



Early Childhood Policy Council

Agenda and Transcripts

Virtual Meeting

Thursday, August 27, 2026

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Physical Meeting

1000 G Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

WestEd, 5th floor, Capitol Room

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introduction

- Review meeting protocols
- Introduce new Council members
- Review of agenda

2. Workforce Needs Subcommittee Discussion

- Subcommittee shares draft letter
- Council feedback

3. Family Access and Federal Policy Subcommittee Discussion

- Subcommittee shares draft content
- Council feedback

4. General Public Comment

- Members of the public are invited to provide verbal comment

Attendance

ECPC Council Members:

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza, Becky Beland McNaught, Catherine Brozowski, Claire Ramsey, Diana Ramos, Donna Sneeringer, Gabriela Gonzalez, Karla Pleitéz Howell, Liz Simons, Maéva Renaud, Mary Ignatius, Matilda Soria, Miren Algorri, Natali Gaxiola,

Ranae Amezquita, Ristyn Woolley, Shanna Birkholz-Vasquez, Socorro Martin, Sonia Jaramillo, Stephen Propheter, Tonia McMillian, Tony Jordan, Wendy Sims-Moten.

Guest Speakers:

Nancy Strohl

Hosts:

Diana Yactayo, Jateri Willis, Karin Bloomer, Ramee Serwanga, Estefania Buitrago (SP), Martha Schmitz (SP), Wendy Feng (CN), Xiangyao Bowler (CN).

Meeting Transcript

1. Welcome and Introduction

- Review Meeting Protocols

Karin Bloomer:

Before we begin the meeting, I'd like to review a few Zoom features with you. We will enable these features after providing instruction. In a few moments, we'll be offering the closed captioning feature in Zoom. To access this feature, you will need to locate the live transcript button at the bottom of your Zoom screen and then click show subtitle. This will allow you to view closed captions in English throughout the meeting. In a moment, we will also offer language interpretation services. I will now turn things over to our interpreters to describe how you can listen to this meeting in English, Spanish, or Mandarin.

Spanish Interpreter:

Good morning. To set up language translation, click the interpretation symbol in the meeting control and then click the language that you would like to hear. We have both Spanish and Mandarin interpretation available for this meeting. You can also click mute original audio to only hear the interpreted language.

[foreign language 00:01:01]. Thank you.

Mandarin Interpreter:

[foreign language 00:01:39].

Karin Bloomer:

We can now activate the interpretation feature. Please select your preferred language channel at this time. And a few more items of note. We'll be opening up the chat feature for five minutes at the end of each agenda item to invite written public comment. During the final comment period, we will also invite verbal public comment from those here in the physical meeting room as well as those on Zoom. The slides we share today will be posted on the ECPC webpage within the next week. And finally, council members who are on Zoom, the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting law requires you to keep your cameras on at all times during this meeting. If you are unable to use your camera due to

technical difficulties, please let us know. I'll now turn the meeting over to Council Chair Claire Ramsey.

- **Introduce New Council Members**

Claire Ramsey:

Good morning everyone, and hello. And for those on Zoom, welcome. And for those in the room, welcome. We have a really full room this morning, which is just lovely and so nice to see everyone in person. I hope you've all had a lovely summer and a good back to school. Or for all the early providers who didn't get a summer break, I hope you're having a good transition into the fall.

As many of you know, I'm Claire Ramsey. I'm one of the chief deputy directors of the Department of Social Services and the council chair. For roll call, we will have our support team take note of the council members who are in attendance. And I want to start this meeting by welcoming our new appointees to the council and asking if they could briefly introduce themselves. So first I'd like to introduce Liz Simons. Liz, would you like to introduce yourself?

Liz Simons:

Hi, it's such a pleasure to be here and an honor to be invited to this group. I'm chair of the board of the Heising-Simons Foundation, and early childhood education and care is one of our key areas. In fact, one of our oldest areas that we've been supporting since 2008. And I also chair the board of the Marshall Project, which focuses on our justice system. And as I read through the materials, I do think that as we think about all the children in need, the foster care system kids, which feed directly into the justice system, are really key. So I'm really glad to see that. And I'm really excited about all the childcare work that's happening at this level as well. So thank you so much.

Claire Ramsey:

Thank you, Liz. We're happy to have you. And we also have a new member, Wendy Sims-Moten. I'm not sure we're seeing if she's joined the meeting yet, so let me just give a second. Okay, not hearing Wendy come off mute or seeing her on camera. So if she does join later, we will take a pause and let her introduce herself, but we're happy to have Liz and Wendy joining the council.

I also want to acknowledge that Mary Ann Hansen, one of our council members, had to step down due to other obligations. So want to thank Mary Ann, excuse me, for all her service, and we appreciate all the time she gave to this council over the years.

We currently have, just so everyone is aware, three vacancies on the council and three vacancies on the ECPC Parent Advisory Committee. If you would like to apply for one of those appointments, please go to the ECPC website and at the top is a hyperlink on how to apply. And we will also paste that link into the chat. So Diana's going to do that for us. Thank you very much.

Finally, I also wanted to just share that, make sure council members and the public is aware that on August 7th, 2026, the federal government released a notice of proposed rulemaking, sometimes referred to as an NPRM, called, quote, "Reducing Federal Burden for Head Start Programs." We are going to drop the proposed rulemaking into the chat. There'll be a hyperlink. So just for a little context, this proposed rule, so it's not in place yet, would rescind current Head Start program performance standards and replace them with a much shorter version. So for those of you who have already taken a look, it's going from over a hundred page of performance standards to about 12 pages. There is a 60-day comment period where members of the public, organizations, anyone interested is welcome to comment, and that runs through October 6th. And after the comment period closes, the Federal Health and Human Services Agency must review and respond to comments, and then it issues its final rule. Right now, as I mentioned, none of these proposed changes are currently in effect, and so current performance standards and Head Start remain in place.

The Department of Social Services is analyzing the proposed rule, and we're still working to determine the department's next steps in regard to submitting public comment. And again, if you are interested or your organization is interested in submitting public comments, the link will be in the chat. So thank you. And I know that's been a high concern for people, so we just wanted to make sure everyone understood what was happening and had the information on the comment period. And again, the deadline runs through October 6th.

Finally, we just want to note that council members have received a letter from Thriving Families California Foundation, and we just wanted to acknowledge receipt of it as public comment.

- [Review of Agenda](#)

Claire Ramsey:

And with that, I will now turn over to a review of our agenda. And this is where I'm going to go back and forth between no glasses and glasses because I can't read my paper with them on and I can't read the screen with them off. So first, as you can see today, we're going to spend a lot of our focus on providing feedback on the draft council recommendations that our two subcommittees, the Workforce Needs Subcommittee and the Family Access and Federal Policy Subcommittee, have spent a lot of time and thought pulling together. We really want to thank them. I personally want to thank the members of the subcommittee for their time they've invested in driving this process and this work forward. This is a new undertaking for this council and is a lot of work. So just want to thank people.

And specifically on the Workforce Needs Subcommittee, that is Andrea Fernandez Mendoza and Natali. I'm going to say her last name.

Natali Gaxiola:

Gaxiola.

Claire Ramsey:

Gaxiola. I'm sorry, Natali. Thank you for pronouncing it for me. And they're going to go first this morning, and then we're going to be followed by the Family Access and Federal Policy Subcommittee. And want to thank our members, Karla Pleitéz Howell and Sonia Jaramillo, and they will go after, as you can see from the agenda.

Just as a reminder, this is the last council opportunity for major substantive input on these recommendations. At the next council meeting on November 19th, we will actually be conducting the roll call to vote on the recommendation so that they can be packaged up to create the annual report as required by the legislature. We will have one other opportunity for individuals who are advisory committee members. There is a meeting on September 21st from 10:00 to 12:00. It is a joint meeting of both the parent advisory committee and the workforce advisory committee. If council members who are not co-members of the advisory committee want to attend that meeting, they need to do so as members of the public. But of course, as members of the public will have common opportunities as well during public comment period.

And finally, just a reminder about our agenda, we will have our workforce subcommittee discussion. We will then go to our Family Access and Federal Policy Subcommittee, have part of that, take a 10-minute break, and then finish up with the Family Access and Federal Policy discussion, and then finally have public comment at the end, and then we will adjourn no later than noon.

And with that, just a reminder, we always do open up our public comment period at the end of every agenda session. So at the end of this welcome session, we will be opening up public comment. So Karin, I'll turn that over to you.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. At this time, we will open the chat feature for the next five minutes so that the public can provide written comment on the first agenda item. And with that, I will turn it to Andrea and Natali to lead us through agenda item two.

2. Workforce Needs Subcommittee Discussion

- [Presentation by the subcommittee](#)

Natali Gaxiola:

So the draft recommendations that were recommended, so just to recap the data, so at the May 27th ECPC meeting and the June 9th joint meeting of the Workforce Advisory Committee and Parent Advisory Committee, our subcommittee shared the first draft of our council recommendations pertaining to the following ECPC priority in its 2026 to 2027 budget letter. So providing support for children, childcare policy changes that build more resilient ECE ecosystems, prioritize provider-centered fiscal reform that ensures operational stability by moving towards enrollment-based funding models such as an 85% contract earning floor for center-based programs to protect providers from the fiscal shock of fluctuating attendance.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

So the first draft recommendation is to adopt the flex factors to stabilize the contract earning floor. And there were two key points that were edited due to council member feedback at both of those meetings and we made two changes. The first change is we clarified the terminology and replaced childcare providers with center-based programs in the applicable sections to eliminate any confusion, as family childcare homes are already eligible for the maximum certified hours and the flex factor does not pertain to them. The second was to frame recommendation as a short-term bridge, so explicitly designated that flex factor as a short-term temporary stabilization strategy while the state transitions to a permanent rate reform under AB 1981.

Natali Gaxiola:

So draft recommendations, to continue a brief summary of the issue. Historically, childcare programs were paid based on attendance. If a child stayed home from childcare because due to illness or other reasons, the center lost money, but still had to pay fixed operational costs such as the teacher salary, rent, utilities, and other operational expenses. The state previously mitigated this fluctuation to some degree by instituting a 5% flex factor, meaning it would reimburse centers for full contract amount if they've met 95% of their attendance-based journey. The flex factor was specific to center-based programs as family childcare homes were already eligible for the maximum certified hours.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

So to continue, during COVID, the state implemented a hold harmless protection for childcare centers so that contractors could be paid the maximum amount of their contract regardless of attendance to account for the pandemic crisis. This hold harmless protection ended June 30th, 2026. As of July 1st, 2026, the state reimburses childcare centers based on enrollment rather than on daily attendance. However, the enrollment-based reimbursement structure is not accompanied by a flex factor policy to support a contract earning floor.

Natali Gaxiola:

To continue, the state policy shifts to reimburse childcare centers based on the enrollment rather than the daily attendance, with significant milestone in improving the sustainability of childcare provisions in California. Enrollment-based reimbursement provides more predictable revenue streams that doesn't fluctuate weekly. Reliable revenue allows directors to budget for the entire year and set realistic budgets that allow for guaranteed hours and salaried positions which are essential to long-term workforce professionalism.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Many factors prevent childcare center-based programs from achieving full enrollment, including universal transitional kindergarten expansion, declining birth rates, staffing shortages, immigration enforcement, and related fear of accessing subsidized programs. Additionally, many center contractors have only operated under the hold

harmless rules and they are unfamiliar with budgeting or planning for fluctuating enrollment. As a result, a flex factor policy is still needed in the enrollment-based payment structure to support childcare centers, their sustainability, and access. Without this policy change, childcare centers will continue to struggle with unpredictable budgets and loss of staff which can negatively impact families' access to childcare.

Natali Gaxiola:

We urge the legislature and the governor to enact a 15% flex factor policy for center-based contractors, allowing center-based programs that maintain at least 85% of their certified enrollment to be reimbursed at their full contract amount. This serves as a critical short-term stabilization safety net to keep center doors open and retain staff during the transition towards long-term rate reform. This regulatory change will have no state budget impact, and these funds are already allocated within the existing contract allocations.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

So this is where we ask for council feedback. This is the council's last opportunity to offer substantive feedback on this recommendation before voting at the November meeting on its submission to the annual report. So we're asking you to all share your feedback as follows. If anything holds you back from supporting this recommendation, what concerns you and how would you suggest changing it?

- [Council feedback](#)

Karin Bloomer:

I'm happy to help you look for virtual hands from council members and hands in this room as well.

Claire Ramsey:

And I'm just pausing for a second to see if we have anyone in the room. Steve, do you want to start?

Stephen Prophet:

Sure, I'm happy to be the first. So just appreciate the thinking and effort to support programs, particularly during the transition. And so recognizing that, and I think it's important to acknowledge that gaps in enrollment do create gaps in funding, which is challenging for meeting those fixed costs. Fixed costs that happen regardless. Rent is always there. Your facilities expenses are always there. Even things that are more difficult decisions, like variable costs, are difficult if you're not... Anyway, just acknowledging that the expense issue is a real one.

