

REALTIME FILE

Association of University Centers on Disability
New EI/ECSE Standards - Why? When? Next Steps Webinar
Tuesday, September 24, 2019
2:45 PM - 4:00 PM

CART CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY:
HOME TEAM CAPTIONS
www.captionfamily.com

* * * * *

Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility. CART captioning and this realtime file may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

* * * * *

[Please stand by for CART captions]

>> Hello and welcome to the "New EI/ECSE Standards - Why? When? And Next Steps". This is a webinar of Early Childhood Special-Interest Group. My name is Danielle Weber. I'm a Public Health Program Manager here at AUCD and we want to thank all of you for joining us today. Before we get started, I want to address some details. We will provide a brief introduction into our speaker. Following the presentation, there will be time for questions. Because of the number of participants, your audio lines will be muted throughout the presentation. However, we will unmute you one at a time during the Q and A at the end. You can also submit questions at any point during the presentation via the chat box on your webinar console. You may send chat to the whole audience or presenters only. We will compile your questions throughout the webinar and address them at the very end. Please note we may not be able to address every question and we may have to combine some questions.

This webinar is being recorded. It will be available on AUCD webinar library. There will also be a short five-question evaluation survey at the close of the webinar. We invite you to provide feedback and also suggestions for future topics. Please join me in welcoming our Early Childhood Special-Interest Group Co-Chair Dr. Mary Beth. She will be introducing our speakers today.

>> Thanks. I want to welcome you on behalf of AUCD and Early Childhood. And remind all of you AUCD is coming up in November for its national conference. Our special-interest group will be meeting on Monday afternoon this year. That's a switch. We usually meet on Tuesday, but moving into Monday. More important, we will have a pre-conference day as we have for the past four years with AUCD. The focus is on moving the agenda in early childhood intervention. Our focus is really for those (indiscernible) personnel. And we have it open and we also have financial assistance for folks who need travel help. Please, look for your -- in your mailbox you will get information there.

It is my pleasure to introduce my friends and colleagues, who are as passionate about the field as I am. Peggy Kemp and Eva Horn have had long careers. Dr. Eva Horn is at the University of Kansas as a faculty member. She is the past president of DEC. Currently she is the chair for the Early Childhood Standards Group which you're going to hear all about today. Dr. Peggy Kemp is the Executive Director for DEC. Past history includes being the state Part C Coordinator for Kansas as well as a professional development provider and also been teaching at the university level.

We have a lot to learn and I'm so glad and thankful for them to share their hour with us. Eva or Peggy. I think, Peggy, you're going first.

>> Hello.

>> Peggy, we can hear you.

>> Okay. Great. Sorry. Somehow I got cut off for a second. We will start that over. Hello, everyone. We are very excited to be here and to speak with quite a number of you today. Excited about the interest in the new Early Intervention, Early Childhood Special Education Standards. Next slide, please.

Today, we will talk about the current status, just briefly. Also talk about why (indiscernible) was made and how it fits in the landscape in early childhood nationally. And Eva Horn will go to more specifics about what the current standards look like. Just sort of a spoiler alert, if you would, we do have one more webinar that we will talk to you about towards the end of this presentation. It's tomorrow, but you are absolutely welcome to attend. If not attend, we're going to also let you know how to get the -- to give feedback by a survey. We welcome you to be thinking about that as we talk today.

I'm assuming many of you know the history and the current status. Some of you might not. The Council for Exceptional Children is working with the Council for Exceptional Children to develop the first ever stand-alone Early Intervention, Early Childhood Special Education Standards. You might think haven't they been in place all along? I know people who are EIs and ECSEs. In a way. Previously, someone who was an educator with the degree of early intervention, early childhood special education was under the standards of the full CEC standards, which are essentially pre-K through 12. In addition to that we have what we call specialty sets that really focused on early intervention, early childhood special education, knowledge and skill statements. But these are not standards. So, for lots of reasons we will talk about, we moved forward when the opportunity came to talk about standards and really think about the impact that standards might have on the field for young children and their families.

