



Early Childhood Policy Council Parent and Workforce Advisory Committees

Meeting Agenda, Attendance, and Summary

Thursday, June 27, 2024
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introduction

- Welcome
- Review of agenda

2. Supporting Families and Providers in the Transition to Universal Prekindergarten Presentations

- Universal Prekindergarten Guidebook
 - Adam North, Director of Professional Development, EveryChild California
 - Committee discussion
 - Public comment
- Family Child Care Home Education Networks
 - Stephen Propheter, Director, Early Education Division, California Department of Education (CDE)
 - Virginia Early, Policy Administrator, Early Education Division, CDE
 - Lupe Jaime-Mileham, Deputy Director, Child Care and Development Division, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
 - Committee discussion
 - Public comment

- Educational Enrichment Systems
 - Celine Krimston, CEO
- Review Draft Early Childhood Policy Council UPK Policy Recommendations
 - Committee discussion
 - Public comment

3. Adjourn

Attendance:

Early Childhood Policy Council Members: Lupe Jaime-Mileham, Miren Algorri, Natali Gaxiola, Mary Ignatius, Robin Layton, Tonia McMillian

Parent Advisory Committee Members: Mary Ignatius, Deborah Corley-Marzett, Lissete Frausto, Patrick MacFarlane, Yenni Rivera, Cheryl Shroeder

Workforce Advisory Committee: Tonia McMillian, Patricia Alexander, Miren Algorri, AnnLouise Bonnitto, Virginia Eigen, Zoila Toma, Debra Ward

Guest Panelists: Adam North, Stephen Propheter, Virginia Early, Mary Loyola-Salcedo, Celine Krimston

Summary Report

Welcome and Review of Agenda — Tonia McMillian, Chair of the Workforce Advisory Committee and Mary Ignatius, Chair of the Parent Advisory Committee

Tonia McMillian and **Mary Ignatius** opened the meeting. McMillian thanked members of both advisory committees, the Early Childhood Policy Council (ECPC), and the public for their attendance.

She shared the central topic for the day's meeting: a discussion of universal prekindergarten (UPK). McMillian acknowledged ECPC members Donna Sneeringer and Dean Tagawa for leading a discussion of UPK transition and integrating UPK into a comprehensive mixed delivery system at the May 20 Early Childhood Policy (ECPC) meeting. Sneeringer and Tagawa are developing draft policy recommendations which will be presented to the Council at the August 13 ECPC meeting. McMillian explained advisory committee input on draft recommendations is welcome as advisory committee recommendations and input that support effective integration of UPK and address its challenges will be shared by Sneeringer and Tagawa.

Other meeting presentations on the topic of UPK during the day's meeting included information to help parents and providers, including a UPK guidance tool, family child care home education networks, and an example of a private-public partnership.

Presentation: Supporting Families and Providers in the Transition to Universal PreKindergarten

The full presentation slides and remarks of the panel discussion are available:

- [UPK Guidebook slides](#)
- [Pathways to Join California State Preschool Program Family Child Care Home Education Network slides](#)
- [Educational Enrichment Systems slides](#)
- [WAC/PAC June 27 transcript, pages 3-28](#)

Panelists, in order of presentation:

- Adam North, EveryChild California
- Stephen Propheter, Early Education Division, CDE
- Virginia Early, CDE
- Lupe Jaime-Mileham, Child Care and Development Division, (CCDD), CDSS
- Celine Krimston, Educational Enrichment Systems

The UPK Partnership Guidebook

McMillian welcomed Adam North, Director of Professional Development at EveryChild California to provide an overview of UPK reference tool.

North spoke as a representative of the UPK Partnership Guidebook project, funded by Heising-Simons and created in collaboration with six organizations based on feedback from the field. He provided an overview of the [UPK Partnership Guidebook \(Guidebook\)](#), an online resource tool to support families, providers, and districts, and shared policy recommendations. North's full remarks are recorded on pages 3–8 of the [June 27, 2024 ECPC WAC/PAC meeting transcript \(June 27 transcript\)](#).

UPK is a holistic vision for the transformation of the education system to meet the needs of children and families ([UPK Guidebook, \(UPK Vision\), slide 2](#)).

North underscored that universal access to pre-K is only one piece of the puzzle. A true UPK vision also includes access to professional learning, mental health programs, meal services, and other supports designed to serve children within the community, with community partners engaged in providing services. It is encouraged that the delivery of UPK adopt a community-first approach that allows the flexibility to tailor services to meet the diverse demographic, cultural, and geographic needs of the various communities across California.

This model acknowledges that (1) transitional kindergarten through grade 12 (TK–12) districts and early childhood leaders know their communities best, (2) partnerships with tribal communities and education centers are important, and (3) localized systems are better able to respond to the specific needs of the community ([UPK Guidebook \(UPK Vision\), slide 3](#)).