And I think to clarify what I'm saying is I think as a state agency, I'm not in a position to support, but offering some technical assistance. I think one of the things that we think about with this policy is one, it would support programs with those expenses. Has the potential of disincentivizing enrollment beyond that 85% mark, which we think about

what does that mean for family access to CSPP. It's not a given that that would happen, but I think that it's a loophole of sorts.

I think one of the things, as we think about how the limits of reimbursement are applied in, say, preschool, we would offer a suggestion to, instead of saying, I don't know if the language is up there, but right now it says, the end of it says they're reimbursed the full contract amount. We would recommend striking that. And what that would do is that would ensure that contractors are reimbursed for their expenses up to the contract amount. So in the case that expenses are less than the contract amount, we get into a very kind of technical, complicated, if anybody has a CSPP and has a reserve account, you probably know what I'm talking about, so I won't describe it here because it gets really technical.

So we would just suggest removing that, "are reimbursed their full contract amount," and again, that would ensure that contractors are reimbursed for their expenses, which is what this is attempting to address.

Claire Ramsey:

Thanks, Steven. Any questions about that feedback?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

No, I'm just trying to find which line that is.

Stephen Propheter:

It's the very last... I think it ends like if you put a period at certified enrollment and then we're to strike through, "to be reimbursed at their full contract amount." We think that, just under the current limits of reimbursement, that that still ensures that contractors are reimbursed for their expenses, which is what we're trying to achieve with this. I understand we're trying to achieve with the policy.

Claire Ramsey:

Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

I think I noticed that Mary Ignatius has a comment or question.

Mary Ignatius:

It's not in response to Steven's though, so I don't know if we're moving on from that or.

Sonia Jaramillo:

Mine is in regards to that and wondering how do we provide incentives to programs who are aiming for 100% and not limit and have that gap in service? Because if I get it at 85%, then I'll get full reimbursement. How do we provide the services to our families? Are we allowed to provide an incentive if you're fully enrolled, 100% enrolled? I'm just thinking about all those possibilities because as a program, if I get 85%, I'm going to stop recruiting. I'm not saying programs are doing that, but it could potentially happen.

To our families then, how can we work towards 100% enrollment and continue to provide those services and not just say 85% I'll get full reimbursement? It's just something that comes to my mind, and I heard that from families as well.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

If I may, as a contractor, our goal is 100%. I'm in the trenches. Many of my peers have had conversations. It's not that the effort isn't there to enroll, there is no one to enroll. Many of them do not have waitlists. They've tried social media, marketing, people literally out in front of social service agencies handing out flyers, trying to recruit, and especially in highly saturated areas where TK and there's a lot of other services. So it's not that we're not striving for 100 because the point is to earn our full contracts. But there are several barriers. And even more so now, because of immigration, we found a lot of families are not willing to access social services because of the fear that their information is going to be reported elsewhere. And so that is a conversation that we've had when we call families that we have old intakes form and we regularly go through our book just to say, "Hey, are you interested?" "No, we don't want our information shared."

There are many other variables that affect enrollment. One of the things that the state I know has put in place for my contracts, CCRI and CSPP, is that there is a more regular reporting, and so the state will see our attendance numbers and our enrollment numbers and then work with us to improve them. So it's not like in the past where the whole year may have gone by and they didn't know we were not earning. There is an open communication between contractors and their analysts to have them help us reach that full enrollment. And no matter how hard we try, which is something that we've done since even pre-COVID, it's not as easy as it sounds, not to mention with all the extra layers.

Natali Gaxiola:

And if I could add to that, because I think as a teacher in the classroom in a CSPP program, I see all this. I'm also one of the people out in the community recruiting. We saw families, we ask them if they need support and we try to bring them in. But also as a reflective point in classrooms, last year I'm going to say I had 21 kids. This year, I have 12. Well, we're getting two new ones, so 14. And that's when we think of how the program runs. My classroom still runs the same, whether I have 21 kids, whether I have 14. So I think that is something that we understand, the expenses. But in the end, if you want to run a high quality program, the funding is needed one way or another.

And as we're seeing also with the transition, the TK impact, but we're also getting kids with a lot of higher needs. So number of children doesn't necessarily translate to less needs in a classroom. Sometimes the needs are exponentially more in a smaller classroom. So that's just to give my view that not necessarily just numbers always translate to facts and actuals that are happening. So it is very difficult when we go out to the workforce like myself and say, "Well, they're not 100% on it of reimbursing to this

rate because of this, that, and the other." So just so that you know that that's where we are getting the feedback. And as one of the people working directly with children, the challenges is financial in that sense, whether the numbers fluctuate a certain range or not.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Just to piggyback on that, contractors are very new to learning how to enroll to their full potential. It requires planning, it requires being on top of your numbers, projections, and a lot of new contractors that have contracts have never had to fully earn their contracts. So they're coming in at a disadvantage because things that should have been happening all along should have started six months ago. It's not something that they're familiar with, so we're going to see.

And the recommendation is for a short term bridge until we can figure out how the rate reform will be implemented, but also to give people a learning curve because a lot of contractors are not going to be able. They don't understand that, and we've seen that in listening sessions, that there is a misunderstanding of how to earn a contract or how to plan for that. And so that's the point of why we have it phrased this way, because it's not a long-term fix. It's a temporary fix to help contractors stay in business while the rate reform process is happening.

Karin Bloomer:

Andrea, I don't know if we can see from here, but Liz Simons has her hand up. The recording symbol is covering Liz's virtual hand.

Liz Simons:

Oh, thank you for noticing. Yeah. Well, first of all, I think this is a really interesting conversation, and for the record, I support the flex factor idea a lot, and I thought Stephen's point was well taken as well. But also, it seems like as I'm hearing this discussion, I'm hearing that there are factors outside of the control of contractors, and that perhaps there might be attention paid to what are the ameliorating factors that can help the contractors get as much enrollment as possible, and also how do we address some of the factors that are really difficult to address, such as the fear of immigrant families to enroll. I just think we shouldn't put it all on the contractors themselves. We should think about how to support them in getting as many children enrolled as possible.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Thank you.

Mary Ignatius:

Yeah, I think my question is sort of similar or comment is similar to Liz's, does this solve for an inequity? And it sounds like this already exists in family childcare, so this is just making something parity, right? And I would like to know, does this solve for, in any way, if you're not maximizing your contract, then money is getting sent back? And we don't want that happening either. If those are dollars that are allocated to serve more

children to stabilize programs, we should be doing things to keep that. So I was just wondering if that has a impact.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

That would have a direct impact on it because rather than sending the unearned contract money back, it would be used in the contract.

Karin Bloomer:

And subcommittee, I know you have a whole other set of recommendations too.

Claire Ramsey:

So what I would just say is confirming that, it sounds like Steve's comment is sort of under consideration right now, and then we will see the next pass on the language at the meeting on the 19th of November. Okay.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

We also would like to take the feedback from the subcommittee meeting.

Karin Bloomer:

The advisory committees.

Claire Ramsey:

Of course.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

And then also bring that feedback as well.

Claire Ramsey:

Okay.

Mary Ignatius:

I'm sorry. For clarity though, are we saying we are taking Steven's recommendation or are we saying we-

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

It's under consideration.

Mary Ignatius:

It's under consideration. Okay.

Claire Ramsey:

And I would just recommend, if people have very strong feelings in either direction, it is an appropriate thing to say that at this meeting, whether you want to say it in comments verbally or put it in writing, which we will take down from the council members, and then relay that back to both of you so you can take it under consideration.

Mary Ignatius:

I would say I would keep it the way it is, to allow for the flexibility to address what Natali mentioned about special needs children and impact on immigrant families.

Claire Ramsey:

Oh, Steve, did you just want to interrupt?

Stephen Propheter:

Yeah, so just removing the language that I suggested would still do that. And if it's helpful to join, I don't know if it's possible to join a subcommittee after the subcommittee's already been formed. But to have-

Claire Ramsey:

Two is a subcommittee, three is a council meeting.

Stephen Propheter:

Got it. Okay. Okay. Okay.

Claire Ramsey:

When we have that problem, we tip over, but...

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

We can have a conversation. Okay.

Claire Ramsey:

Can Steve provide the council with what he's talking about in writing so that at least Natali and Andrea can look at it and see what is being flagged?

Karin Bloomer:

It's a good question. I think as long as we post it on the webpage.

Claire Ramsey:

So that would be really helpful.

Stephen Propheter:

Okay, thanks.

Karin Bloomer:

Right. Thank you. And subcommittee members and council members, it's important that you don't respond back to what he provides. It's one way information sharing that we then make public.

Claire Ramsey:

And do you want to move to your next recommendation?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Yes.

Claire Ramsey:

Yeah, please. And one more page.

Karin Bloomer:

Oh, Sorry. Sorry, I'm just learning as we go. And then it's important to send that technical explanation to the ecpc@dss.ca.gov inbox and not to the council because that's where we get into some trouble with responses. And I'm happy to clarify that again later.

Stephen Propheter:

Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you.

Mary Ignatius:

Thanks everyone.

Tony Jordan:

I had a comment. I don't know if my hand raised is showing.

Karin Bloomer:

Oh, sorry, Tony.

Tony Jordan:

I put a couple comments in the chat just so you have it in writing, but if I'm understanding Steve's comment right, it's correctly, the last paragraph under draft recommendations, third line down, I think. What I understood was eliminating at their full contract amount, eliminating that clause of that sentence. So I think that's what was being considered.

I'd like to suggest going in a different direction. The reserve accounts have always been somewhat of a confusing component out in the field. And I think as we look at this potential for a 15% flex factor on enrollment, knowing that volatility exists and knowing that there are things beyond our control that happen at the local level, to me, what would best serve local communities and allow even more flexibility at the local level and not cost the state any more funding is if contractors meet that minimum enrollment threshold and their expenses are less than the MRA, it would seem supportive to local contractors to have the balance automatically transferred to the local reserve account.

And there's not a lot of meat on the bones there, but any little bit helps to have a local rainy day fund, especially considering that we would have that minimum. If this were to come to fruition, we would have that minimum contract earnings in place with that 15% flex factor. And I think that would better serve local communities to have almost

instantaneous impact reserve accounts established and increased through that kind of mechanism versus the way it's done now is convoluted. There's a lot of back and forths, and I think we have an opportunity here to better support local communities and contractors with the reserve account.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Tony, you have a clarifying question. What do you mean by local? Are you specifically referring to each contractor and the amount in their contract that is eligible for transfer into the reserve?

Tony Jordan:

Yes.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Into a pot, for example, Los Angeles County.

Tony Jordan:

Yeah, each contractor has available to them through, again, like Steve had mentioned, it can be confusing, convoluted process, but we have opportunities for putting dollars into our reserve accounts at the end of the school year. I'm just saying, make that a little bit more conducive and flexible to local contractors with the advent potential of this 15% flex factor. So if you hit your 85% enrollment threshold, and let's say you only spend 95% of your MRA, I'm saying that 5% difference between your expense and your MRA, have that automatically transferred into the reserve account, does a few things. It reduces the whole convolutedness about how the reserve accounts work and when dollars go in and when they don't.

And it helps establish a little bit more flexibility and a rainy day type fund at the local level for contractors. And it doesn't cost the state any more dollars because the MRAs had already been allocated out. That's what I'm trying to say.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

My concern is that it's a mandatory. That is a currently allowable option in contractors' financial workings, but to make it a mandatory might tie the hands of contractors who some spend their full potential, some invest it back in their staff. And so that's my concern. I don't know if anybody else has a concern with that.

Tony Jordan:

I'm not understanding your concern. The dollars in reserve accounts are always available to put back into the program, but when the state swoops them up, they're not available at the local level. So I'm trying to simplify the process by which those dollars can stay local and be put into reserve accounts a little bit more seamlessly.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Thank you for your clarification.

Tony Jordan:

And then earlier in my chat, I had also said, do we need any carve out language on the section under the brief summary where it said family childcare homes already eligible for maximum certified hours? Do we need some carve out language for the family childcare home networks, either the direct education network funding or the networks that are funded through CCTR and CSPP? Yeah, just put that back to the committee. I'm not sure if any carve out language for clarification would be needed in that section for those contract types.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

This recommendation is specific to center-based contractors, and we have made those changes rather than label it as childcare programs to be specific to center-based so that it would not affect family childcare homes. So I'm not sure if that's further needed in this section. Does anyone have any strong feelings?

Mary Ignatius:

You're saying it already captures networks?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

That was a clarification we made several iterations ago.

Claire Ramsey:

And I'll just say that I don't know if that's a technical assistance point about whether the FCCHENS will fall under a...

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

They already have their protections specifically to center-based programs.

Claire Ramsey:

Okay. Thank you.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

We have a lot to cover.

Claire Ramsey:

Appreciate that, and thank you for all the feedback on that. Lynn, go ahead and we can move on to your next recommendation. Oh, sorry, Steve.

