



Early Childhood Policy Council Joint Meeting of Parent and Workforce Advisory Committees

Meeting Agenda, Attendance and Summary

Tuesday, August 29, 2023 — 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Agenda:

1. Introduction

- Welcome
- Review of agenda

2. What is in the 2023-24 State Budget for Young Children, Families and Early Childhood Providers?

- Presentation
- Committee questions
- Public comment

3. What's Next: Identify Areas of Need for Families and the Workforce

- Committee discussion
- Public comment

4. Adjourn

Attendance:

ECPC Council Members: Kim Johnson, Lupe Jaime-Mileham, Carola Oliva-Olson, Janet Zamudio, Mary Ignatius, Robin Layton, Tonia McMillian

Parent Advisory Committee Members: Deborah Corley-Marzett, Naima Facih, Mary Ignatius, Patrick MacFarlane, Cherie Schroeder

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

Guest Panelist: Laura Pryor

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 opened the meeting with **Mary Ignatius**, chair of the Parent Advisory Committee. Ms. McMillian thanked members of both advisory committees, the Council, and the public for their attendance. She then shared the first central topic for the day's meeting: the new state budget and its investments supporting families, parents, and the early childhood workforce.

Ms. Ignatius shared the second topic of the day's meeting: identifying factors impacting parents and providers and the most important ways to support them.

The committees want to expand the conversation from budget issues to concrete practices and policies. Ms. Ignatius explained that ideas brainstormed at today's meeting will be revisited in the November WAC/PAC Joint Advisory Committee meeting, where the focus will be developing policy recommendations that can be shared with the Council.

Ms. Ignatius then welcomed the meeting's guest presenter, **Dr. Laura Pryor**, Senior Policy Fellow at the California Budget and Policy Center.

Presentation: What is in the 2023–24 State Budget for Young Children, Families, and Early Childhood Providers? — Dr. Laura Pryor, Senior Policy Fellow, California Budget & Policy Center

Dr. Pryor summarized the creation of the 2023–24 California Budget Act and its investments in early learning and care. Dr. Pryor's full remarks are captured on pages 3–6 of the [August 29, 2023 ECPC WAC/PAC meeting transcript](#).

The Governor signed the new budget agreement on June 27, and the budget went into effect with the July 1 start of the fiscal year. However, each house had until September 14 to pass *trailer bills*, which can make changes to state law related to the budget, as well as *budget bill juniors*, which amend the Budget Act.

An ECE trailer bill, AB 140, was released August 28 and scheduled to be heard in the legislative budget committees on August 30. The Governor has until October 14 to sign or veto bills passed by the legislature by September 14.

The 2023–24 budget totals approximately \$310 billion in spending. Dr. Pryor highlighted several important points about this year's budget:

- Protects the Safety Net Reserve. The Safety Net Reserve was created with the intention of maintaining CalWORKS and Medi-Cal benefits in the event of a recession creating higher caseloads due to higher unemployment. While the Governor's May revision proposed tapping into these funds, the final budget does not draw from the Safety Net Reserve.

- Does not include any ongoing cuts to core programs and maintains planned increases for schools, higher education, CalWORKs, Medi-Cal expansions, and more.
- Includes a reserve of nearly \$38 billion. This record high reserve is notable given the shortfall the budget is facing.

The budget agreement projects a gap, or shortfall, of approximately \$30.7 billion. This shortfall is due to several factors, including lower tax revenues, higher interest rates, and a weaker stock market. While the budget does not assume a recession, the Legislative Analyst's Office estimates that this shortfall is likely to be \$6 billion higher than the administration's estimate. Within this context, it's important to note that the legislature does have the discretion to pull back any one-time funding by March 4th, 2024.