North clarified that Universal TK is just one component of UPK and it cannot fulfill the UPK promise alone. He reviewed examples of different paths children may take through UPK with parental choice. For example, some communities would value delivering a full day of developmentally and culturally appropriate education services for the children ([UPK Guidebook \(How You Deliver\), slide 5](#)).

He explained that fully delivering UPK is not possible without creating partnerships. Areas with opportunities for partnership include full-day services, IEP and IFSP services, and staff development ([UPK Guidebook \(Community Partnership Examples\), slide 6](#)).

North presented on the mission of the Guidebook “to create a landing place for these fluid conversations and for these resources and to celebrate how some communities are...excelling at these partnerships so that we could share this model across California.”

The three main goals of the Guidebook are to (1) create a shared foundational understanding and terminology for UPK, (2) share resources, tools, templates that can be adopted in various communities, and (3) emphasize that partnerships are mandatory for success in this model ([UPK Guidebook, \(UPKGUIDEBOOK.ORG\), slide 9](#)).

The Guidebook website is entering its second phase of development and North explained that Phase II involves gathering community input “on what you need to deliver on UPK and then that way we can build it with your vision.” This is why some components are not fully built out. Plans for Phase II include creating mechanisms to find community partners and offering expanded downloadable templates that can be put into parent handbooks, marketing materials, or community spaces to build family awareness.

The Guidebook website is organized into sections based on the three groups it aims to support: local education agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations (CBOs), and families. Tools are categorized under these areas, with organic crossover between them ([UPK Guidebook \(The Site is Organized\), slide 10](#)).

North provided an online tour of the CBO and LEA sections of the Guidebook website. The resources for CBOs largely follow the Program Monitoring Instrument for compliance as an overarching guide “for all the resources that a [CBO] might need to deliver child care or a CSPP [California State Preschool Program], part-day CSPP program, full-day CSPP program in their community.” Resources include documents

created by the CDE and other state entities, but many of the resources come from the community. The resources for LEAs follow the [UPK Planning and Implementation Guidance](#) with tools that fall under each focus area. The documents are intended to establish a common language when discussing UPK in a variety of communities.

North expressed appreciation to Heising-Simons who has committed funding of the project and shared that the Guidebook creators hope the Guidebook website will allow UPK-related products to be placed under one “umbrella.” The central location can save time in providing resources to build or expand a local plan and help communities be inspired “from what other individuals are doing across the state.”

North encouraged attendees to use the “Contact Us” feature of the Guidebook website to share their thoughts on what they see and what is missing, as well as to upload resources. Resources shared on the website will be credited to the organizations that created them.

North also highlighted Guidebook partner EveryChild California's policy recommendations:

- Actively promote parent and family choice to support mixed delivery vision of UPK ([UPK Guidebook \(Policy Recommendations\), slide 12](#)).
- Intentionally promote partnerships within UPK from a state level ([UPK Guidebook \(Policy Recommendations\), slide 13](#)).
- Promote play-based curriculum ([UPK Guidebook \(Policy Recommendations\), slide 14](#)).
- Adopt well-founded health, safety, and high-quality early childhood education standards throughout UPK ([UPK Guidebook \(Policy Recommendations\), slide 14](#)).
 - North noted that some children move between three programs each day for a full day of service. If each program is part-time and does not require a rest period, this may result in four-year-old children going to 8–10 hours without a rest period.

Committee Questions—Led by Tonia McMillian

Comments and questions from attendees both in person and via Zoom were invited. (The full text of this discussion period is captured on pages 8–15 of the [June 27 transcript](#).)

Deborah Corley-Marzett thanked North for his presentation. She asked: “Were there family child care providers, home-based educators, in [the Workforce] Group?”

North addressed Corley-Marzett's question and responded that: "...The administrators were in the planning and then the home providers were a part of the feedback process that we received."

Corley-Marzett emphasized the importance of including providers in all aspects of decision-making processes because of their valuable expertise and firsthand experience: "The information that providers bring to the table is powerful and the input is needed because we are the ones doing the work." Their contributions are seen as essential, and they value being actively involved and consulted.

She then asked for clarification of who "community voices" refers to in relation to the Guidebook: "You may mean those who are directly involved, like First 5 and all those [project] partners that you have there....What did you mean when you said that you wanted to expand the voice of the community? Because when I hear that, I'm thinking of the parents."

North acknowledged Corley-Marzett's points. He reiterated that EveryChild California's policy recommendations call for a more formal process to include family child care (FCC) in UPK efforts and noted: "I think that's definitely a major gap that we heard in our policy recommendation."

He explained that a purpose of the UPK Guidebook project is to "expand the voice of the community" and bridge gaps between community stakeholders and stated: "The UPK model calls for our flexibility in the delivery of UPK. But we were not sure that every community was necessarily delivering on that. ... [The Guidebook is] just gathering the tools, and we're hoping that we can find models of individuals doing this well. And if our results are that it's not happening well, then [there should be] a call to formalize the tools, the process, the regulations, the guidelines, the directives that would create a better healthier pathway for the expansion of all voices within the community."