Stephen Prophet:

Just I'll be super quick. Technical, again, not taking a position, support or against. Just to Tony's point, if we did not strike the language, the funding would go into the reserve account, to Tony's point. So just wanted to acknowledge that. It is technical, it can be a challenge, but again, not expressing a position either way, just technically that is what would happen.

- [Presentation by the subcommittee \(continued\)](#)

Natali Gaxiola:

So to continue, the recap of the process to date is that at the May 27th ECPC meeting and the June 9th joint meeting of the Workforce Advisory Committee and Parent Advisory Committee, our subcommittee shared the first draft of the council recommendation pertaining to the following ECP priority in the '26, '27 budget year, and that's funding the rate reform to ensure compensation for true cost of care and at rates reflecting economic realities.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

So the draft recommendations that we took back for advancing the rate reform, so based upon everyone's feedback, we made the following changes to the current draft recommendations. Tribal sovereignty formally recognized the Tribal Childcare Association of California as an active sovereign partner in planning, rate discussions and data collection, base rate enhancement, expand the rate structure to explicitly cover the costs of non-traditional hours, inclusion supports for children with special needs, predictive pay and employee benefits, retirement and health insurance, meaningful collaboration, added language to address the friction among CCPU, the state and stakeholders, ensuring state imposed prerequisites do not impede implementation. And lastly, facilities as a structural barrier. We highlighted the need to address the facilities gap and licensing delays, especially in rural counties.

Natali Gaxiola:

So brief summary of this issue, California is transitioning to a cost-based alternative methodology to set reimbursement rates moving away from price-based regional market rate, which institutionalize race and economic-based inequities. While process has been made, including the right of family childcare providers to unionize and development of cost estimation model, full implementation of the single rate structure is delayed, contingent on budget decisions and expected to take at least two additional years.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

A brief summary of the progress to date, our successes, so you have to highlight those two. Family childcare providers were given the right to unionize and collectively bargain with the state leading to the formation of the childcare providers united. The state has developed the alternative methodology cost model. The state is formally moving towards a single rate structure. The state has provided funding for implementation activities and automation infrastructure. The state extended and expanded the cost of care plus payments, a form of interim financial relief while the state works towards a permanent cost-based reimbursement rate. The state extended policies allowing providers to be reimbursed based on certified enrollment rather than on attendance alone.

Natali Gaxiola:

So to continue, despite the progress, several key issues remain unresolved. Unresolved issues include delays in statewide rate schedules, funding uncertainty, and

disagreements over geographical cost assumptions. Ongoing gaps include the lack of workforce benefit and stability, the lack of structural allowance for retirement, health insurance, and predictive pay for employees in both centers and FCCHS. Tribal exclusions, the state's failure to collect distinct data on and partner with sovereign tribal childcare programs. Facility barriers, severe facility resource limitations and licensing bottlenecks, which prevent providers from competing with public TK expansion. Collaboration gaps. State identified prerequisites for rate reform are increasingly viewed by providers as policy barriers rather than supportive steps.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Our first draft for recommendation consideration is number one, ensure accountability for the implementation timeline. Require CDSS to submit a timeline for transitioning to the new reimbursement rates by January 31st, 2027 and update it annually until rate implementation is complete.

Natali Gaxiola:

Two, ensure consistent and equitable application across the mixed delivery systems. To ensure the shift to a single rate structure delivers on its promise of equity, the implementation plan must ensure equity access provider types. Apply the same cost-based methodology uniformly across center-based and family childcare providers with appropriate structural adjustments. B, incorporate comprehensive base rate enhancements, explicitly design base and enhance rates to cover non-traditional hours, inclusion supports for children with disabilities, predictive pay and benefits, health insurance and retirement.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

C, address infrastructure and facilities, establish a dedicated support mechanism to help providers navigate licensing and overcome facility barriers when expanding or adapting to serve younger age groups, zero to three. D, partner with tribal sovereignties, formally recognize and include the Tribal Childcare Association of California as a distinct partner in state planning, rate negotiations and data collection. E, address other legacy inequities. Ensure the rate setting process accounts for the race and income-based inequities of the legacy of the RMR system. F, keep the model current. Update the cost estimation model regularly to prevent rates from becoming outdated. And G, don't wait to increase rates. Provide immediate interim rate increases to bridge the gap to the true cost of care. So if you notice there's a policy written behind each of the different items, this G would be the one that would affect policy and budget.

Natali Gaxiola:

So two, require transparent, collaborative and honest data in all decisions. Rate and fiscal estimates must be based on actual verifiable cost data rather than deflated or selectively presented figures. Foster active co-design. Address unresolved disagreements transparently. Ensure CDSS actively engages in meaningful ongoing collaboration with CCPU and other ECE stakeholders, ensuring that prerequisites for rate reform serve as building blocks rather than administrative barriers. B, ensure data transparency. Ensure that the methodology is documented clearly enough for

independent review and explicitly communicate any changes in projections or data assumptions.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

So this is where we ask the council, and this is the last opportunity to offer substantive feedback on this recommendation before voting at the November meeting on its submission in the annual report. Please share your feedback as follows. If anything holds you back from supporting this recommendation, what concerns you and how would you suggest changing it?

- [Council feedback](#)

Karin Bloomer:

You've got council member Donna Sneeringer with her hand up.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Go for it, Donna.

Donna Sneeringer:

Hi everybody. Happy Thursday. I thank you all for all of these recommendations and comments, and I know how much time it takes to put these together. I would like to suggest a friendly addition. I think we need to have an active step to consolidate the cost of care plus stipend with the RMR to create a new base rate. Right now we have it split into two buckets. It requires a lot of extra administrative work. It also creates a lot of confusion for providers to have these two separate pieces. And what has ended up happening the past couple of years is when we have a cost of living adjustment, it only goes on the enhanced rate, not on the base. And so I think that there's going to have to be an active step to consolidate what's currently there to ensure that we shore up and have a firm base to grow from rather than having it in two separate buckets the way it currently is. So that would be my ask of an addition.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Thank you, Donna. Anyone else?

Claire Ramsey:

Oh, go ahead. Yep.

Maéva Renaud:

Thank you so much for working on this. I was looking at the A through G recommendations, and I am curious because I understand that right now we have a longer timeline for rate reform, and if G needs to be its own recommendation because the work doesn't stop. And so as we continue to work towards single rate structure, we still need to increase the reimbursement rates. And so as we work through rate reform, I think it is important to make sure that if we're recommending this to our legislature, to make sure that they are also looking at real time needs of the field. So I would recommend separating G from under advanced rate reform to its own recommendation.

Mary Ignatius:

I'm not responding to Maeva, on the sort of data transparency, and I don't have the language that was in there, but the sort of disagreement around it. I think we'd like to see something related to course correction with some transparency when data is shown to be incorrect and then incorrectly applied, that there's some amount of time, 30, 60 days for correction. One of our chapters is in Alameda County and the current calculations put them in a lower cost region, and even with the incorrect data, they would still be in a higher region than they are now. So we need some guarantee, some guarantee that resolution is imminent. And then we also just want to make sure that there's some sort of hold harmless that nobody goes under, goes below, that where people are today is the floor. Yeah, not the ceiling.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

What was already established. Anyone else?

Catherine Brozowski:

I want to really appreciate C, the opportunity to work with facilities and helping around licensing. This bridges also the universal access recommendations that I'm wondering if there could be some streamlined pathways for centers that want to convert classrooms, if there's any opportunity to really simplify that process for those that have been serving preschool age and want to support more infant toddlers. So I don't know if that will fit better here versus in universal access, but to me it's an opportunity.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

Is that Miren's hand up? Forgive me, it's hard for me to see.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

I can't see.

Miren Algorri:

Yes. Thank you, Karin. Maybe this is not the time, and I'm sorry I missed part of the meeting because one of my students, she had vaccines and she's not feeling well, so I had to contact the parents. Anyways, are we having anything included about disaster planning, response or resources for impacted programs providers, or is this not the time to have that conversation? Because I feel that there are so many things that get put on the back burner but are very important so we can continue to serve our communities.

The conversation about the mixed delivery system is something that we need to continue to have and actually have providers that have been told in the past, yes, family childcare providers are a part of the mixed delivery system. I would love to hear what is a mechanism in place for family childcare providers to be a part of the mixed delivery

system because we're told that we're a part of it and yet we don't find the mechanism, the platform for providers to actually be a part of it. So thank you for that.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Thank you. I will look and see where and have a conversation on where we might be able to fit in the disaster. I'm thinking probably C, under infrastructure and facilities, but we'll take that comment back and look at how it could be addressed if we're able to.

Miren Algorri:

Thank you. Because we have providers who haven't been able to reopen their homes after they were affected by the fires. We have providers like myself who were affected by the floods back in January last year. So I think it's important to keep that in mind as we think about expansion. What about supporting the programs that are currently open or have not been able to reopen because they have been affected by these natural disasters? Thank you.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Thank you. Anyone else? Yes.

Tonia McMillian:

So there is definitely some overreach with AB 150, and so what's going to happen there?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

So that I know, and maybe someone from administration would be able to comment on that. That was a surprise to a lot of people. Usually when trailer bill language comes, there are the offices that get to see it before it goes out. That was not the case this time.

So I know that there is advocacy as well as administrative action happening to deconstruct what that means for programs because that specifically addresses disasters. So I know that there are things happening behind the scenes to get us that information and figure out what it actually means for providers. But yeah, that was a surprise to a lot of us.

Tonia McMillian:

So you're just waiting to get?

Claire Ramsey:

Oh, I'm sorry, Tonia, go ahead and finish.

Tonia McMillian:

You're just waiting to get more?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

We're waiting to find out how it's going to be implemented.

Claire Ramsey:

And I'm sorry, I'm not sure it's clear what you're referring to.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

AB150.

Claire Ramsey:

No, no, I know, but what provisions in the trailer bill?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

The requirements for facilities to have various trainings and planning in place that would cost significant amount of time.

Claire Ramsey:

Thank you. Okay. Thank you for clarifying.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Anyone else? Okay, so our next... not seeing any, I'm going to move on. And Natali?

Natali Gaxiola:

So our next steps is September 1st, there's a joint meeting with the workforce committee and parent advisory committee. Share current draft content for feedback, and then at the November 19th council meeting, seek a council vote on recommendations.

Catherine Brozowski:

Could you provide guidance around the protocol and those joint workforce and parent advisory committee meetings.

Claire Ramsey:

Sure. Yeah, thanks for asking. So they are open meetings, so basically anyone is allowed to attend as a member of the public. Only advisory committee members are formally on the advisory committee providing feedback as committee members in that setting. But if any council members who are not... We have some dual members, but for anyone who's not a dual member, if you want to join as member of the public and then provide feedback during that session in the public comment time period, you're welcome to do it.

And the only thing I would just clarify is you can identify yourself as a member of the council, but it's not quite the same as our open council meeting here where you're having the back and forth. It would be sort of submission as a piece of public comment, and then it would just be like, thank you, and there wouldn't necessarily be a dialogue on it or a back and forth or even questions answered the way we handle public comment at open meetings like this. Yeah, sure, of course.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Just to close out, we will be taking back the public comments that are in the chat, council members' comments, and incorporate that into the revisions that we will be making in our recommendations. And thank you all for your time and for your commitment to children and families and your participation in giving us this feedback.

Claire Ramsey:

And sorry, we were just conferring to say if there are technical amendments that people are proposing that are more hard to convey verbally, but you have a language suggestion, as we mentioned to Steve, you can submit it through the council box, but just to be very clear, it's not going to receive back and forth on it, and it would just be for consideration of the subcommittee as they're doing any drafting updates based on the feedback they received today. So just want to say that this is a hard way to receive, I know, the feedback, and if there are really technical fixes that people are asking for, language changes that are hard to convey in the meeting, please submit them through the box, but only for consideration and they will not receive a reply because then we are violating open meeting rules.

Karin Bloomer:

And Claire, is it fair to say it's really explaining something that was shared here, explaining it? It's no new suggestions because there's no deliberative opportunity for back and forth on that, but an explanation of something that was described verbally here today.

Claire Ramsey:

Right, that would be right. So if you've mentioned something here today and want to provide written feedback toward an edit, you can send it to the box, but if you have something you want to say now, this is the time to say it. So if you have a feedback, even if you're just saying you're thinking on it, even if you don't have a suggestion, this is the moment for it. And I'm just giving a minute to see if there's any other hands raised online or any other hand raised in the room.

Mary Ignatius:

Well, I mean, I feel so much pressure to say something now.

Claire Ramsey:

It was a setup, Mary.

Mary Ignatius:

I took the bait. Again, speaking for our chapter in Alameda that's having a hard time with this data issue around the regions, I also think we need the department to acknowledge, recognize that the data could potentially be wrong, because in order to then fix it, someone has to take accountability, and this all happened through negotiations, and things get locked in.

And so we just need to understand what is the role of the state to when it's presented that there is an error or something was overlooked or whatever the case may be, what

is the role to repair that and to resolve it? And on top of a period of time, we also just need to understand what. If it's transparently being shown that it's incorrect, then yeah, it's the repair.