So why Early Intervention, Early Childhood Special Education Standard? Why in the field feel it is important to move forward? First of all, the changing national landscape. And could be realized with a set of stand-alone standards. This is an -- there is an increased need as we all know for quantity and quality of early intervention and early childhood special educators along with all educators in most of our disciplines. Looking at really defining this professional role of what is -- what are the skills and knowledge that someone who is serving young children with disabilities ages 0 through 8 would need specifically so that during the preservice training time, they can really hone in on what's critically important. The changing world of EI/ECSE has for a long time called for unique and additional skills beyond those of the general special educator. As we all could move forward. We were also looking, working in partnership with the Early Childhood Personnel Center and looking at way to really, again, help understand the role of standards and standards as they pushed forward and integrated with the Division for Early Childhood Recommended Practices, which are cross-disciplinary. So, we moved forward in

collaboration with other professional associations. The National Association for the Education of Young Children has been a partner from the very beginning. We work together now through blended programs in a number of connections, assuring that inclusion is our primary focus. But at the same time, have been involved with an initiative that many of you are probably familiar with. Actually had an AUCD webinar on it a couple of months ago. But the Powers of Profession Initiative. As our early childhood educators, as we worked on rising that profession, it seemed a good time to work on rising up the profession through new standards. They would also complement and parallel the new EC, Early Childhood Educator Standards, our general education counterpart. Quite honestly, a voice at the table for children, all children, including children with disabilities, and some of the unique knowledge and skills that those who advise and assist and serve that population need. We are also working closely with our zero to three partner looking at their competency work and how that can be integrated. The other issue we were trying for was ongoing difficulty in reviewing the EI/ECSE education program. Alongside our partners. So, again, if we have a more comparable set of standards, the belief is that that review process for universities would be easier.

So just a brief overview of where we have been over the last year plus and where we are headed. This all started in March of 2018 with our umbrella organization the Council for Exceptional Children and their Professional Standards and Practice Committee. It was approved with great enthusiasm. Moving forward with CEC on development of these new standards. Next slide, please.

Just a quick look at the task force. We have a combination of researchers, of university personnel, of direct service providers, and our NAEYC partners represented in this group of our standards development task force. We are fortunate to have support from Early Childhood Personnel Center. Supports us with the consultant, Margie and Vicky, who have a significant history in development and standards. Also of course we were working with the exec office and DEC staff support. More than that, this will be the third time that the standards are brought to the full field for feedback. Along with numerous opportunities that the standards have taken over the last couple of years to get as much feedback from the field as possible.

Overall, this basically tells us that we will continue to do webinars and face-to-face meetings. We estimate that June of 2020, if we are approved, the first set of standards will be ready.

In addition to that, just a reminder that those of you who do follow the accreditation process. The new standards will be available for program review in 2021 and will be mandatory in 2023. We always like to remind everyone that our standards are not just designed for those who go through accreditation. The standards are absolutely for pre-service. For anyone really wanting to look at the (indiscernible) also for in-service. Educators and across disciplines. Again, as we move forward, be thinking about how these standards fit in your work and in your collaborations.

With that, I am going to hand the hour to the Chair of the standards task force.

>> Thank you, Peggy. Assuming everybody can hear me since the little red X is off of me and my microphone seems to be flipping on and off. I'm going to assume that you can hear me.

Again, thank you for inviting us to do this. It is really important to all of us on the task force as well as all of the other folks that you heard working with us on the development of these standards that we get as much input as we can. One of the things that I wanted to start with before sharing the current draft of the standards is to just give you a little bit more background on what it is that we are doing in our work to developing standards and what these standards really are, the personnel standards.