There are major early learning and care investments and historic wins in this year's budget:

- Major reform to family fees to address inequitable costs for families with low incomes accessing subsidized care. The details of these reforms are shared in [The 2023–24 California State Budget: Key Implications for Early Learning and Care \(Key Implications\), slides 8-9.](#)
- Rate Increases: Due to the organizing and advocacy efforts around rates, this year's budget includes up to \$2.8 billion for reimbursement rate increases distributed across two years. It additionally requires the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to develop an alternative methodology based on the cost of care. Rate reform of the budget was linked to the collective bargaining agreement with Child Care Providers United (CCPU), described in further detail in [Key Implications, slide 10.](#) All of this language is now reflected in the [budget trailer bill, AB 140, on the California Legislative Information website.](#)

This hard work is going to make an incredible difference in the lives of providers across the state, but the work is far from over. The budget only includes one-time funding to cover two years of rate reform. Theoretically, after that point, the state should have an alternative methodology based on the true cost of care, but there is not yet a plan for how the new rates will be funded on an ongoing basis. Additionally, funding for some state commitments are delayed (see [Key Implications, slide 11.](#))

Committee Questions and Public Discussion — Tonia McMillian, Chair of the Workforce Advisory Committee

Ms. McMillian invited comments and questions from attendees both in person and via Zoom. (The full text of this discussion period is captured on pages 6–13 of the [August 29, 2023 WAC/PAC meeting transcript](#))

Deborah Corley-Marzett, family care provider, thanked Dr. Pryor. She shared her gratitude for CCPU's historic win for retirement, as well as the healthcare fund and training fund for California's providers. Her hope is for a permanent funding stream to

support these programs and the new true cost of care methodology because "...providers should not have to, at the end of each contract, fight for what they truly deserve." She noted that she was interested in reviewing the text of AB 140.

Dr. Pryor thanked Ms. Corley-Marzett and confirmed that the \$2.8 billion in the state budget is one-time funds over two years noting "... there is still a need for a dedicated ongoing funding source." Dr. Pryor and the chairs then addressed the following questions from attendees.

- *Will the California State Preschool Program (CSPP) continue to be held harmless after September 30th?*
 - Yes. CSPP and Title V will be included in hold harmless.
- *When 'delayed' is stated, does this mean that it will not be implemented until stated date?*
 - It will be implemented at the time stated unless it's delayed further in next year's Budget Act.
- *Will there be more funding to support and retain the workforce? We are currently in a crisis.*
 - This topic is an area that must be addressed, and that conversation is still ongoing.
- *Will the State Reimbursement Rate (SRR) receive a cost-of-living adjustment?*
 - No.
- *Will the next budget have funding for special needs children to have lower-cost or no-fee evaluations?*
 - This year's budget mentioned screenings for reading disabilities, but the costs for other screenings are unknown.
- *October 1 is when the new family fee schedule begins, with no fees for families below 75% of state median income (SMI), but there are families currently enrolling or recertifying. What is the guidance to agencies? How are they informing parents about fees? Are they obligated to inform them of how much the fees would have been previously, or are they being told to tell families, "Starting October 1, we're looking at your income. You're not going to pay any fees"?*

The previous family fee schedule is still on the CDSS website. The notice of action there should state that fees are waived until September 30. It is okay for agencies to say that there is a bill currently moving through the legislative process that will potentially create a different fee schedule.

The new family fee schedule, which takes effect October 1, is already posted. Agencies can reference it and say, "This could be the potential new family fee schedule." Once AB 140 is signed, CDSS will release a Child Care Bulletin.

- *How long does the Governor have to sign AB 140?*
 - The Governor has until October 14.
- *Does it have to wait for the Governor's signature before CDSS can send the bulletin out?*
 - Yes, we need to wait for the signature so then everyone can be aware of the different steps and the timeline to think about those next steps.
- *Some parents are choosing not to enroll without knowing fees or if fees are too high. Do agencies and providers need those next steps and timelines in writing from CDSS before speaking to these parents?*
 - Providers can tell parents that if they are under 75 percent of SMI, there's no fee.
- *Will AB 140 still go into effect October 1 or when it is signed?*
 - The way AB 140 is written, the effective date is October 1. If it is signed after that date, it would be effective retroactively.
- *Is there any updated information on whether hold harmless will continue after Sept 30?*

The ECE trailer bill states: "The Legislature hereby allocates funds to the State Department of Social Services and the State Department of Education to provide family child care providers with the monthly cost of care plus rate commencing January 1, 2024, and through June 30, 2025, inclusive...The state shall provide the amount of the monthly costs of care plus rate for all family child care providers serving children described in this paragraph based on the number of subsidized children enrolled. This monthly rate shall be issued to family child care providers based on monthly child enrollments for subsidized child care and development and state preschool programs."