Claire Ramsey:

Yeah, just acknowledging Mary's request on the administration, specifically on CDSS, and then just also reminding everyone that there is a mechanism to update the alternative methodology every three years. And so it is in process to be updated now and will be released. It's July 1st, 2027.

Mary Ignatius:

And that happens through the state plan?

Claire Ramsey:

It is submitted through the... It's parallel. Thank you. I have my technical assistance guru in the background.

Mary Ignatius:

Yeah. Okay. And then if something comes up within those three years, how do you resolve it? I mean, we can't wait another three years if this is funding to keep doors open, this is funding to expand, we need some protections.

Claire Ramsey:

Thanks, Mary.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

[inaudible 01:01:34], Donna?

Donna Sneeringer:

I just want to echo what Mary's comments were, and I share the concerns about Alameda County, but I would also say there's concerns about how much of the state was put into the lowest cost tier. I think we live in a large, complex, socioeconomically diverse state, and even within counties, there are variations, but having been part of numerous reimbursement rate reform work groups over the last 15 years, I've never seen it fall out the way it fell out in this survey.

And I think that there was a clear cost containment effort, and the lack of transparency is problematic. As Mary said, I want to go on record because if we have to say it now or forever hold our peace, I want to make sure I say it, and just really am concerned about how this was divided up, and we have weighed in with those concerns and they fell on deaf ears. And so I think it's important that the council really hold firm on the fact that there needs to be enough transparency that people can believe and feel good about how the divisions are set.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Thank you, Donna.

Claire Ramsey:

Any other last comments? I'm impressed we're actually ahead of schedule right now, so.

Karin Bloomer:

We're right on schedule.

Claire Ramsey:

Oh, just kidding.

Karin keeps me honest all the time. Oh, I'm sorry. And Wendy. Oh, great. And I wanted to say, I apologize, Wendy initially came in as a member of the public before we could move her over, which is why she wasn't able to come off mute. Wendy, welcome to the council. Do you want to introduce yourself as well as provide your comment?

- [Introduce New Council Member](#)

Wendy Sims-Moten:

Yes. Wendy Sims-Moten, so glad to be here through technology on the East Coast and participating on the West Coast, so try to make sure that three hour difference is there. I'm so happy to be a part of this council, and I've really been learning a lot in this discussion and hearing this and fully understanding it. As being part of First Five, sometimes we're directly involved, sometimes we're not.

And so this is an opportunity to see how we can work together, particularly around TK transition and the rates, and what does that look like across our systems to ensure that the best care that we can provide for both our childcare providers and certainly the families and children that we serve. So I'm grateful to be here, and hopefully at some point get to meet each of you. And so I just have appreciated the conversation today. So again, I apologize for the technical part. I was here, I was here. I couldn't see. And to say hello to my counterpart, Santa Barbara Catherine, I think I see you in the room. So yeah. Okay.

Claire Ramsey:

Thanks, Wendy. Anything else you wanted to add to the recommendations portion? Just want to make sure I get you your whole comment time.

Wendy Sims-Moten:

I really just appreciated the discussion and certainly the add-ins as to how to correct it and make it make more sense. And I appreciate, too, the point about the urgency to make sure that we are looking at the rate exchange timely and not having to wait for so long. How do we keep that as a evolving as opposed to seemingly once upon a time in three years? I don't know how we look at that process, but I think just hearing the conversation and hearing the conversation locally about how we look at that a little bit more often than just three years. And again, I'm coming in new to this, but just hearing

the conversation both here in this conversation today as well as local conversations that I've been a part of in our county as well. So I appreciate all the work that it takes to do that, and certainly appreciate the work of the committees trying to get that done and capture all, what we're all trying to say.

Claire Ramsey:

Thank you very much, Wendy, and welcome again to the council. We're happy to have you. Thank you. Okay, with that, thank you. I think it's very clear from the presentation how much work Andrea and Natalie put into this, how much of their thought, time, expertise, and we really want to thank them for that. As mentioned before, this will also be presented at the Workforce and Parent Joint Advisory Committee meeting, which will provide the advisory committee members a chance also to weigh in on these recommendations. That's September 21st from 10:00 to noon. And then our next council meeting on November 19th, we will be voting on the recommendations so that they can go into the annual report. With that, let me turn it over to Karin so we can open our next section to public comment.

3. Family Access and Federal Policy Subcommittee Discussion

- [Presentation by the subcommittee](#)

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you, Claire. Yeah, so because we've just concluded that agenda item, we'll open up the chat feature now for written public comment and we will keep that chat open for 10 minutes so that the public can provide feedback on that most recent item. While that happens, we'll move on to agenda item three, which is the Family Access and Federal Policy Subcommittee discussion. And then just as a reminder, during that segment, we'll keep our eye on the time for our 10-minute break, we think around 10:45. Claire can kind of read the room in terms of when the right pause is for that. And we'll turn it over to Carla and Sonia.

Sonia Jaramillo:

Hello everyone. Well, that's going to be a hard one to follow. With all that great information and the support for our families and the programs, we do see the gaps and I'm happy to see those addressed on these proposals. And walking into our section, I would like to introduce myself, Sonia Jaramillo, and I'm here with Karla and she'll have an opportunity to introduce herself. But I want to thank you for the opportunity to be part of today's conversations, and I'm pleased to introduce the work before us as we continue developing the subcommittee's contribution to the Early Childhood Policy Council's 2026 recommendations. Our role today is to help ensure that those recommendations are thoughtful, responsive, and grounded in what California's children and families are experiencing. As you may recall, the full council identified five priority topics from the ECPC's 26-27 budget priorities letter and divided those topics across the two subcommittees to minimize duplication and allow us to go deeper into each one of the areas.

Our particular focus is family access and the risks created by the shifted federal policy and landscape. As you can see on the slide, you have the tasks, the principles to guide the review, and they're all grounded in the existing work.

As we approach this work, the three principles mentioned guided our review. First, build on existing leadership. There is already tremendous work being done by families, advocates, providers, researchers, and community organizations, and our goal is not to reinvent the work, but to recognize it and build upon it and elevate what we have already here and what we're learning.

Second, respond to family realities. Families are navigating significant unknowns from changes in federal policy and threats and safety net programs to housing instability and immigration related concerns. These issues can directly affect the family's ability to access early learning and care and other essential supports, and we heard from the presentation those issues and how it impacts enrollment and the reimbursements, and third, draw on our collective expertise and this council brings together professional knowledge, community experience, policy expertise, and personal experience. All of you have a lot of wealth and knowledge that we want to hear as you continue to provide that input that we must need. We want our recommendations to reflect that collective perspective.

We move into the next slide. To ground our work, we reviewed public comment and stakeholder input shared through these meetings, historical ECPC annual reports, the master plan for early learning care, and the Assembly Blue Ribbon Commission report. We also consider materials from providers and workforce organizations, equity focused early childhood organizations, research and policy institutes, and national early childhood policy and advocacy organizations.

This has been an intentional process. We began with a discussion with the Early Childhood Policy Council on the May 27 meeting, followed by a joint Parent Advisory Council and the Workforce Advisory Council meetings discussion on the June 9th meeting. From June through August, we continue reviewing the research recommendations and previous council discussions that could inform our work. Slide three, please, and today is another important step, and that's why we're here. Our goal is not necessarily to reach perfection into the recommendations that we get today, but our goal is to mature alignment. We want to identify where there is unity and share understanding, answer questions, and clarify the proposed recommendations, hear additions or proposed changes and identify any areas where we need additional information or further discussion.

Following today's discussion and public comment, the next draft will come from back to the Parent Advisory Council and the Workforce Advisory Council on September 21st, and we anticipate bringing the final recommendations to the full policy council for approval of November 19th.

So as we begin today, I encourage us to think not only about what we believe should be recommended, but also about what families need, what is actionable, and what California can do to strengthen access and stability during a time of significant change. What do your families need and how can this proposal support those needs? As this proposal is presented, we look forward to hearing everyone's perspectives and continuing these important conversations together, and I'm going to pass the stage to Karla, who will take the next step to share the critical information that we have for you. Thank you.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Thank you, Sonia. I am Karla Pleitéz Howell. For those that I haven't had a chance to meet, I started my career as a poverty law attorney and really focused on providing legal advice to childcare providers. I had the great privilege of working at CDSS with Lupe, and now I work at First 5 LA, and Sonia and I have been in a lot of discussions of what opportunity is before us given AB 563.

AB 563 is our task here, and the legislature has given us the task of looking at workforce, which, phenomenal job with the previous presentation, facilities and access. We are really focused on access in this proposal, and before I jump in, I also want to share that Nancy Strohl will be joining in the conversation. We'll share more. Many of you know Nancy with her leadership in the Blue Ribbon Commission and lots of other content and expertise in early care and education, and we thought it was really, really important to look at the history of recommendations that all of us have given in decades past, and I really want to emphasize, we are not bringing something new to the council, new recommendations. These are recommendations that exist.

What we wanted to do with this recommendation is really take a step back. If we are being asked for access, what we often have heard is we are building access at a piecemeal during the last 10, 20 years, and we wanted to take a step back and say, do we really have to do it that way? Is that what we want to propose to the legislature? So this time around, the proposal is really about imagining the future that Sonia just mentioned, where a California, where we see anyone that is looking to bring a baby into this world doesn't have to think about what's going to happen, where is this child going to be taken care of if there are other things that a family needs to consider.

So that's where our intent and proposal's coming from, and we really wanted to imagine a California where access to childcare is not determined by zip code, where access is not determined by your income, your language you speak, disabilities that might exist, but it is really a California that provides universal access for all, and we start with those furthest from opportunity.

So that's the future proposal that we are building towards, and if we go to slide four, we're going to spend a lot of time on slide four, because we want to give you some information about where we're starting from, and we want to be really clear. All of us know we are not starting from zero. The previous work group, really subcommittee

really emphasized where there has been tremendous progress, and for us, it was really important.

At the bottom of this slide, do you see the foundation? And for us, it was really important to review work from the last few decades. We know California has made significant progress. We have four-year-olds TK enrollment that's reaching 62%. When I started, that seemed really impossible. That seemed like a task that we would not be able to get to. For three-year-olds, we have publicly funded early care and education that reaches approximately 25%, and for children under three, the period when development is happening at the most rapid pace, we have access that still remains below 20%, and some of this data is to share the two stories that are happening in California right now. There is the really, really hopeful story where California has demonstrated that if we make a public commitment and say things out loud and make the goal really clear, we can accomplish, we can really dramatically expand access, and the other story is that there are some young kids and families that will always be just a little further behind if we do not pay attention to it.

So we know that age matters, we know geography matters, income matters, race and inequity. We know that these things matter, and the proposal today is really how do we pay more attention to that so that when we talk about universal access, we don't leave some of our families and children behind.

So that is the problem we are trying to solve with this proposal, and I really want to emphasize that foundation on the slide in front of you. This is coming from decades of research, and this is why we're really, really lucky to have Nancy Strohl here to provide us with an overview. We've had these discussions before, and we have created really tremendous plans and proposals.

So this proposal really builds on that strong foundation. There's a distinction I want to make. The Assembly Blue Ribbon Commission, which Nancy facilitated on behalf of the state, was really meant to inform our legislative body. It was recommendations. It was a legislative-led process. We looked at the master plan. The master plan for early learning and care was built for the governor's administration, and here's the uniqueness about ECPC. ECPC has continued that work, has reviewed that work, but with this new legislation that Corey Jackson has led and is asking for these proposals, we're mirroring that information. This is information that's supposed to inform the legislator to the governor, and we think that's a really tremendous opportunity, and I want to name something really, really clearly as well.

Our administration is going to change. We have a new governor that is coming in and may not know as much about early care and education. So naming a foundation that's coming from decades of research... Not saying, "Here's the one plan that we have to move forward," but rather, "Here's what all the folks in this room, all the folks that are not represented in this room have been working on for decades," and being able to show, we don't lack recommendations.

What we want to make sure is that we're really clear about the direction we're going into. So I think we're in a really unique opportunity as ECPC to help inform that accumulated knowledge and be really explicit about the destination we want for children as we move forward.

So with all of that, I want to explain this slide. This slide gives you a summary of the comprehensive proposal you all received, and the proposal really has five major components to it. The first is adopting the goal. What is it that we're really saying California is going to build on behalf of families and children, especially around access? So that's question number one, what is our goal for this group? What's our north star? The second is targeted universalism. We propose a framework that says let's start with children furthest from opportunity as we build that universal goal.

The universal goal we are naming for the group, and we will have discussions about this, is the very top half. We believe that by 2034, every child in California should have access to birth to five services, and that needs to be culturally affirming and it needs to meet family needs. We believe that is possible, and we think that paid family leave needs to be a component of it, and that's the goal one, the sort of stake on the ground. Step two is targeted universalism. Through Nancy's work during the Blue Ribbon Commission, members in this very room introduced targeted universalism. It wasn't adopted in other plans. It was discussed during that time, and we think that it's an opportunity to say we're really going to start with families and children that are furthest behind.