Corley-Marzett expressed her viewpoint that more information needs to be gathered prior to implementation and advocated that providers be included.

North concurred with Corley-Marzett's sentiment.

Zoila Toma thanked North for the presentation. She welcomed the graphic showing the components of the UPK vision that are being acknowledged while speculating on its timing and commented: "That visual pie... it's exactly what early childhood educators [see].... so it's not actually something new for us, but it's apparently something new that is being taken now in consideration. So I really appreciate that. ...I think meals, for example, some children count on that when they go to school and that's very important. When it comes to the IEP for example, that's also another thing that matters...As a mother of a child that struggled during school as an early age of kinder, and I never received the support."

Toma pointed out that workforce issues in the child care industry affect both current and future providers as well as children and families. She shared her daughter's recent dilemma deciding if continuing to work in special education was feasible while she prepares for college. In summer, her work hours were reduced from full-time to less than half-time to match the seasonal reduction in services. The children also lose out on the continuity of providers when school and services are halted.

She noted, "They have to now find another person to be reassigned to those children, because what? They don't have no support in the summer. Their hours are not as stable. ...When I started child development, the classes were full. But where are those students now when they actually enter the field? You see the passion for education, that love for children. But when they enter in the field and they see that it's not a sustainable industry, that you cannot sustain your life from this industry, they look somewhere else. The low wages that we have in the industry for [FCC] ... it's even worse."

She shared her opinion that early childhood education providers still are not considered real partners, despite having been trying to address the same issues for a long time: "we've been bringing [the UPK ideas and concerns under discussion] to the conversation for decades. But...now that things are coming to place or want to start implementing policies and develop programs, we are pushed to the side." Further, "And this industry has started for the need of working families. But it looks like because of that, we are still not being taken in consideration as early educators. We're not being seen as educators, and we are educators. The industry started that way, but we have been developing, changing, adapting, and improving that industry."

Toma pointed out that she is spending her work time at today's meeting serving as an advocate for providers when she could be working with the children under her care.

North thanked Toma, saying, "Couldn't be said better."

Mary Ignatius shared that she has observed FCC providers' repeated grievances at advisory committee meetings about being excluded from the UPK system, particularly those outside of FCC Home Education Networks (FCCHEN). She highlighted the slide illustrating different ways a child can get to kindergarten validates the concern that FCC providers are only recognized within FCCHENs and stated: "This is what they've been saying this whole time." Ignatius acknowledged the frustration of providers who have and long sought recognition and inclusion in the UPK system and "begged and pleaded for validation and the honesty that...in fact, the UPK system does not consider providers outside of FCCHENs part of UPK."

She expressed solidarity with Corley-Marzett's concerns, speculating on the apparent absence of parental involvement in focus groups. She also stressed the importance of including the perspectives of those directly affected by UPK policies and the need to hear from parents managing complex childcare arrangements. Questioning the inclusivity of the UPK system for both parents and all types of providers, including

Family, Friend, and Neighbor (FFN) providers, Ignatius noted: “The parent who's having to send their child to three part-time programs should be interviewed and heard from about what that's like, and how hard that is, and why they don't want that...”

Ignatius expressed further frustration over the repetitive nature of these issues, the lack of a racial equity goal in the Guidebook, lack of clarity around the purpose and intended audience of the Guidebook. She also raised questions about the ownership and relevance of the UPK curriculum and asked: “When we say ‘UPK’, is it a specific curriculum by which the teacher, the provider, the program has to deliver in order for it to be considered UPK? And that's why it's exclusive to FFN and FCC providers? Who owns the word UPK? Who owns the curriculum? Is that curriculum even today's families?” She also suggested that integration with MyChildCarePlan.org could be beneficial.

North thanked Ignatius and clarified that “the initial UPK vision” referred to in the Guidebook does not originate with the creators of the Guidebook project. The vision comes from looking at “the legislation, governor's proposal, all those things, [unpacking] where it came from and how we race to keep up with it.” He explained that the six community organizations who created the Guidebook are looking at the UPK landscape as it is while trying to identify what needs adjustment and emphasized: “So all this feedback is very valuable to us. This is a living, breathing document that belongs to the community and we're working on it.”

Anne Louise Bonnitto stated, “...Tribally licensed child care providers need to be in this process as well. I suggest that you reach out to the Tribal Child Care Association to get them to input as well. Tribal providers are truly on the outskirts of the system.”

McMillian shared that she tried to find FCCs on the Guidebook website but search results only produced the ones registered with a FCCHEN.

She asked for clarification of North's reference to creating stability due to declining enrollment and stated: “...it sounds like you guys are anticipating loss of enrollments for [FCC] providers. And that is a problem, especially when there are so many challenges in retention of [FCC] already.”

