do you largely mean advisory groups? Do you mean ece pta types groups that may make decisions about the programs in which these children enroll?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 10.4 Don't say it if you don't mean it. Program available to families/ parents during all hours of operation. It can be a logistically difficult reality.</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 10.6...and what roles in relation to their children?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 10.7 Do/ will most programs be able to comply with making opportunities available for families at home to support their children's learning? Is this minimal like a newsletter? Or something more substantive and active?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 10.10 strong reciprocal relationships? Meaning what? And please specific to what end. Why do this?</p> <p><b>HS</b> - 10.15 +++ languages.</p> <p><b>CWD</b> - Indicators for standard 10 are overall comprehensive &amp; very appropriate to EC settings. It</p>

					<p>does seem that 10.8 needs to be expanded at both the program &amp; practitioner level to include indicators that address legal requirements of programs specific to family involvement through IDEA &amp; ADA.</p> <p><b>WV</b> - Home visits included?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--