Step three in the proposal, or category three, is what we just talked about with the workforce group. If we don't have measurable milestones, we keep on pushing things down the line and don't focus on it as needed. So the proposal offers concrete three phases. I will share here with all of you, what you have in the proposal might not be the exact right ones. We wanted to offer something as food for thought for the group, and we think that's where we really need to spend more time. How will we know these spaces will actually get us to our universal goal of access for all?

Category four are things that we could really do now, 2027, and proposals that get us closer to this, and then lastly, it's been really interesting to hear the dialogue here about accountability, data, and we live in a world where artificial intelligence makes this so much easier than it ever was before, and data collection gives us... We measure what we treasure and we'll be able to see where have we actually made progress or not. So the proposal gives a lot of that information.

We wanted to give you the overview of the proposal as a whole for universal childcare, but before we jump in to the specific recommendations and milestones, we want to make sure that we ground ourselves on two really critical components. One, can this group agree on the universal goal? Can we say, yes, we are putting a stake on the ground that every child deserves access to early care and education learning? And then two, do we believe the framework of targeted universalism starting from those furthest from opportunity?

With that grounding, we can have discussions about measurable milestones, sort of buckets three, four, and five. So with that, those two first buckets, let me arrive at the first decision point and let's start with the goal. The goal is right in front of you, it is the proposal. By 2034, we will have universal access to early care and education that's culturally affirming, that meets families' needs, and with paid family leave supporting families from the very beginning.

So the universal goal, the first question to you all, before we get to the recommendations and milestones is do we support a universal goal with this committee? And if there is something you need to strengthen or clarify that goal, we would love to hear that. So with that, let me open up the first question, and we'll stay on this slide.

- [Council feedback](#)

Claire Ramsey:

And right now, we can't see.
I don't see any hands up. Do you?

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. Thanks for changing the screen.

Claire Ramsey:

Thank you. Liz, please.

Liz Simons:

Yeah, I would love to hear just a description of what we mean by culturally affirming, and I'm especially curious if that includes language, diversity, linguistic support for families and children.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

I so appreciate that question, Liz. So the state has actually not defined culturally affirming. I will share CDE and CDSS have put out really tremendous documents that give us a general definition for it. In the document, we provide two sort of steps for that. One, we provide a definition that takes CDE and CDSS information, and yes, includes all the things that you have named, and then secondly, during the Act Now phase, we provide an overview of actually adopting one on behalf of the state. So we provide a recommendation, and in the document, you would find that on page...

I want to say page two. Let me double check, and I could read it out loud for the record, if that is helpful.

No, it is not page two.

Mary Ignatius:

Is the document linked on the site?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes. Yes, correct?

Karin Bloomer:

No, not yet. No.

The materials for today will be posted within the next week, but it's in your inbox.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

I'm sorry. The document was emailed, and it is on page six, Liz,

Nancy Strohl:

And then the actions is on page nine. So the foundation of the definition, what are the three foundations to make this work is on page six of the document, and then under the actions, the fifth action that's immediate the first year is the documentary definition of page nine.

Liz Simons:

Thank you. Thank you. I should have seen that. Sorry.

Nancy Strohl:

Oh, no.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

And Wendy?

Wendy Sims-Moten:

Good morning. Just have a quick question. I really appreciate this as we're starting to look at the targeted universalism. I really appreciate it, but by 2034, is that across all, or have you worked with other agencies who are also trying to make sure that birth through five have early care and education needs, their needs met? So I'm just wondering, is it just us, or is it along with other folks perhaps we have met, and then this is somewhere in the middle that we're all moving toward all those that support families and children, are we all moving toward this 2034 goal?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah, and Nancy will respond, Wendy.

Nancy Strohl:

I think part of the 2034 goal is it coincidentally is the eight years of a governor's administration.

Mary Ignatius:

Okay. It's coincidence.

Nancy Strohl:

Coincidentally. So it's not at this point, but certainly the spirit of both recommendations taken together when we get to the safety net and all the discussions we've had is for this to be integrated, and I think one thing that has moved forward incredibly in my decades doing this is the fact that this is seen as integrated today in a much stronger way than it has before. So that would be the intent. I don't know of other health or nutrition or foster care timelines that are 2034, but certainly would be the intent that that would be the case.

Wendy Sims-Moten:

Appreciate that. Thank you so much.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes, Donna.

Donna Sneeringer:

Again, thank you to everyone who worked on this, and appreciate bringing back the recommendations that were involved in the Blue Ribbon Commission. In all of my years working in this field, that was the most universally agreed upon document. I think it's a good place to go. Appreciate the North Star and the reemergence of targeted universalism as we get there, and I do think sequencing is going to matter, and as we get further into the next administration, start to understand financial realities in the state, what might be possible, making sure that the investments that we make also don't disrupt what's currently there. I think we've seen a lot of times where we'll invest in one thing heavily and it disrupts other pieces. So I think that the idea of targeted universalism and having a strategy of how to get there is really prudent. So I just really appreciate this work.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Donna, really appreciate that and sounds like support or universal. All you are lifting up during bucket three on the slides that you were saying are the exact type of discussions that need to be had and making clear that this is not a blueprint that lays out the next few years and gives exact milestones, but rather it is having those discussions here if we have agreement on that universal goal, and then bringing it to the room, Tonia and then Mary.

Tonia McMillian:

Yeah, I appreciate what Donna just shared and you just made me think, and I love you so much, Karla and Nancy, because yes, we don't want to reinvent the wheel because we already reinvented the wheel with the Blue Ribbon recommendations, but it just made me think of Dr. King did a sermon called a drum major instinct, and in that it says that he says, he preached that there was one group leading the way when it should be all of us leading the way because the goal has already been set. There's many pathways for us to reach that goal, and so I really appreciate this conversation right now. We don't need the drum major instinct in this work.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah. Responding to that, so Tonia, a lot of looking at this was looking at some of the civil rights movement, and Dr. King was really clear about what is it that we're actually striving for? And we've all read his I Have a Dream speech, and it was clear about the world he was imagining. So the civil rights movement really does have a lot embedded in this, and there's something about us not putting a stake on the ground of why can't we ask for universal access for our families? And I will share, all of us are in conversations with different folks, and this isn't our zygotes. People are asking for this, but there's something that's stopping us in saying it. So this group taking a stance and saying, "Yes, that is a direction," and it isn't one person leading it. It does require all of us, and that's why the foundation is really critical.

This isn't coming from one group. It came from a lot of individuals that have been built, but if we're not united in the goal that we're all striving towards, then we're sort of going in different directions. So I really appreciate your comment. Mary?

Mary Ignatius:

Okay. Going back to the pressure I'm feeling about it all being said now, do you want me to just respond to... Are we yes on universal care?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

We're on one and making sure that if there's no objections to a universal goal or ways to strengthen it, we will move to two, and Nancy will lead that. So are you on two?

Mary Ignatius:

I have seven points that probably cross all of them. You tell me when you want to bring me in.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Actually, so maybe if you lay them out and then we could share... Okay, we'll bring it up during this time.

Mary Ignatius:

Sure. Okay.

One. When we get really specific on 200,044K, I was looking at the statute. The statute actually says 206,800. I want every single one of those. So I don't know if it's too... At minimum, the floor should be what was promised, the full commitment, but just every space matters. Two, I think however this gets submitted to the legislature, that we have a preamble around racial equity, the harm that this system, that this is an opportunity to really repair the damage that has fell upon BIPOC families and early educators, and this is the response to that, and that we need to be moving both rates and access simultaneously, that this one for one or "I can only do this now," but then you have to wait and then, "Oh, I'll do yours next and then you have to wait," it makes no sense. It's not how families or early educators operate. It's not what children need.

So a real statement on that. I know the purpose of the ECPC is zero to five, but again, families and early educators don't stop caring after that. So what is the sort of bridge to the full system of service through 13 or an acknowledgement that we have to be serving whole families, so some sort of relationship to that.

Okay, I'm going to go back to that. Something around also declaring and universal that we're talking about no means testing, that there's no, "How many hours are you working? How many school hours are you doing?" That we're not chasing people's need, because it should... Just like K through 12, just like TK, you shouldn't have to prove why you need care. This is the right of the child to access it.

Anything around simplifying the process to apply, to maintain your subsidy, to speak to other data systems, to alleviate the need to reproduce paperwork and reproduce things that the state of California should already have access to in some way. So I don't know if it's... I don't know, automatic eligibility, the presumptive eligibility, something to stop that madness. I think similarly in the rates section that really calls out tribal consultation. We were in a meeting yesterday, and I know there's just nuances between tribal TANF and non-tribal TANF and how families, depending on the community they are in, which one they can access, and I don't pretend to be the expert in any way, shape or form. So whatever to call out, again, parity or true access... Formerly incarcerated, I didn't see named.

Another thing around foster care, again, from history, in 1971, 72, when we could have gotten universal childcare, in lieu of that veto, we got the abuse and prevention in child welfare, and in 2024, California's reached 93% of cases are neglect, and it's around poverty and the inability to raise a family and afford what they need, and so how do we also just make that declaration that we're trying to provide something to families before the government separates them, and that we're not just putting the resource like, "Okay, I can't afford childcare. I can't afford my rent. I'm now at risk of losing my child. That child's going to go to a resource family in the foster care system, and now they've left their community, they've left their culture, they've left their language."

So we need some just language around that, and I don't know if this counts here, but again, pressure to say it before I. This ECPC parent advisory group process, the link on the site is to a Google form that provides four links to four different applications that are very difficult, and I remember when we had gone through the process in the very beginning to get parents through it, we had to write up a whole instruction manual on how to do it, and I don't think it should be on the parents to figure this out. If we're truly committed to those who are furthest away from the door to access this universal program, what can the ECPC do to adapt and adjust processes so that maybe Karen can do an interview over the phone and it's like one form, and then that form gets distributed across the speaker, the Senate, the governor, or it's on me and Parent Voices to spend hours in supporting parents to do something that is supposed to be set up for them, but there's tons of barriers.

So any way to simplify or add in that there's a commitment that we do the work, but we as a collective we, not a Mary we, but how do we collectively really make this space open to parents who have the hardest barriers and largest barriers?

Can any of this be done without legislative intent? Are these administrative changes across both or all of the recommendations that can just be done in-house that doesn't need a whole legislative process? And then lastly, so I don't forever hold my peace, we would love to see Parent Voices listed as a consultation partner as well on the access side, because we do have the parents, we are working with the department to create a parent advisory group. Things that come out of here can also go to them until we fix this parent subcommittee long process vacancy, thank you, for vacancies. That's crazy. So I think that's all.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Incredibly, incredibly helpful, and Mary, I want to take the right read on this. Yes to getting to universal, yes to targeted, and there are concrete things we have to address and noted those, and on the Parent Advisory public comment and a way of weaving it in to the recommendation that makes it easier for individuals participating, very, very helpful. I think that completely strengthens the proposal here, and a lot of that is missing, so we'll make sure to look at incorporation unless there's any add-ons to Mary's information, but yes.

Claire Ramsey:

I don't have an add-in. I was going to say, if that's a good 10-minute break point, we're right about 10:45. So thinking maybe we could-

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah, because targeted universalism is coming up, I just want to do a temperature check for one and if it's okay to do a temperature check before on one, let's see, if we could do a temperature check of anyone that's no on universal goal, sort of thumbs down would be helpful.

Claire Ramsey:

Just looking online, and I believe in your... I'm just trying to remember how to use Zoom, those features on Zoom. There should be a way in which, council members only, just to be clear, can express those kind of ...

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

I'm not seeing-

Claire Ramsey:

But I'm not seeing-

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Okay. If we could see.

Catherine Brozowski:

I have one more comment.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes, yes. Thank you.

Catherine Brozowski:

Can I answer your question?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Of course.

Catherine Brozowski:

So to me, just one other thing that would strengthen this aspirational plan, is more around the costs. Like really, what is it that we are asking for? To know how realistic is this?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes.

Catherine Brozowski:

Because if the costs are so, so massive-

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah.

Catherine Brozowski:

... the whole concept then gets cracked.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah, so Catherine, I really appreciate this coming up. In section three, there is a whole funding assessment and analysis. And there is two aspects to it. One is, what kids are we talking about? The data part that we've talked about as the group. And then there's got to be a proposal. The goal is, if this is where we're moving towards, then figuring out here is milestones and the funding costs. So I have included some of that.

And then a temperature check then on thumbs up for those that approve the universal goal. Okay. Seeing thumbs up around the room. Administration is holding back. I completely understand that. Okay. So ending part one with the universal goal, we'll come back with that proposal. And then the targeted universalism, do you want to cover-

Nancy Strohl:

I think it'd be more logical if we just take a brief time to do that. So the two main overarching points. What do you want to pick?

Claire Ramsey:

Let's do this. It's 10:45. Nancy, how much time do you think the targeted universalism needs.