North acknowledged that UPK is going to create movement. Children are going to be moving into free slots and out of their existing slots (many of them in FCC) and there needs to be awareness and supports for this big shift.

McMillian thanked North for his presentation expressing the hope that he will take the advisory committees' feedback and “open up the discussion.”

Selections from Public Comments (Zoom live and chat included)

“If parents can choose anywhere (FFN, FCC, Center, School District) they want without worrying about money and eligibility part, that is my ideal vision of UPK.”

“UPK should absolutely promote, support, and allow for full parent choice. Additionally, UPK should have a true continuity of care and education birth to third grade. Although California's UPK starts at preschool, brain development and family need for quality care starts at birth.”

“The biggest issue with having FCCHEs support Expanded Learning Opportunities Program is the insurance requirements that districts require. It would be great if there could be a collaborative for insurance.”

“FCC should be a part of the process not just feedback.”

“The problem is trying to act like care and education for children this young are separate. They are not. FCC spaces are developmentally appropriate places for children to receive their education.”

“In Modoc County there are four CSPP sites. One site has reported 47 percent are TK eligible children enrolled for August. This is due to the LEA not creating a TK classroom and in part lack of workforce across the board. Unfortunately, this is creating issues for our FCC and FFN providers who are at their max and so are our families.”

“We focused on educating our families on the definitions of UPK and TK...If the district's message was focused more on the addition of preschool spaces so *more* children can be educated, instead of creating something called TK to confuse parents. It implies once again that what Home-Based Providers and CBOs have been doing is somehow less than what the district can do as TK.”

“UPK is exclusive and prohibits true participation by all community-based providers (state-subsidized, private, FCC, and center-based programs). Reframing the title of UPK to embrace and educate children 0–5, starting at BIRTH, is necessary. Very frustrating also, that UPK promotion does not give detailed information about all programs—e.g., center-based Title 5 programs have 1:8 ratios vs TK 1:12. That is just one example of different assets of programs that are not being differentiated and shared to parents.”

“Based on the data that has been shared about the shortage of [early childhood education] in our state - the message could be *TOTALLY* different if it was that our FCCs and CBOs are amazing, and we are joining them in effort to educate our younger learners by adding preschool slots in our elementary schools.”

Family Child Care Home Education Networks

McMillian welcomed **Stephen Prophter**, Director of the Early Education Division at the CDE, to speak about CSPP FCCHENs. Prophter previously shared recommendations from the *UPK Mixed Delivery Quality and Access Work Group Report*, including involving more family child care homes and FCCHENs, at the May 20 ECPC meeting. The full record of the CDE presentation on this day is captured on pages 15–20 of the [June 27 transcript](#).

Prophter introduced his colleagues in attendance—including Virginia Early, Policy Administrator of the CDE Early Education Division’s policy office, and Mary Loyola-Salcedo, a child development consultant who leads CDE policy work on FCCs and serves as a lead for bargaining. Referring to comments in the chat, Prophter noted the “groundswell of interest in having [FCCHENs] funded throughout the state.”

Prophter emphasized the CDE shared vision to expand access to CSPP FCCHENs, which are currently available in five counties. FCCs is recognized as a crucial component for providing UPK access to parents of three- and four-year-olds because the CDE has been tasked to focus on them by the state. He shared the following regarding CDE and FCCHENs:

The CDE does not have the authority to appropriate funds, determine budget allocations, or redirect pre-K funds to TK–12 education. These financial decisions are made by the Legislature and Governor. The CDE also does not redirect pre-K funds to TK-12 education; such budgetary decisions are made by legislative and executive branches of the state government, not by the CDE.

The CDE values FCCHENs as an essential option for families and acknowledges the low participation rates and the need to increase access for families. Because of this, FCCHENs are a focus area in the CSPP improvement initiative.

There are strategies that can be implemented within the CDE's administrative authority to expand access to family child care homes, as well as recommendations that can be made to lawmakers to support this expansion. Increasing access to FCCHENs requires additional funding, which is a critical component of the expansion effort.

As part of California UPK, CSPPs serve age-eligible three- and four-year-olds. CSPPs are required to meet a variety of program standards, including quality standards provided in statute from the Legislature or through the regulations and rulemaking process that includes public input.

A CSPP FCCHEN, as defined in Education Code Section 8205, is an entity that contracts with the CDE to make payments to licensed family child care home providers and provide educational and support services to those providers and to children and families eligible for state-subsidized early learning services. Education Code Section

8223 addresses specific FCCHEN requirements for CDE programs ([CDE Pathways to Join CSPP Family Childcare Home Education Network \(What is a CSPP FCCHEN?\), slide 2](#)).

CSPP FCCHEN contractors are required to support the family childcare homes in their network to ensure they are providing certain quality components. Propherer underscored that these requirements also exist for centers.