There's a bunch of words on the screen. I'm going to highlight a couple of things for you. You

can have a copy, and as I understand, it is available to you, a copy of the PowerPoint. I'm not going to read this to you. A couple things I want to highlight. Personnel development standards are expected to reflect current research, evidence-based strategies, beliefs, values of our field and current trends in our field. One thing I want to quickly highlight here that is not on the slide -- I'm not sure Peggy touched on this, but our standards, the ones that we are developing, birth through grade three. As we -- we needed to make sure as we were looking at the content of these standards that we are addressing the birth to three group, the 3 to 5 group. And, the kindergarten through third grade. Or 5 through 8, through age 8. As you can imagine, that hasn't been the easiest thing to do, but we're working hard on making sure that as much as possible these really reflect our beliefs and values across the different age groups, which align with changes, obviously, in setting and context in which educators may be practicing.

The other thing I want to highlight is that these personnel standards are for beginning level educators. Upon completion -- we expect them to be proficient in these standards -- according to the expectations of being a beginning level first-year just starting off, in the field of early childhood, birth through grade three. Another thing that we relied on heavily, and are expected to, as we looked to identifying the standards, writing the standards, developing the standards, was that we include information, the kinds of things that are noted in the DEC recommended practices, which go birth to -- through age five. And CECs, high leverage practices, which go from kindergarten through actually grade 12. But obviously our focus is on up to grade 3. So using both of those recommended practices, if you will, to inform us as we're moving through what the expectation should be about the knowledge and skills of these educators.

Last thing I want to point out is the next to the last bullet. Because DEC, which is our umbrella organization, is an international organization, as is the division, an international organization, we really need to maintain these standards at a global level and therefore not go into sort of U.S.-specific kinds of ideas or even terminology within the standards. Now we do have opportunities to use U.S. terminology and criteria and expectations within some of the supporting explanations as examples. But, again, we really want them to be more broadly applicable because it's not just about higher education, as Peggy said, higher education in the United States. Really, we see these standards while we're following requirements, not just for folks that are wanting accreditation.

Speaking of CAEP, the accrediting body for higher education programs that do all kinds of educator preparation. They do have specific expectations that we need to be meeting so that we fit into the host of different kinds of licensing and credentials for educators. The first of those is we can only have seven standards. You can imagine that was a bit daunting when we first started talking about this because, again, the age range that we're talking about. Again, maximum of seven standards. Yes, we used all seven. We could have had less, but we really felt like we needed the seven. In addition, underneath each standard are components. You'll see some of those. You'll see the ones that we have developed. Underneath those seven standards you can have no more than 28 components total. So, it could be that one standard, which, again, you'll see when you look at the draft, some standards have three, some have four, some have as many as seven. But the total number cannot be more than 28. Again, definitely put some limitations as we were developing these statements.

They must be possible to be assessed through a limited number of assessments. This goes very much for the program approval process that institutes of higher education go through. When we are writing the standards, we really need to think about how can programs assess whether their candidates, as we call them, those in the educator preparation programs, are moving

through, gaining competence on these standards. We also all are required -- this is true across every single program area or content area that CAEP administers the approval process on. We are required to be in line with the four principles of InTASC. If you don't know really what it stands for, I can't tell you at this moment, each one of those letters. But you can do a quick Google search. Basically, it's educator preparation standard. There are four principles that we needed to ensure were reflected. The learner and learning. Content. Knowledge of the domain in which your specific focus area of licensure or credentials focus. Instructional practices and professional responsibility. I challenge you as I share with you the draft standards to think about when we have hit all of those. In addition, CAEP expects us to address the use of technology within educator and educational settings. And technology and digital learning should be seen throughout -- and actually this slide is missing. There is a second one that should be seen that's a -- that cuts across theme, cuts across all of the areas and should be very evident across all of the standards is cultural responsiveness. I'll take the next slide. Getting close to getting to the standards. A couple more things. As we worked, we needed to ensure -- our initial work, very much, CAEP standards now expect these -- the standards to reflect a performance-based perspective. In other words, the statement should be about what educators can do. You can talk about the knowledge that they should have; but you always need to indicate how that knowledge plays out in their performance as an educator. Again, here we are looking specifically as a beginning early interventionist and an early childhood special educator. We are really wanting to emphasize and -- the fact -- I see it in my heading on this slide. We haven't done as good a job as we should -- these standards that we are developing, they're not just early childhood special ed. They are early intervention, early childhood special educators. Again, because of the age range that we are addressing within this includes early intervention, the birth to three, and early childhood special ed. The three to five and then the five to eight.