Nancy Strohl:

I think at this point, it would be a good few minutes. I mean, I don't know what the comments will be.

Claire Ramsey:

Why don't we do this? Because Nancy will present it, and then at-

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

And then a break.

Claire Ramsey:

... no later than 10:55, we will take our break for 10 minutes. And if we need to wait for comments on that until after the break, we will.

- [Presentation by the subcommittee \(continued\)](#)

Nancy Strohl:

So I will use my fast talking voice.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

But not too fast because we have interpreters.

Nancy Strohl:

No. Okay. The reason that we're doing both of these separately. And I remember a time seven years ago when Mary Ignatius came to the Blue Ribbon Commission. It was the first time I'd ever heard of targeted universalism. Tonia, you may remember that there too.

Tonia McMillian:

Yeah.

Nancy Strohl:

For it is such an important goal. And it gets thrown around a lot. But I don't think we go back to what it really means. So before this happened, there was targeted. Which is the kind of thing like veterans benefits are targeted. Aging benefits are targeted. Specific populations. And there's universal. TK through 12 is universal. Roads, police, I mean, there's a lot of services that are provided that are.

But targeted universalism was a kind of breakthrough to understand how you can deal with early childhood education, and say, "We want all of this." But at the same time, we want to make sure that we're not increasing inequities. Because if we just say, "We're going to go towards the universal goal," then the people who already are kind of tied

into the system, as money expands, they'll be able to apply for the childcare provider slots as well as the parent slots. And we'll have more of them in the system, and inequities will be greater as we increase investment. Which is not what any of us want. But with targeted universalism, you're really not looking at just targeted or just universalism, because you're saying that it requires multiple strategies. So for me to sign up my grandchildren, because I'm older, for childcare, it's going to be different than what Andrea needs to sign up her kids for childcare. And to really understand what that is and what the needs are for that particular thing.

And so we have to make sure that as we're developing this, that we see that different groups are situated differently. And it goes back to what Mary was saying about the introduction. I mean, a lot of this in our country and our state has to do with the legacy of structural racism. And the way that our society has developed, the childcare system has developed. And so that certainly is part.

It's also the way that women take care of it, and women get low wages. I mean, there's all these things that are built in that we have to take. And the only way we can take those into consideration, is if we do it with them. What is it, Mary? Not, "Don't do anything to us, but do it with us"? I can't remember the exact-

Mary Ignatius:

Nothing for us without us.

Nancy Strohl:

Yeah, nothing for us without us.

Mary Ignatius:

Nothing about us without us. Nothing about us without us.

Nancy Strohl:

Yes. And so basically what targeted universalism is, it's not only targeting a group. It's not like saying, "Well, this group, we're going to figure out what to do about." It's saying, "We are going to with them, develop the pathways that we can reach universalism." So there is a broad-based community support. We can certainly, no drama majors, everyone's involved. And also there's a sharp focus on structures and barriers.

So we're looking at what are the structures that we can change and what are the barriers that exist now? So the reason we are bringing up and really highlighting the targeted part as it relates to universalism, is this is the way that we see recommending to go. And this builds on years of discussion and most profoundly, on the lived experiences of family and childcare providers that when I went back and looked at the past meeting notes of the EPC, some of the parent provider focus groups with the Blue Ribbon Commission, I mean, we have learned so much. There's been such important leadership there, as well as the researchers and the other people.

So this is the starting point to developing our new strategies. Not that we're starting from scratch. But as we do this, we are going to develop the universal goal by doing this targeted universalism. Quick. That could be much more nuanced. It's much more complicated than that, but that's a quick introduction.

Tonia McMillian:

Before we break-

Claire Ramsey:

Sure, please, Tonia.

Tonia McMillian:

Redefining targeted universalism, because I do remember that day. And I know we had a whole presentation. I think the guy's name was Graham. I can't remember, but I think it was-

Mary Ignatius:

I think it was John Powell.

Tonia McMillian:

... Keys or something. But I can remember that day.
Yeah, so.

Mary Ignatius:

It wasn't me. It was [inaudible 01:48:44].

Nancy Strohl:

The videos, their website is great, [inaudible 01:48:46]. And John Powell developed this. And they have a wonderful website.

Claire Ramsey:

So thank you very much. That was very impressive for such a complex topic. So it is 10:51, we are going to take a 10-minute break. We will reconvene at 11:01 and then we will let everyone continue their presentation on this and go through the next recommendations. So thank you everyone. See you in 10 minutes.

BREAK

Claire Ramsey:

Welcome back everyone and just for people online, we're just getting situated back in the room. So we'll just need probably 10 seconds before we actually go start back with the presentation. But I will turn it back over to Karla and Nancy.

- [Presentation by the subcommittee \(continued\)](#)

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

And I will turn it to Nancy so that we have a clear understanding of what we mean for this universal goal when we talk about targeted populations.

Nancy Strohl:

So what I was talking about before was the kind of principle and how they're related. Actually, if you look at slide six and seven, there's been real definitions of who these targeted groups, communities, families are. It always sounds so odd, but it's a descriptive word. And so the way that it's been organized, and in the proposal it's in more detail, are families navigating economic and systemic hardship. I mean poverty. Families and children affected by racial inequity, multilingual dual-language learner families, tribal communities. And then there's families with additional care needs.

Because of all this is, we all know families don't fit into categories. They have many different needs and there's a lot of intersection in all of these. But certainly children and families with disabilities, connected to the child welfare system, survivors of domestic violence, incarcerated or recently released parents, families facing housing insecurity, and expecting and young parents, including those transitioning out of foster care.

So these are groups that were identified. And there was a Parent Voices discussion a couple of years ago in one of the parent advisory committees that had further groups that could be looked at. But these are the ones that were in the Blue Ribbon Commission and that actually were at ... I think there's been some agreement on this. But definitely is your starting point, with always the need to look more closely as the situation changes.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

And the next slide. Also, I will point out some group members today brought up there are additional needs. So part of the invitation is, what else might we need to look at? So I wanted to share there's this for families with additional care needs as well. So the list for targeting those furthest from opportunity. This is captured from the reports that Nancy has mentioned. So if we could go back to slide four, this brings us back to ... One more.

Thank you. This is bucket number two, targeted universalism. So if we are saying yes, universal goal is access to early care and education by 2034, this is saying we will start with the populations that we've identified as furthest from opportunity. Looking at income, looking at race, special needs. And we wanted to test out, this is decision point two for the group. Does this group support targeted universalism as the frame for achieving our universal goal? Yes, we are committed to starting with those furthest from opportunity. And if so, is there anything you would offer to strengthen that?

And Mary, I am taking some of your comments under here in regards to making sure that we're looking at simplifying process. Some of the tribal comments would also be included in here. But wanted to invite other voices for expressing support questions, or additional ways to strengthen this. And we'll keep it on slide six so that you all see

here's the populations that have been identified, knowing that slide seven also has some of that. So with that, we'll open it up.

- [Council feedback](#)

Maéva Renaud:

I have a question. I love this, and my question are military families included?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

That's fantastic. We did not add that, but that is us missing it. That has come up, Maéva, so we'll make sure to include that. And thank you for the support.

Maéva Renaud:

Mm-hmm.

Tony Jordan:

Can that comment be repeated? It was hard to hear.

Maéva Renaud:

If military families were included in this targeted universalism.

Tony Jordan:

Thank you.

Liz Simons:

Could I just say, we've already talked about this, but children, families, caregivers, and early educators targeted by our immigration detention system. Nowadays, I think we can't leave them out.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes, you're absolutely right. Thank you, Liz.

Liz Simons:

Mm-hmm.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

I would also propose to add either under that bullet, but grandparents as caregivers. There's a lot more of other adults being responsible for children whose parents were deported, or have other situations, or they're incarcerated. So I'm not sure which it would fit under, but grandparents and others as caregivers.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

That's a good point. Thank you. Catherine?

Catherine Brozowski:

Oh?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Did you raise your hand?

Catherine Brozowski:

Yeah, I did, yeah. So to me, I don't know if this is the right of your benchmarks to bring it up. But the needs around staffing, and workforce development, and facilities are all opportunities that I think really do need further attention. I don't know how many additional educators we would need by 2030 and 2034. But I don't know if it's a realistic pathway to recruit and train a sufficient number. And if the Rate Reform will be enough to draw people in fields. There are a lot of educational barriers that are preventing people from pursuing the challenge of certification and degrees right now.

So I wonder if there's more opportunity to flesh out the needs for educators. And then also if there's sufficient facilities to create enough spaces for infants and toddlers. Right now, it feels to me that licensing really needs to be redesigned, so that it is a partnership model. That is looking at how do they help centers bring in infant and toddler classrooms and to help them work towards that pathway, rather than being such a policing force of enforcement. They need to be our partners to say, "We need to have more classrooms. And you are the providers to do that and we're going to help you. And we're going to work together to do that." So that to me is just another real opportunity. And I would love for there to be some additional language around that.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

I will add a bucket three, sort of the phases. Hear that really, really clearly and have also heard other members comment on connecting with the Rate Reform. So taking that into account and will include within bucket three here.

Catherine Brozowski:

Great. Sorry, I didn't know which bucket.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

No, I apologize.

Catherine Brozowski:

But to me, 2030 and 2034 are really soon. And so to think about what can we accomplish in four years? There's not enough workforce right now. Can we make modifications to the education system that teachers can get the certification and degrees that they need in the next four years? That and costs are the two that are really big questions for me.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

I'm going to come back to cost and the timeline because would love to get input from the whole group as we think about bucket three. Like, what are the realities? We will share the rationale for why the timeframe in some of those phases. Before moving on to

bucket three, want to close on targeted universalism and see if there is one more comment, or ... Yes, Mary?

Mary Ignatius:

Loan forgiveness might be another. How do you certify early educators as part of the emergency responders? I mean, something. When you mentioned facilities, just thinking about the impact of transitional kindergarten and you can't just overnight turn something that served 14 children or whatever into four children, and the impact of the loss of funding. So I don't know if there's some ... How do you support converting spaces to be able to take in infants and toddlers? But I don't know if that's back in the other section. But she mentioned it.

And then anytime we talk about universal childcare, or some sort of publicly funded system, I think we also have to name the role private equity is playing in the childcare industry. And how to put guardrails. Because we've witnessed and seen in our own community what private equity backed childcare centers have the choice to be a profit driven model. And at the cost of health and safety of children and the teachers in those programs.

Maéva Renaud:

We don't [inaudible 01:59:36] system.

Tonia McMillian:

We don't have it.

Mary Ignatius:

Without the private equity, the ability to take it all.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes-

I think Natali had her hand.

Oh, Natali first, and then Maéva.

Maéva Renaud:

Oh, sorry.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

No, that's fine.

Natali Gaxiola:

No, I just wanted to second that, especially with the loan forgiveness because I'm paying back loans still. But I think the looking at the workforce and looking, you know, like TK, I know that there was so much discussion about TK. And there was this all for expansion. But then they're going through their own hardships there when it comes to providing quality programs. Because of the lack of experience and the lack of knowledge in early childhood. Because we're having a lot of teachers that are

credentialed for higher grades coming down. Especially within the school districts being placed in these.

And I know that for my district, they've been taking me in to do professional development for their teachers. And yet my pay is a fraction of what they make. Because as much as they know and they're very well credentialed, and know certain age groups, they don't know our young kids. And they don't know child development. And they don't know what it looks like. So I really wanted to emphasize on the looking at the workforce and really supporting them.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah, and definitely want to voice, they have heard the alignment, and asking for alignment. The legislation asks access, workforce and facilities, so we'll figure out how to present that in a way that shows that these two are joint proposals. We have Maéva and then Donna. And then we'll take a vote on targeted universalism, because some of these comments are getting into bucket three and we're holding the notes for that. So let me go.

Maéva Renaud:

I just had a question regarding this, if this would also fall under targeted universalism about childcare deserts in areas with the highest needs. Oh, I'm sorry, the highest unmet needs of the children who are eligible for subsidized care, but there aren't enough facilities in those places, right?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes.

Maéva Renaud:

Could add something that's qualified that the person needs [inaudible 02:02:05]-

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes, that's a really, really great one.

Maéva Renaud:

And then if that, I'm just thinking, is there a way to also have ... So I know back in 2020, there was legislation that basically supported cities, or supported childcare programs, to start a family childcare home. So it had something to do with the zoning laws that would allow for family childcare homes to have better access in their cities, to open up. If there could be some sort of technical assistance around that? And especially in those targeted areas.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah, and that's fantastic. Why calling population matters, because the strategies will be different and can't be universal.

Maéva Renaud:

That's right.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

So yes, fitting into that. Going to Donna and then coming back to Andrea.