In addition, FCCHEN contractors are required to provide training and support to FCC providers and staff, assess each family child care home provider's services according to quality standards for CSPPs, and ensure that a developmental profile is completed for each child ([CDE Pathways \(The Role of a CSPP FCCHEN Contractor: Quality Components\), slides 3-4](#)).

FCCHEN contractors are also responsible for administrative activities including recruiting; enrollment; certifying eligible families; training, supporting, and reimbursing providers; assessing program implementation of CDE standards; collecting family fees; monitoring; and reporting.

FCCHEN contractors share data and reporting with CDE in accordance with contract requirements. Data from the Desired Results Developmental Profiles (DRDPs) are shared with providers to scaffold learning ([CDE Pathways \(The Role of a CSPP FCCHEN Contractor: Administrative Activities\), slide 5](#)).

Virginia Early explained the benefits of FCCHENs for contractors and the community ([CDE Pathways \(Benefits of FCCHENs: Contractors & Community, slides\), 6-7](#)). She detailed how FCCHENs benefit FCC providers through professional development, mentoring, and more ([CDE Pathways \(Benefits of FCCHENs: Family Childcare Home Providers\), slide 8](#)).

Early reiterated that CSPP FCCHENs currently exist in five counties and the CDE hopes to grow that number. She stated that, within their authority, the CDE is "committed to ensuring that strong mixed delivery system and encouraging existing contractors, as well as potential applicants for new funding, to consider providing services through a FCCHEN to increase the number of counties on this list" ([CDE Pathways \(Current CSPP Contractors Providing Services Through a CSPP FCCHEN\), slide 9](#)).

Early shared that there are two pathways to becoming a FCCHEN contractor: (1) Prospective CSPP contractors can apply for new funding as it becomes available and specify in the application that they want to offer services as a FCCHEN. (2) Existing CSPP contractors can request to use a portion of their current contract funds for a FCCHEN.

Early also outlined the steps to become a CSPP FCCHEN provider in counties where FCCHENs are already operating: ([CDE Pathways \(How to Become a CSPP FCCHEN Provider\), slide 10](#))

- Have an FCC license with no serious health or safety violation of the Title 22 regulations.
- Have a current appropriate [Child Development Permit issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing](#). At this time, that's an Associate Teacher Permit at a minimum.
- Contact the FCCHEN contractor to ask about joining the network. If you're not sure who the FCCHEN contractor is, contact either the CDE or your local Resource and Referral Agency.
- Work with the FCCHEN contractor to identify what steps you need to take to meet the CSPP quality requirements.
- Once you meet those requirements, sign a CSPP FCCHEN contract agreement with the FCCHEN contractor to provide services.

Propheter highlighted Section II.C Intersectionality of Quality and Access from the [UPK Mixed Delivery Quality and Access Workgroup Legislative Report Executive Summary](#). The section includes recommendations on how to provide pathways for FCC providers to join FCCHENs. (see [CDE Pathways \(UPK Mixed Delivery System Recommendations\), slide 12](#)):

- Provide recommendations and technical assistance to CSPP contractors on how current CSPPs could adapt their model to support family child care homes through a FCCHEN.
- Ensure that CSPP contractors and applicants are aware of expansion funding opportunities to provide services through FCCHENs and work with early learning and care infrastructure partners to communicate with providers about opportunities to join a FCCHEN.
 - Propheter pointed out that the CDE always announces application opportunities on its distribution list, so subscribers get that information. He noted: "But I think this recommendation gets more at those Quality Counts California hubs, Resource and Referral networks, which are a key connector in communities, as well as local planning councils, licensing, any place where an FCC provider may interact with already."
- Modify the CSPP Quality Rating Improvement System's Block Grant Request for Applications to include a stronger focus on FCCHENs.

According to Propheter, the CDE is aware that more funding is needed, but the Workgroup was operating under specific limitations: "...one that I think we found

particularly challenging ... is that [recommendations] could not create new costs either at the state level or local level.”

For more information on FCCHENs, access the following:

- [CDE FCCHEN Factsheet](#)
- [UPK Mixed Delivery Quality and Access Workgroup page on CDE website](#)

McMillian thanked Propher and Early. She then welcomed Dr. Lupe Jaime-Mileham, Deputy Director, CDSS-CCDD (Child Care and Development Division) to discuss FCCHENs. Jaime-Mileham's full remarks are captured on pages 20–21 of the [June 27 transcript](#).

Jaime-Mileham stated that the CCDD administers three contracts that can be operated through a FCCHEN including 1) California Family Child Care Network (CFCC) which is FCC-only 2) General Child Care and Development Program (CCTR) which can be FCC or center-based, and 3) Migrant Child Care and Development (CMIG) which can be FCC or center-based.