The next thing that I want to highlight on this particular slide is that we do have a current draft. It's dated, I believe, August the 20th. It is our second draft. The first draft was made public in January. We responded to a range of input. We had a webinar. We had a survey. We had a lot of different things, different ways of getting input. A number of listening sessions across multiple conferences. We revised that set. The second draft that is currently available, includes the seven standards. It includes the components. In addition, it now includes an item called supporting explanations. Which provides additional information to understand the meaning of both the components and the standards.

We're going to move into actually looking at this second draft. I'm not going to read these to you. In fact, I would encourage you not to try to read them even on the copy of the PowerPoint. At the end of this PowerPoint we have where, you can access currently available. This second draft. August, 2019, draft. In addition to right here, what you have is the standard, which is the paragraph that is at the top of the slide. Then the numbered items are the components. Again, it's going to be a lot easier for you to read in the document itself. Let me just highlight each one of these standards so you get kind of a sense about what we were doing, what we were looking at, what our thoughts were within each of these standards.

The first one, child development in early learning aligning directly with the InTASC that we talked about. I'm not going to read these to you, but basically what this one centers on is that the candidates are able to apply knowledge of typical development, variations in development, individual differences, exceptionalities and other direct and indirect contextual, teaches that restrain development and learning. They need to know this in order to facilitate meaningful learning experiences and individualize intervention and instruction within natural and inclusive

environments. I would like to highlight one of the things that we have, again, tried to be very consistent about. Is that while natural environment tends to be the term that we use in the birth to three environment -- world, the early intervention world, inclusion is what we tend to use as we look at preschool and up. Even though we got a little bit of push-back on this, we have decided to be consistent about always including both terms. Again, to make sure that the full age range is represented in terms of our beliefs around the importance of each and every child being -- and their families, being provided support within the natural or included setting.

This is one partnering with families. And we have gotten some questions about this. I want to say that we very intentionally did a stand-alone, a separate standard directly on partnering with families. If you look at other standards, some of the special education standards or elementary, secondary, partnering with families is a part of other standards, or will be in a collaboration standard. We said, "No, the role that we have in EI and ECSE with families is so central that we want to put that emphasis on taking one of our seven standards and giving it to the partnership with families". What you will see as I move through the standard, particularly as you read them for yourselves, you're going to see families, I don't think there's a single standard that doesn't say, has the word "Family" in it. We have it threaded throughout. But we felt really strongly it needed to be also its own standard so that it provides the kind of emphasis and importance we believe.

Again, the standard itself just provides information about reciprocal partnerships with families, recognizing that we need to work on family capacity-building. A strength-based approach to working with families, partnering and fostering family competence in supporting their young children in development and learning.

Take a quick breath and move on to standard three. Here is our collaboration. Again you'll see this often in other standards as well. Again, a really important part for us. One of the things, like I said, you'll see families absolutely partnering together with families. One of the things that we really wanted to highlight here in addition to maintaining that thread of the importance of partnering and teaming together with families, is that we really are a field or an age range in which working together with multiple disciplines and people in multiple roles, including community partners and agencies. Multiple disciplines. Individuals in multiple roles but also multiple kinds of programs. Legal system. Funding agencies, et cetera. And licensing agencies. That is such a central part of what we do as EI and ECSE that needed to be a part of our collaboration in teaming work.