Donna Sneeringer:

And I'll be as quick as I can be. I support targeted universalism. I did want to bring up one other guardrail Mary made me think of. I think somewhere in here we need to underscore our support for a true mixed delivery system, that is inclusive of the current childcare provider community. I think that we've got some lessons learned from TK. And we really need to have that public-private partnership underscored. While I share the concerns about private equity, I think we have learned that California's not a one size fits all state, and we have to have different models to meet different families' needs.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah. Thank you, Donna. And Andrea.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Just a couple of comments. One on access and true universal preschool, waiving [inaudible 02:04:00] parent needs. So one of the biggest hurdles and one of the things that we faced this last season of children leaving the kindergarten and TK, we lost double the amount of children. Not because of [inaudible 02:04:13], because it's easier for a parent to go to TK where their older children are. But one of the things that they also said was, "Well, we don't have to pay a fee. We don't have to submit paperwork." And so keeping that in consideration, that is a hurdle for families. That are, "When I could do it for free." Or, "I may have to pay a fee." They're going to go where they can do it for free. And that's another big draw.

My second comment is, one of the things to keep in mind, is that many cities and counties, and I'll highlight LA City, there is a partnership working that you're familiar with on access and facilities and these same issues. The County of Los Angeles also highlights these. And so when we're looking at it, we're not reinventing the wheel. I know Long Beach did something really well to partner communities' access for families and opening homes and centers. So I would really encourage us to be mindful of what's already happening. And then partner with those existing models, so that we can make the best recommendation for how to move forward, rather than reinventing the wheel again.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yep, yep. Completely hear that. And also looking at, we'll talk about federal later. We talk a lot about state at this table, lifting up local city counties. So we'll incorporate them. We're going to do a temperature check on targeted universalism. We've already started a lot of discussion on bucket three. So I wanted to leave some room for that. Temperature check on targeted universalism, knowing the administration cannot give a vote. For folks supportive of, we have our universal goal and we start with those furthest

from opportunity first, thumbs up. Checking in the room, we have support. And in the fantastic. So bucket two, yes, proposing targeted universalism.

Now, bucket three, we want to leave some space for talking about the federal and safety network that the group tasked us with. And that will be much shorter. So in order to cover the milestones. These are the phases. There's proposals for dates until 2034, critical components. If we go to the next slide, I will cover these phases really quickly. Phase one for getting to 2034, is really about data infrastructure, looking at cost models. And this is really building a foundation to make sure we have the correct information. Details are in the documents that were emailed to you all. We do not believe these are the end-all components. We offered some to give food for thought. But phase one is really, let's make sure we have the correct data as we look at targeted universalism. Phase two, if we go to the next slide please, takes us until 2030. And that's where we start looking at capacity building by income level. We look at some of the populations here. We call out infant toddler. But you all named some other populations. But we start testing whether there are unique strategies for targeting access for some of the populations you all named. And there is a component, a multi-layered funding. We talked about private-public partnerships. This is really, really complex funding modeling, and making sure that we're looking at that.

And then phase three is, next slide, where we look to what would it take to get us to universal access. Where we have yearly accountability measures. These are proposals. And we've heard a lot of new information that you want to make sure that's included. What I want to test out here is, as you look at these phases, what do we absolutely have to look at to make sure that we strengthen that universal goal? Very clearly hearing workforce, hearing facilities, and making sure that there is components on that. But anything else that is either missing or you absolutely do not want to see in these phases? And we'll spend about five minutes. We'll not respond. We'll just get high level, make sure that you're looking at this, and these phases. Or questions you would pose to us or the group.

And then after five minutes, we do want to spend some time on immigration and safety net. So this is rapid fired. If there are things that are really essential that folks want to be looking at as pathways for universal access.

Claire Ramsey:

And Karla, I just would remind people that the report obligation on the council is yearly, so also this is not being carved in granite, that could never be changed. It'll be iterative within the council's work.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes. Thank you, Claire. That's really, really helpful.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

I guess, I'll start.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Thank you.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

I just wanted to highlight an appreciation for number two, the guarantee for continuous eligibility. One of the hurdles that I know families are facing, and providers and the people who are providing the care, is that lack of continuity. There is a specific set of eligibility and need for infants and toddlers versus preschool age. And it is a hurdle when families are trying to enroll both, and they qualify for one under the family scale. Or because it's now per CSP, there are new eligibility and need requirements. That's much more open than CCTR. Which has a lower threshold for family income. Making that equitable I think is going to help a lot for access for families. But not only that, for enrolling children.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you, Andrea. And apologies for this prompt that's come up a few times. Someone will come in and remove it from this room's presentation screen.

Mary Ignatius:

Can I just add to that? When you enroll at a contracted center, you're enrolling at that specific program. And therefore you're restricted by what is available. And when there are multiple children with different ages, you may not be able to serve the whole child. And I just wonder then, is there something that triggers some sort of eligibility on the voucher-based program to support the whole family at the same time? So they're not ... Because this is what we keep seeing with our members. A couple of their children get served and then the others don't, and now you're stuck. You're still not able to fully work. You're still not able to move forward with your life, because your whole family is not being served. And I think also within the contracted programs, how to make sure they're not ...

Like, you're checking eligibility for CalWORKs. They may be on CalWORKs and therefore entitled to a voucher that would allow them to at least find care for their other children. So it's kind of a different blending and braiding, but it's an eligibility blending and braiding. That how to maximize access.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah, okay, I hear that. I'm going to give it maybe 20 seconds. And I do want to emphasize Claire's point by landing on a universal goal in targeted universalism. Part of the proposal is bringing it back to ECPC as we look at the phases. But I am not seeing more input. Two additional things, the chat will be open, so if folks want to add in chat anything we may have missed. And then of course, the September 21st meeting. Yes, Catherine?

Catherine Brozowski:

This current slide, Reach Universal Access by 2034, I would welcome clarity about universal access of what the state is actually paying for. Is it every family has access to

the care they want, but they are always paying for certain segments? Or is it, it is a free system for all?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah. And we're proposing a targeted universalism model. So really looking at poverty levels. If we look at phase one or two, that's what we're proposing. Thank you for-

Catherine Brozowski:

So further defining the costs around that would be very helpful.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Perfect. Thank you. All right, so if there's additional comments, chat or September 21st on this one, we're going to move to slide 13, because universal access was the largest, most comprehensive process for our subcommittee. But you all also tasked us with immigration, looking at the safety net, and immigration given some of the federal destabilization that we're seeing. So with that, for the next 10 minutes, we'll share a quick overview of what the proposals are, and then we'll take our final inputs. I'll turn it over to Nancy for the recommendations.

- [Presentation by the subcommittee \(continued\)](#)

Nancy Strohl:

Okay, and so I'll do them both together since we have-

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

That's perfect.

Nancy Strohl:

... limited time. Is that okay? So the first proposal is the safety net and response to federal destabilization. Which we all live every single day. So I will not go into it. But the first two bullets are standard. They were in the letters that ECPC sent. So I think that these are ones that there certainly are agreement on. Taking Medi-Cal coverage and streamlining the state requirements, preserving food assistance, and reducing the CalFresh error rate. So those are the ones that have been agreed upon before. The fourth bullet, which is protecting federal EC funding for Head Start, and probably the structure. This has to get rewritten a little bit I think, because we're also looking at the comments that are going to be made. But it's basically protecting Head Start funding and integrity are some word that people can help me think of, as well as looking at the CCDF, but preauthorization. Clearly, the federal government, funding is critical to this as we talk about funding, so that's, I think, just logical. I don't think that's controversial, but we're adding that.

The third bullet, which is countering the federal fraud narrative without adopting punitive systems is in direct response to some of the particular packs that have been going out. This is something in my 30 years in this field that's waxed and waned. There've been attacks and I think that it's really critical at this point that California take a very strong

stand and that we communicate that to the governor and the legislature. Do we expect that to happen in a federal level? As well as not adopting any of the punitive stuff here. And I think one of the things that came up at the Parent and Workforce Advisory Committee meeting, and I think it was Mary, I'm sorry to point at her all the time, but was really framing and protecting families' legislative agenda, recognizing how all of these things fit together in an overlapping way, and also not having a punitive system. Having a welcoming kind of system, so that was kind of the overarching thing. So that's the first one.

The second one is immigrant family protection, and these are that part. This is clearly not a whole agenda on what immigrant families need, and a lot of groups are doing incredible work on that that many of us are partnering with a different way, but this was looking at those particular ways with which it intersects with the systems that we're talking about, the immediate action, and mostly rely on infrastructure that already exists. So it's increasing the legal services and continuing legal action against federal overreach and strengthening the rapid response across county coordination. And there's more detail in the actual proposal, but again, I think those are things that have been discussed at past ECPC meetings as well as in the federal budget plan, yes. And goes to the very first question I think that we had about how we're combining in an overarching way of looking at all the families are one way in which we're doing that in the-

Do you want to add anything?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Nope. Thank you so much for that. Want to open it up for the room to see if any of these recommendations are an absolute no for anyone in the room, and are we missing anything? And Donna, I see your hand.

- [Council feedback](#)

Donna Sneeringer:

These are great. Thank you. The one thing I would say around the Head Start and CCDF, I think it's more than reauthorization and funding. I think it's program integrity as well, and I think you could probably consistently say the same thing across both funding streams. The current Head Start proposed rule would require English-only instruction. There's a lot of things in there that would be really harmful to immigrant families. We are anticipating we're going to see a similar proposal of rule changes around CCDF, so I think probably just to be on the safe side, if you say protect federal funding, reauthorization and integrity or something, that might cover it all for both of them.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah. Very helpful. Thank you.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

I can go.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes, Andrea commenting.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

So thinking about the recommendations and what it means to families and obviously educators as well, one of the things that I know has been brought up in the past is a one door stop, and that would be streamlining the requirements. You're eligible for this, you're eligible for all of these. I know that at the county level, that's also been brought up, and so I think that should probably be added somewhere, to create formalized technology. I'm not sure how to approach that, but that one stop for families.

Nancy Strohl:

Yeah. And just a brief cut, this was so long, that was what we cut out. There's a whole section that draws on the last Parent Advisory Committee and Workforce Advisory Committee that actually is already written.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes, yeah.

Nancy Strohl:

One door.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

And with the technology. Yeah, yeah.

Nancy Strohl:

With comprehensive systems and linking the eligibility. I think clearly, no one here seems to be worried about how long this is, and so that [inaudible 02:20:57].

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Oh, Tonia. Tonia.

Tonia McMillian:

I just want to piggyback off of what Donna said about us being careful. There was a phrase that came out of Black ECE symposium, and it was be courageous without being suicidal. Yeah, right? Drop the mic.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah. Thank you. All right. So I am sensing a general agreement. We'll make amendments as proposed by the council. We'll add that again. We'll add... Oh, one more. Mary?

Mary Ignatius:

Can we just add CalWORKs in here somewhere or TANF, just as a umbrella that-

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yeah, yep. Yes. All right. Final temperature check on these recommendations. We are combining safety net and immigration, so would love a temp check with yes, move forward with the thumbs up. Fantastic, seeing it in the room. Thank you. Really, really appreciate it.

I want to thank Nancy for joining us as an independent contractor, which yes, not only her expertise, but just how much she sorted through, so really, really appreciate it. And thank you all for the really, really insightful input. We will come back with the universal goal of looking at access in 2034, universal access, targeted universalism. Very, very thoughtful and very excited to be in partnership on this. And thank you, Sonia. We'll turn it back to Karin. Claire.

Claire Ramsey:

I'm going to turn it over quickly to Karin, but I'm just going to say thank you so much, Sonya. Thank you so much, Karla. Thank you, Nancy. This was a really rich discussion, and I feel like was really just clear how long and thoughtful people have been talking, thinking and building this up so that so much of this complicated stuff could be like, thumbs up, good conversation, but we're on the right page. So thank you all. With that, we are going to turn it to our last section, which is our general public comment, and I'll turn it over to Karin to move us forward on that.

4. General Public Comment

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you, Claire. Yeah, we're now welcoming public comment, both on this most recent agenda item and general public comment. We're opening up the chat feature now for the duration of the meeting and we'll be taking public comment till just before noon when I will turn it back to the chair to close us out. For those on Zoom, if you'd like to be in the queue to speak, please raise your virtual hand at the bottom of your Zoom screen or the bottom of the attendee panel. I'll also be looking here in the physical room in case anyone would like to make public comment. We're going to ask that speakers keep their comments to no more than two minutes so we can accommodate as much verbal input as possible in the time we have. I'll gently let you know when you have 30 seconds left and then when the two-minute mark is up. Please understand that public comments are statements submitted for the public record. Council members are not in a position to respond to questions or comments during this time.

And with that, we'll invite the first person in the queue to speak. I'll look to the virtual list first, and I see Deborah Corley Marzette. Deborah, we are un-muting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead.

Deborah Corley Marzette:

Good afternoon, or good morning, everyone, and thank you for that. Real quick, I want to say, Mary, thank you for highlighting that childcare goes beyond five years old. I also want to thank Miren for mentioning the mixed delivery system. With that being said, I would like CDE and DSS to provide a diagram, some sort of outline, on what the mixed

delivery system looks like and how it is going to work, and where does the fetching providers fit in this mixed delivery system? What does it look like? I have yet to hear or see a real life outline of this mixed delivery system. Let's stop talking and show us the mixed delivery system itself.