According to data from last fiscal year, CCDD FCCHENs serve approximately 11,153 children in 24 counties, including Alameda, Fresno, Glen, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Marin, Monterey, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Tehama, Trinity, Tulare, and Ventura. CDSS has had requests to expand the number of FCCHENs through the CCTR request for application, where an LEA or nonprofits can be the operator.

As in CSPP, CCDD FCCHEN providers receive support through the FCCHEN contractor. FCCHEN contractors provide technical assistance, training, coaching in the provider's home site, assistance with DRDP, and more to be able to meet the quality components outlined with CDE.

Jaime-Mileham assured that she will see to it that a list of existing FCCHENs is posted so interested FCC providers can see where they are. She acknowledged that more FCCHENs are needed, which requires new funding opportunities.

Committee Questions—Led by Tonia McMillian

Comments and questions from attendees both in person and via Zoom were invited. (The full text of this discussion period is captured on pages 21–23 of the [June 27 transcript](#).)

Corley-Marzett asked for clarification from the CDE: “You had mentioned in order to become a FCCHEN provider, you need your Child Development Permit. Is that correct?”

Early confirmed that a prospective FCCHEN provider would need at least the Child Development Associate Teacher Permit.

Corley-Marzett advocated for better preparation of all FCC providers for the UPK program, transparency about the process, and improved communication to ensure providers can take full advantage of the opportunities presented by UPK.

She expressed her belief that information related to UPK should have been communicated to providers earlier, specifically the importance of obtaining permits. She lamented that the May ECPC meeting discussion of UPK pathways for FCC providers did not mention the permit requirement.

She also noted that the FCCHEN benefits to communities as listed “apply to every single family that's a licensed provider as well as an exempt provider. Everything that's required for the providers to do, and the benefits are the same thing every other provider does. The only thing that other providers that are not in FCCHENs lack is that permit. Had that permit been brought up a long time ago, I think a lot of other providers would've started or started finishing [the Commission on Teacher Credentialing permit process].”

She shared her observation of declining participation in ECPC and related meetings: “...there used to be so many more people engaged and participating in our meetings. So I think that we need to think about what we're doing, why we're here, and how it's working to get more people engaged in what's going on.” She encouraged FCC providers to learn how to become a part of FCCHEN. She thanked Early and asked if a FCCHEN provider can work with agencies as well as networks.

Early affirmed Corley-Marzett's question and responded: “If you have voucher like kids that are maybe getting a CalWORKs voucher and you also want to be a part of a FCCHEN? Yeah.”

Propheter acknowledged Corley-Marzett's “great point” about the CTC permit noting that one of the recommendations the Mixed Delivery Quality and Access Workgroup has brought to light is “the need to get information out there.” He stated, “I thought one of the pathways to getting that was also the [Child Development Associate] also qualified as an alternate.”

Corley-Marzett commented, “We need to work on getting that pathway more open for all providers [so they] can participate and make sure it's provided in more than one, two, three, and four languages for everyone can be included.”

Early stated, “The Child Development Associate credential from the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition is an alternative pathway for the [CTC] Associate Teacher Permit.”

Ignatius commented, “[you] said [the CDE is] limited by what law states and you can only do what it says, yet it seems CSPP moved to include children who are 24 months old in this last budget. How did that happen? Was that a proposal that came from the CDE? With all the unspent money that CSPP doesn't use each year, why not use it to expand FCCHEN's beyond the five counties?”

Selections from Public Comments (Zoom live and chat included)

“FCCHENs are not designed to certify quality. They are an old model that existed before and without including the leadership of [FCC] associations and FCC educator leaders.”

“As an FCC we provide all these quality components, but yet we cannot operate as an FCC. The new FCCHENs are just money distributing agencies and control what FCCs can be part of FCCHEN.”

“FCCHENs are only in the south half of the state... none in the ‘rural and geographically isolated’ north.”

“Why not consider the alternative of accreditation rather than expanding a system that isn't popular with those of us in the workforce?”

“If you're not allowed to increase cost, acknowledge a provider's years of FCCH operation, and/or make more accessible pathways to support providers in becoming “Preschools” within the UPK Mixed Delivery System.”

“Thank you for addressing how the [request for applications] will roll out. In the north state we all work together, and it is our priority to reach all ECE partners.”

“My understanding...is that simply expanding FCCHEN will NOT fix the root of the problem that 4-year-olds are going to TK and there is no funding to support providers to pivot and serve younger children with smaller ratios and different developmentally appropriate needs. Even though FCCHEN [providers] can “participate” in UPK, as currently implemented by a majority of districts in the state, districts are still only promoting TK and district-run preschool programs AND students with special needs will still be required to be served in a district program to receive IEP services.”

Educational Enrichment Systems

McMillian then welcomed **Celine Krimston**, President and CEO of [Educational Enrichment Systems](#) (EES), to discuss factors and policies that contribute to successful collaborations between early care providers and school districts. EES is a nonprofit child development agency that has provided early education programs to families throughout San Diego County since 1979. Krimston's full remarks are captured on pages 24–28 of the [June 27 transcript](#).