Moving on to standard number four. We have a standard, a stand-alone standard on assessment processes. Probably the most important thing that we want folks to understand in Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education is that assessment has multiple purposes. And that each of those purposes are something that, as an EI or an ECSE, provider, educator, you are likely to encounter and very likely need to, at the minimum, know how to interpret that information. It sets us a little bit different from other areas of special education licensure or certification in that most educators primary responsibility around assessment is for monitoring children's progress and making informed decisions, and intervention planning based on that. Absolutely, early intervention and early childhood special educators need to be doing that. But we also have other kinds of assessment processes that we engage in in a regular basis, including, eligibility determination, screening for determining whether further evaluation needs to be conducted. So really understanding all of these different ways in which we engage in this assessment process and knowing when to use different kinds of assessments are a really important part of what we believe. We also have a strong belief in a strength-based approach to assessment and to ensuring that our assessment processes are authentic and reflect

developmentally, linguistically and culturally appropriate tools that are responsive to the characteristics of -- I'm sorry -- my computer just went to sleep. Shoot. And I can't see the screen anymore. Hold on one second. Have to wake it up. Put a password in. If I can remember the password. Okay. I'm back with you. Sorry about that.

In summary, again, that we're responsive to the characteristics of the child, the family, and the programs in which we are working or collaborating.

Standard five. We're on the downhill side of the standard at this point. Not in terms of importance, but just in terms of number. Our next one is really talking about curriculum. Again, here we are not saying this is the curriculum, these are the activities, these are the ways in which you intervene. But what we are saying is that as an EI/ECSE, you need to understand around how to take curriculum frameworks that are in place and develop developmentally appropriate, culturally responsive ways to embed --

[Music feedback in the background]

How to really look at curriculum frameworks that are in place in the various kinds of settings in which we might be engaging and make an assessment to be able to validate that these curricula are culturally responsive to the particular environments in which we are working. And really include all of the developmental and content domains that are appropriate for the age group in which -- for which we are working. As a part of that sort of reviewing and validating those frameworks, we want our candidates to know how to ensure that the curriculum that is being implemented is universally designed, and if it's not, to do that work themselves. That it focuses on providing those learning activities and engaging environment in inclusive and natural learning environment that provide each and every child and their family with equitable access to high-quality learning and experiences. Again, that's where we are really focusing this one. Not on do this curriculum or do this curriculum, or make sure you're teaching these skills. What we're really saying is knowing how to evaluate what is being implemented and ensure that it meets these criteria.

Moving to standard six. The all-important instruction or intervention. Again, here we needed to think about broadly across the age range. A lot of us kind of cringe when we think about instruction for 3-year-olds and some of us still continue to shudder a little bit when we think about instruction with a big "I", when we think of working with three to five years old. What we wanted to really talk about is that this interaction that we have with children to create and support learning environments, engaging appropriate learning environments and provide scaffolding and support for learning, we wanted to really reflect that. And hopefully our title gives some of that sense. So, using responsive, again, so it doesn't sound to teacher-led, or adult-led, using responsive and reciprocal interaction, interventions and instructions. We really felt strongly that this gives us a better sense of the values and beliefs that we have about how young children, starting with infants, how young children grow and develop and the ways in which we provide support for their growth and development. Again, here I want to just point out that even in this sort of more adult-focus, that partnership with families and other disciplines, other professionals, is key. It's central. Shows up as an important part of what we expect our candidate to know how to do and to actively do. As they plan and implement these responsive interactions, interventions, and instruction. We also do have at the very end of the standards, you can see we do have a nod to our value and our belief that we need to, as early interventionists, early childhood special educators, be making databased decisions so that we are clearly monitoring children's progress, their outcomings, and making adaptations. Revisiting, changing our intervention, our interactions, interventions and our instruction, based on how the child and their family are responding to this

intervention and interaction.