I would also like to suggest that CECO, WestEd, add nutrition and lead poisoning to the health and safety modules for family childcare providers. These two modules will help providers who were licensed before nutrition and lead poisoning was added to the health and safety.

I would also like to say that it's hard to hear and believe that no one at the State knew the language that was in AB 150, and as if the State was sideswiped with this trailer bill. So with that being said, I'm not understanding why providers were not at this table to provide real life issues and the effects that all the provisions and changes in AB 150 was going to make for providers. Again, it's hard to believe that no one was there. I want to say thank you for that.

Karin Bloomer:

That's two minutes. Thank you, Deborah. I'm going to turn to the physical meeting room here and invite public comment.

LaWanda Wesley:

Okay. Hi, everyone. LaWanda Wesley, Childcare Resource Center, and I know you don't need my agreement, but I do appreciate the target universalism and have studied that work, John Powell, for a while. But I do want to say, around thinking about looking at those who are least supported, also think about adding those also yet most promised. So maybe not just that deficit language, but thinking about these are the ones who are also yet most promised.

Also want to just reiterate what Donna noted around the mixed delivery system. I just want to expand and also say we don't want to have families having a false choice. So when they talk about when families go to this free, because I watched the webinar the other day on can't compete with free, we don't want to give families a false choice because it's easier. I was a mother of five in the subsidy system, and I had to use all of them. I used the kindergarten program, I used school age, I use expanded learning a mother of five trying to put herself through school, I need every single system. So when you talked about the one-stop shop, you want the access of burden to be easy, so how do we make it easy on both sides? Because we need all of it. We need the TK, we need the mixed delivery, we need every single part of it so people like me who have multiple children, or if you have one child, you can access it. I also need to shop with that. I need to go be able to find my family friend and neighbor. So we want it to work and we need these kind of convening spaces. Keep talking it out so that it can work. And I've been a practitioner in a classroom. I'm now sitting in policy and advocacy, so I know all of it, and I was that low-income mother trying to make it work, so I'm sitting in all of it.

And the other piece I want to add is the mentorship. We need to make sure those who are in these programs have access to mentoring, whether you're in the TK system or whether you are on the early childhood system. We have a lot of folks exiting. People like myself as a practitioner, we're just getting older. More years behind me than in front of me, so how do we make sure we show up mentorship across all of these systems? So I'm complete. Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. And looking online, Manju Kumari, we're unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead. Please go ahead. Manju, you're unmuted on our end, it looks like on your end as well, but we're not hearing you.

Manju Kumari:

Now you can hear me?

Karin Bloomer:

Yes. Please go ahead.

Manju Kumari:

Okay, thank you. I am childcare provider. I have been doing childcare almost like 24 years and listening all those things. It's very hard to understand exactly what you guys are doing, but as a family childcare provider only, I do understand. We are nowhere in your system, all the freaking out the people. And this is that business, a smaller scale business, family childcare provider, women-driven business. And then I think I feel like government is forcing us to go in the childcare. We are well-educated. We are in childcare provider, first five, Santa Clara County. So many education professional growth training we have, but still, I think exactly you guys don't understand what the family childcare is about that. It's like making the women strengthen. And then after thinking all those things, we have to go back to working in the center and then in the lower scale income, rather than to the male versus female and then have no any idea how younger kids will grow up in that three to five mixed delivery system. It's a big setting up. Thank you so much.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. We're looking for more virtual raised hands, so please, if you did want to provide verbal comment, please do raise your hand, and again, the chat feature remains open.

If anyone else would like to raise their virtual hand, I do see a hand, and so Rebecca Grasty. Oh, excuse me, Tessie Reagan, we're unmuting you. Please unmute and go ahead.

Tessie Reagan:

Hi, my name is Tessie Reagan. I'm a family childcare educator. Can you guys hear me? I'm so sorry.

Karin Bloomer:

We can.

Tessie Reagan:

Okay. So equity is an action word. I know y'all hear me say it every time I come off mute. Equity is an action word. It cannot be something that we simply say that we value. It must be reflected in who is at the table, whose knowledge is respected, and whose reality is shaped by the decisions that are made. As long as we keep making decisions without the entire early childhood system not represented at the table, including family childcare educators, center-based programs, families and practitioners. And I'm a family childcare educator who hardly ever sees people like me at the table making the decisions, and when I say that, I mean from jump. Not brought in to consult with decisions that were made prior.

So a lot of the things that are happening right now within the system seem to be happening in a vacuum, and then we're brought in afterwards. If we don't bring a lot of us to the table, we are not going to get what we need done for the children and the families. The gaps, the barriers, all of that that keeps happening and repeating is because we're not consulting with the entire system. Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. Rebecca Grasty, we're unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead.

Rebecca Grasty:

Hello, everyone.

Karin Bloomer:

Hello.

Rebecca Grasty:

Can you hear me?

Karin Bloomer:

Yes, we can.

Rebecca Grasty:

So I just want to reiterate that people don't know what you mean when you say toddler. We don't have toddlers in FCC. We have infants that are children age zero to 24 months, so walking, talking, self-feeding children age 18 to 24 months are not a developmentally respected stage. They're no different than a six-month-old in our care.

So we can't pivot to a toddler and infant program because we don't have toddlers. Not only that, but the ratios that we have and the age ranges were set in 1982. They need to be updated. We are in the minority of one of six states in this area. We then have children who are age two until not enrolled in school, and then school age who's enrolled in TK or higher. Other childcare avenues in California have these words that you're talking about, toddler and preschooler. These are foreign words to us. These

words are not in Title 22. Please adjust your materials to speak in words that our titles that are governing us actually use. Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. Looking for any more virtual raised hands for someone who would like to provide verbal public comment? Not seeing any virtual raised hands. Okay, I do see one. Nam de Silva, we're unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead.

Nam de Silva:

Hello, everyone. Can you hear me?

Karin Bloomer:

Yes, we can.

Nam de Silva:

Great. Good afternoon. My name is Nam de Silva. I wanted to find out or I wanted to make a comment. The county subsidies are forcing the parents to choose TK over childcare services or childcare daycare services, and I wanted to know if it's possible for this panel or the committee to make recommendations, or are there any regulations passed that require the children that are TK eligible to be in TK programs, not daycare or childcare services? Because as far as I understand, the state mandate is six-year-old or first grade, and if the subsidies are forcing the children to be enrolled in TK and cutting them off of childcare and daycare services, then you're going to have a lot of daycares and childcare services that's going to close down because we're going to lose a lot of kids. Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. Deborah Ferguson-Doss, we are unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead.

Deborah Ferguson Doss:

Hi, my name is Deborah Ferguson-Doss and I'm a large daycare licensee since 2007, and the reason why I mentioned that is because I've seen a lot of change recently, some devastating change for large and small family daycare licensees. They're barely hanging in there, along with our centers. I've heard a lot from centers where they're struggling financially, and there was this thought that mixed delivery would include us, and I'm just hoping that the council can turn their attention to the mixed delivery system and find out what exactly is happening to cause this imbalance. And I appreciate all that you do. I know it's a lot of work and I know that it's not easy when a lot of people are coming at you, and I thank you for your time. And I did add some more information about universalism in the chat, and that's it.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you so much. Anita Thurman-Olive, we're unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead.

Anita Thurman-Olive:

Yes, thank you. Can you all hear me?

Karin Bloomer:

Yes.

Anita Thurman-Olive:

Good morning, everyone. My name is Anita Thurman-Olive, and I am a family childcare home provider in the City of Redlands. I've been doing this for eight years, and when I received this invitation to join this wonderful panel and this discussion today, the title of it, it was aimed towards directors in preschools, directors in preschools. And what I want to share with all of my family childcare providers is that the qualifying factors to be a director is to have a bachelor's degree. So please, all my providers, please stay in school, get your bachelor's so that we can transition to becoming directors and perhaps facilitators of our own preschool if we so choose, because this initial meeting was not directed for us. True enough, the information is phenomenal. We need to know it and I learned a lot just sitting in on this discussion, but it's for directors and preschoolers, so please stay in school so that we can obtain and aspire to be in that position. That's my comment. Thank you for your time.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. Just looking for any individuals who haven't had a chance to speak in general public comment yet, if there are any raised hands. And I'll just mention as we look to see if there's any new names that there is a website that speaks more to target universalism, belonging.berkeley.edu. It's the Othering and Belonging Institute at UC Berkeley. Looking for any other individuals who haven't spoken yet. Hey, Deborah Corley-Marzette, I see your hand. We do have a bit of time, and so we'll welcome you to provide public comment.

Deborah Corley Marzette:

Thank you for that again. I appreciate it. What I was going to say here, I would really love for the ECPC to have an open meeting for California's providers, so we can have an open meeting here publicly so that the public and the legislatures who are listening in can hear what's going on in the field, hear the conversations from the providers, hear the concerns from the providers, and also hear who's closing their doors and why they're closing their doors. So I just think it's important, and I think that's a great idea that ECE take the time and let's listen to the providers out in the field on what's really going on. Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you so much. I'm going to turn it back to the chair now.

Claire Ramsey:

Thank you, Karin, and thank you everyone for all your insightful and helpful public comment. It was much appreciated, both for those who provided verbal public comment and those who put in written public comment, and we also thank everyone who

attended this meeting and participated. Karla had one last thought she wanted to add, and I want to give her just one second to do that before we wrap up.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes. We heard from you all the importance of making sure that workforce and access are more aligned, so wanted to see if there's a way of making sure that we could have some way of adjusting that. Would that be proposing things to the website, or could two of us meet to make sure that there's some alignment?

Claire Ramsey:

You're saying subcommittee?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Yes.

Claire Ramsey:

Could one member of each subcommittee meet?

Karin Bloomer:

Let us-

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Or if there's a way to turn in. I just heard from the ECPC, make sure that they're combined and that we're giving one proposal, so wanted to see.

Karin Bloomer:

Can you say more about what you mean by one proposal, Karla?

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

So there were a few folks that lifted up for access. Make sure you're thinking about workforce, and we had just referenced workforce, so just want to make sure that we're addressing that part of the request. And yes, if there is other ways to consider or making sure that...

Karin Bloomer:

Here's just a thought, and that would be if there was feedback to the Family Access and Federal Policy Subcommittee, where Family Access, of course, and workforce needs obviously do interact, if it might be something that the Family Access Subcommittee could include. And we can cross-reference in the annual report that these are also relevant to the workforce needs component, I think that would be the cleanest approach from a Bagley-Keene perspective.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

Perfect.

Claire Ramsey:

And also just thinking that the advisory committee, since it's joint, might give some opportunities to basically hear the voices pulled together.

Karla Pleitéz Howell:

That's a really, really great idea. Yep. So we'll add some of the things we heard from council members, and it might be duplicative, but we'll see it during September 21st. Thank you.

Mary Ignatius:

I'm sorry, can you just clarify? So this is Deborah's recommendation on hearing from the providers?

Claire Ramsey:

Oh, no, no. This is related to what Karla just said. Sorry.

Mary Ignatius:

Because Tonia and I were just talking. I think we'd really love if we could use the joint subcommittees of workforce and families to just open, I don't know how long our meetings are, two hours, three hours.

Claire Ramsey:

Yeah, two.

Mary Ignatius:

And give it an open free time for all providers across all of the settings, and I would add the families who are navigating these systems, to be able to just name all of the things that they would fix. So that we make sure... Sorry, Tonia, but make sure we're tapped... I know we can do this every year, but if this is our first time, I don't know, I just think we haven't done that, invited that.

Claire Ramsey:

As the chairs of the advisory committee, obviously we'll work with you on an agenda.

Mary Ignatius:

Yeah, all right.

Karin Bloomer:

Also, just acknowledging at the same time for the two of you to discern, giving ample time for the advisory committee members, who I know many of whom were listening in as attendees today, to bring back their feedback formally as those two bodies in addition to what you're suggesting as well.

Tonia McMillian:

And we are thankful for Karin for working with us because we did expand the public comment time. We're always coming for more, more, more, more. Give us more attention.

Mary Ignatius:

We need the chat open the whole time.

Tonia McMillian:

She's amazing.

Mary Ignatius:

Yeah. Thank you, Karin.

Claire Ramsey:

Thank you. I see a lot of thumbs up for that. Thank you, everyone. With that, I want to thank again everyone for their participation and engagement, and very active engagement in this meeting. As we've mentioned a couple of different times and was a good segue from what Tonia and Mary just mentioned, there is an advisory committee joint meeting between the Parent Advisory Committee and the Workforce Advisory Committee meeting that will take place on September 21st from 10:00 to noon, and again, that will be a forum for people to provide feedback on these draft recommendations that were shared today.

The last council meeting of the year, shockingly, we're already there, is November 19th, and it will be also from 9:00 to 12:00 where we will have both an in-person and a virtual format. And with that, this meeting is adjourned at 11:57. Thank you everyone. Hope you have a great day.

END OF TRANSCRIPT