Krimston shared that she will celebrate 31 years with EES this summer, having started as a preschool teacher. She described EES's partnership with Vista Unified School District (VUSD) via CSPP and CCTR contracts to deliver play-based, early education programs. EES started serving "a couple hundred children at a handful of sites in 1979, and we've grown to 19 schools, part-day and full-day serving children zero to five. ...we have a capacity for about 1,300 students at this time." She noted that as a Title 5 program, EES maintains very low ratios and "many of our teachers have degrees, associate degrees and bachelor's degrees. So we're very proud of the high-quality early education experiences. We're also very proud that since 1979 we've had a whole-child philosophy, and our learning is all through play" ([EES \(Quality Child Care and Early Education\), slide 3](#)).

Krimston acknowledged Council member Robin Layton, who served as EES President for 38 years and shared: "Layton ...created and nurtured many of the relationships that I'll be speaking about today." She laid out the developmental phases of the EES partnership with VUSD sharing a presentation slide about the Heckman Curve ([EES, slide 7](#)). She noted that VUSD Superintendent, Dr. Matt Doyle, often shares this slide during presentations to administrators, principals, and the school board to help "everybody really get on board and understand his vision of wanting to serve the youngest children in [the district]."

Krimston shared on partnership phases with VUSD, which included initial partnering activities, formal agreements, and establishing and maintaining operations and communications. She added the following regarding the partnership:

Key Phase I work can be credited to Layton's networking efforts and conversations with Paul Miller about how Kidango established relationships with school districts in Northern California. EES started from the ground up and did not have the benefits of any existing strong relationships with an agency.

In the next phase of partnership building, EES and VUSD engaged in discussions to learn about each other. EES toured potential classroom spaces that could meet the needs and requirements of licensing, parents, the school district, and EES. "VUSD ... wanted high-quality early education programs for children zero to five so that children and families had...a seamless transition, as much as possible, before they came to elementary school, and EES had funding for slots."

EES explained the DRDP and California Preschool Learning Foundations to VUSD. In addition, they shared the organization's commitment to their play-based philosophy and curriculum, which they made clear they "weren't going to waver on just because we were on an elementary school district campus."

The EES and VUSD boards decided to enter into a formal partnership. The partnership "started with four classrooms on an elementary school campus. They were part-day programs, morning and afternoon...now we have ten part-day programs on elementary

school campuses. We have four full-day sites, and one will be opening this summer” ([EES \(The EES VSUD Partnership\), slide 8](#)).

Krimston then described some of the considerations that needed to be addressed to launch an early education program on an elementary school campus: sharing the school play yard, parent access for different drop off/pick up times, parent volunteer involvement, nutrition for family-style meal services, and the play-based curriculum.

After programming was implemented and learning environments were in operation, EES discovered that principals and teachers sometimes interpreted the play-based activities as “just playing.” EES adjusted some of its training so for staff, teachers, and directors at the sites would be able to describe the pedagogy in use.

This experience informed EES’s planning and collaboration for developing a formal preschool to elementary transition plan. EES started a liaison department, modeled after VUSD’s Community Family Liaisons, to help serve families. District personnel and EES preschool directors hold regular strategic meetings to align preschool learning goals and formative assessment tools, schedule campus events, and look for collaborative training opportunities ([EES \(Seamless Transition\), slide 9](#)).

Parents also have significant participation in the transition plan.

Krimston highlighted some of the collaborations that have developed: “Some of the great leaders in the parent-led groups in VUSD were the leaders in our Parent Advisory Committee (PAC). VUSD started an early education fair where Title 22, [FCC], EES, [and] TK, are there... it's all about giving the early educators and children zero to five in Vista and VUSD...a warm welcome.”

She added that the transition plan now includes preschool director meetings with TK: “It used to be just the kindergarten team when we started, but now it's the TK and the K team.”

Krimston described the EES VUSD Prenatal to Third Grade (P–3) Continuum: “...for the VUSD, their ‘P’ in P–3 is prenatal. The continuum involves a P–3 focus group of community organizations like Vista Community Clinic and also Title 2 programs. It's a true example, I believe, of mixed delivery. [FCC] is involved.”

Another component is the Teacher Research Collaboration. Composed of EES and TK–3 teachers, with research teams from University of California San Diego leading meetings, the Teacher Research Collaboration “has really taken a turn since TK has become very relevant on the campuses.”

The Career Superhighway Collaboration, a career pathways program for VUSD students, includes an early childhood pathway. High school students can earn credits at Palomar Community College and complete work experience at the applied EES Vista

Early Learning Center. One student who recently completed her work experience “already has six units, and her goal is to get an associate teacher permit by the time she graduates high school next year in June of 2025.”