Moving to the final standard. Professionalism and ethical practice. We strongly believe Early Intervention, Early Childhood Special Education, is in fact a professional endeavor. It is work that we do that we have to be well-prepared for. And that we have a set of ethical expectations, standards, logical guidelines that we must adhere to. In order to be able to do that, we have to obviously know and understand them. This particular standard is all about having candidates understand and act upon the fact that they understand that they have an expectation of dispositions, that they are expected to be advocates and have leadership skills in moving our field forward in positive ways to ensure that we have positive impact on children and their family.

That's the last of the standards. I believe I at this point turn it back over to Peggy.

>> So that's a lot of information in a short amount of time. Please know you are absolutely welcome to contact myself or Eva with more questions. Probably a better place to jump in to the conversation at a little deeper level is with our next public survey and standard webinar. And/or, if you have others on your team that you think would be very interested in this information. The webinar is tomorrow, but we do have spaces still open. If you cannot attend, we are -- please go and register anyway. If you're interested in a recorded version of the webinar which will include how to access the public survey.

The information is on this slide. Actually we have to go into that. If you go to the DEC website "news" there's information about how to connect to the personnel preparation standards webinar tomorrow.

As stated, the next public survey is tomorrow. There are additional feedback opportunities. If you're joining us in Dallas, Texas, for a couple of opportunities as well as many of the task force members there to share your comments with. We will be at the Teacher Education Individual Conference and the NA EYC annual conference as well, with sessions about the standards. And overall, here is the main link for you to get information for the standards. We will just leave that for a little bit.

A few minutes to open up so I want to go ahead and leave those. Before we open up for questions, thank each and every one of you for the comments that we have been following in the comment section. Excited that others are also excited about this work. We do hope that the end result is supporting young children with disabilities and their families through adequately preparing the professionals that serve them.

The other last point we want to put forth is that none of this can be done alone as an EI/ECSE workforce or profession. It's absolutely in collaboration with all of you. And we look forward to seeing where these standards can take us all together, as well as supporting our preservice.

Opening it up for questions.

>> Thanks Eva and thanks Peggy. Just a reminder. We do not have (indiscernible) if you have questions, please press star and pound on your telephone key pad. If you're on the phone line, the conference call system will unmute you in the order in which you indicated you have a question. Otherwise, you're also welcome to type them in the chat box below the slide and we can read the questions through there. Peggy and Eva, I don't know if you can see the chat box. [Feedback in the background]

>> Yes, I can. This is Eva. I call (indiscernible). Hi guys. I really appreciate both of your comments. The first few comments that you had. Thank you. Mark, in terms of yours around knowledge, I realize particularly the way I highlighted the things, that it does look like more knowledge rather than application. If you read the standards in full, there is always an application statement within the standard, but also, one of the places to really see this notion that we are

expecting more than that they have the knowledge is within the components. Then, the supporting explanations, which I didn't share but are on the full set of standards. That's available at the website that is there saying "for more information". The supporting explanations, again, emphasize the performance. Then when it comes time to translating this as a higher ed professional, as a higher ed faculty member who wants my program to be approved by CAEP. I cannot simply say I've exposed the student to this information. I've given them the knowledge. I actually have to have assessments that demonstrate that they can actually do these things in the field. There is a really high expectation for performance-based assessment for those. Now, does it get us exactly where we need to do, Mark? Absolutely not. We all know that that continues to be a struggle. But I think we are absolutely being pushed as a field of folks that are preparing these folks to really be able to more directly impact that they come out. Yes, they're beginning level, but they come out with some ability to actually -- we're not expecting them to do the hard work of figuring out how that applies in the real world. Hopefully that gives you some idea of what we did.

>> Thank you. It looks like the next question we have is from Tricia. In the chat box. Can you see that?