Krimston reported that when VUSD applied for the Early Education Teacher Development grant they included EES in their proposal: “EES teachers, support teachers, and directors have all benefited with additional training and stipends to attend those trainings”.

For any follow up or further information on Educational Enrichment Systems, Krimston can be contacted via email at celine@educ-enrichment.org.

McMillian thanked Krimston and congratulated her on 31 years in the industry.

Presentation: Review Draft ECPC Policy Recommendations and Committee Discussion—McMillian and Ignatius

(The full text of this discussion period is captured on pages 28–32 of the [June 27 transcript](#).)

McMillian explained that the conversation would focus on a list of draft policy recommendations from the May 20 ECPC meeting where Council members, committee members, and the attending public identified the needs they felt are most important. While recommendations still need to be refined, the goal of reviewing them with the joint committees is to determine what stands out.

McMillian read the draft list of [UPK policy recommendations](#).

Ignatius asked the committee members “Do [you] feel they speak to what your needs are, what your solutions are, how you want to navigate UPK? And, I especially ask the parents on the subcommittee because I don't feel like the parent experience is reflected in here.”

McMillian concurred with Ignatius stating, “I feel like we need to revisit this and spend a little more time on it.”

Bloomer facilitated a brief conversation on the best way to acquire more input for the policy recommendations Sneeringer and Tagawa are compiling. She opened the floor for Council discussion.

Lisete Frausto concurred with Ignatius about gathering more parent input on recommendations. She shared that as a parent deciding whether to move her daughter to TK or keep her in her existing program, she was not sure of the implications. She noted that other families aren't sure either: “...many families are being told about TK, about UPK, but then we're not knowing how it's going to affect them. Many working parents need full daycare. How is that going to look like? What are we going to do for

that? We also usually need 'before care,' before we drop them off at school. How is that usually done?" She stated, "...we don't want to make it even harder for families to be able to have care and have that stability."

McMillian commented, "the FFN voice is not recognized at all."

Toma commented, "I feel that FCCHEN is now creating a bigger gap for [FCC] providers. We need a clear list of requirements. Additionally, I am concerned that this may mislead families into thinking that if a home-based educator is not part of the UPK or FCCHEN programs, their program is not of high quality. As we approach the full implementation of UPK and continue to lose more children at the start of each school year, the competition among providers to enter FCCHEN is going to become very intense."

Selections from Public Comments (Zoom and chat included)

A partial record of public comment is captured on pages 31-33 of the [June 27 transcript](#).

Sara Lynn, a mother and EES staff member, encouraged the committees and their members to talk about early childhood education as encompassing prenatal to third grade and follow the research, despite the fact that "California has decided to define UPK as preschool to kindergarten." She noted that "providers are being [siloed as FCC], private, state, center-based by referring to early childhood education as UPK, as defined by California preschool. ...Start at birth and that will include all of the providers that have worked in the system for so long. And the inequity is really pronounced between the zero to two providers, the community-based providers, and the district providers because of pay parity and other items."

Lara Magnusdottir of 4-C Sonoma shared county workforce data that shows the impact TK is having on centers and FCC providers: "72 percent of centers saw a decline in enrollment of four-year-olds and 42 percent of FCC providers saw a decline...that's very significant." 4-C Sonoma subcontracts with many of the county's 40 school districts: "We provide our contracts on campuses and this year we're moving two or three centers. We always have to be moving centers because of changes with the schools and it is a very costly and a very difficult thing to do."

Tessie Ragan, an FCC educator and member of the Commission for Excellent and Early Childhood Education, shared her opinion that the early education community in California is not equitable: "They say that they want to be equitable, but there is actually a framework that's being developed...that is not recognized or told to FCC educators, they're not referenced at all." She also shared her personal perspective on representation of FCC providers in policy discussions and retention issues: "I'm a military person. I've moved around from different countries. I've done this in different states, and the fact that we are still not being represented at all, at any level, in a way that actually makes a substantial difference or a change within the system is a

continuous kick in the face.... And I do not like that I have to always qualify that I do have education. Only reason I was able to get a bachelor's degree and a master's degree was because of the military. And if we do not have extra pathways that the unifying framework actually allows for, we are going to continue to lose highly qualified, educated individuals within here and within the field.”

“UPK needs to focus on campaigns to educate *parents* on the benefits of enrolling their child in early childhood education instead of just shifting...to the district. With the number of children in [California], no one should be losing kids - we all should be GAINING kids if the state focused on UPK as a benefit to children.”

Ignatius acknowledged providers “in whatever setting you are providing care” as well as all the families. She commented, “These rules in this system, they were not designed by us. And so we are committed to reshaping those rules to make it work for all children, all families, all early educators.”

McMillian thanked the members of the public for their written and verbal input, acknowledging the importance of their participation, and thanked ECPC members and Parent and Workforce Advisory Committee members for their insights and continued dedication to this cause.

The meeting was adjourned.