>> What a great question in terms of, again, I'll just reinforce that the standards are what we are saying that a beginning level teacher needs to have. Yes, there is a high expectation that as the programs use these to develop their programs and then get program approval, there is an expectation of extensive field work. In fact, there is an additional standard which at this point is in a draft form. Pretty much all certification programs -- we're waiting to actually hear from CAEP. We right now have our draft in to CAEP to make sure that -- you're allowed to have an additional standard that speaks directly to the expectation for the amount of field work and in the types of field work that the preservice educator or the preservice candidate has. We do have that in there as well. But, nonetheless, they're still beginning level and they need to have experiences. I think the way that these standards, while they're not designed for professional development, specifically, I mean, that's not the primary purpose of the way they're used; but, I think that they can provide useful information in terms of now as we look at the person now in a program, what are the kinds of things that we can provide ongoing professional development on as the individual moves and continues to grow and develop in their career. So a roundabout answer.

>> Thanks, Eva. The next question I'm seeing looks like it's from Roxann Lamar about a rural area and where it can be a real challenge. And whether or not there will be any funding inspired by these standards for professional development.

>> I kind of throw that back at the group. Again, we certainly hope, and I think doing webinars like this, and there will be -- I'm obviously talking and thinking at the same time. Let me slow down for a second. I do think the standard -- there is an expectation with the standards that once we get everything in place that we need in terms of approval through CAEP. There are a lot of expectations about materials that will be developed that go along with. And these are expectations that CAPE has for us. For example, we will need to provide a document that gives to higher education faculty members, but, again, I think could be very useful for professional development providers, in terms of assessment that can be used to assess individual performance on the component -- on the standard as well as the components of the standards. So, examples of, again, not all-inclusive, every single possible assessment. But, some guiding documents, including some actual rubric that you could use to assess, do an observation or do a portfolio that you would then assess. So, again, there may be some real help in that for professional development providers to use that information as well as they evaluate where the

need is. And then the impact of their professional development. The question about funding. I would love to be able to say, oh, yeah, absolutely, we're going to get more funding when these standards come out. I hope that it becomes part of what we use for advocacy for funding I guess is my true belief.

>> Again, you're answering some of the questions as well. I can mute for a second and see if you want to add anything.

>> Peggy, it looks like you are trying to speak but we are not hearing you for some reason. I don't know if you have some comments that perhaps you could type into the chat box there if you want to try chatting one more time.

>> Peggy, we might be able to hear you now if you want to try talking.

[Echo in the background]

>> For some reason I am -- can you hear me now?

>> Yes. We can hear you, Peggy.

>> Sorry. This whole on/off thing. I just extend it a little bit to say that the DEC, EI (indiscernible) standards were absolutely informed by practices and the high level practices that extend through the K through 3 space as well as the pre-K space. So, what we -- the suite of resources available now both through DEC and our partners, including these others, that we continue in years moving forward to develop the type of resources connected and driven by these standards and the practices that really can help move, develop practice. And also support those who are in places that aren't -- are in need of some extra support as mentioned earlier. Absolutely open to ideas. As we move forward with all of this work.

>> I have to say thank you to -- there's so many wonderful comments on here. I assume that we will have access to these comments? Because, one, there's really wonderful positive ones, which we all need a little positive reinforcement, don't we. But he also really appreciate -- this audience, you guys have really hit on some important pieces around with that notion of ongoing professional development that to extend the focus, and extend the impact this work can have as we move forward. So, thank you.

>> Thank you. This is Danielle. We will make sure that you get a transcript of the chat following the presentation.

>> Thank you.

>> Do we have any more questions from the audience? I'll give it a minute. It looks like we may have one or two folks typing. Those might have been kudos for our speakers. Thank you for attending the webinar. It has been recorded and will be archived in the library. You can also download below the chat box. You have access to those. Please take a few minutes to complete our survey that will come up.

[Time 3:58 p.m.]

* * * * *

Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility. CART captioning and this realtime file may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.