AB-140 has a list of programs with the cost of care plus that is an additional amount that providers would receive, and it's arranged based on geographical location.

- *Is there any chance that the ECE trailer bill won't be signed or that items will be removed?*
 - The budget committee meeting will provide more clarity about the path forward for the bill.

Ms. McMillian thanked Dr. Pryor for her expertise and overview.

Ms. Ignatius stated "what we have accomplished collectively in this state budget for families and providers is truly historic. It's really a game changer." She pointed to federal guidance to eliminate fees for families below 150 percent of federal poverty level, which has already been achieved in California. And she noted that the new fee schedule will put California way ahead of a lot of the rest of the nation. "We want to make sure we give ourselves a moment to take all of that in and feel good about this work."

She pointed out several other areas where California has made great strides. The state has the first retirement fund for child care providers in the nation. Family fee reform means thousands of dollars remaining in families' pockets so they can decide what to do with money they've earned. Increases to provider pay, in whatever form they arrive, means increasing quality of life for providers who work to increase the quality of life for the children and families they serve.

On behalf of the chairs, Ms. Ignatius acknowledged the efforts of the child care providers and families who took time off from school or work to advocate for reforms: "It is making a difference, and we all deserve to celebrate."

What's Next: Committee Discussion to Identify Areas of Need for Families and the Workforce

(The full text of the committees' discussion is captured in pages 15–31 of the [August 29, 2023 WAC/PAC meeting transcript](#).)

Ms. Ignatius reminded participants that the two advisory committees' purposes are 1) to bring voice to the needs of parents and providers and 2) to share policy advice with the Council. She commended parents and providers for their unity in mutual support. She shared that the committees could have met separately, "but that didn't feel like the spirit of this victory and what we know is needed going ahead."

She then offered the committee members a question: "What rises to the top for you as the most important ways to support parents and providers?" The answers to this question will be revisited in the November meeting and reflected in policy recommendations shared with the Council.

Ms. McMillian shared that at the top of her list of ways to support ECE providers is creating a career pathway that incentivizes the men and women who want to do the work. The career pathway and base pay should be equitable, relatable, and attainable. Those who want to seek higher education should be validated by having somewhere to grow with a salary that matches their educational investments and hard work in the field. She then opened the floor for committee member discussion.

Cherie Schroeder asked Ms. McMillian to expand on her vision of an incentivized ECE workforce.

Ms. McMillian expounded on her ideal vision, both for those entering the field without a college background and for those already in the sector seeking higher education: "If you seek to go and have higher education, then your pay, your rate, should increase just like any other vocation..."

Naima Facih pointed out that in the ECE sector, pursuing higher education comes with a cost: "You end up with the bills, with a loan, but then you are not making more to pay back the loan at least. So it looks good in your books; you have a certificate, higher education. But — any education, it's always valuable. The higher you go, the better it is. But... you now have a new bill."

Ms. Schroeder noted that many who have earned master's degrees in early childhood education leave the field because it's not equitable: "You just gave the time, gave the finances to better yourself, and then you don't see the ability to stay there."

Deborah Ward advocated for considering free college tuition for those wanting to pursue a career in early education or child development.

Ms. Ignatius expanded on this point, noting the availability of two years of free community college in California, which can reduce loan debts. She also raised the question of whether there are efforts for loan forgiveness for early childhood professionals.

Ms. McMillian commented that it can also be challenging to go through an apprenticeship program and see rates stay the same.

Virginia Eigen stated, "If we incentivize growth in the field, we'll be able to attract more people to the field."

Carola Olivia Olson brought up EDvance College's debt-free bachelor's degree pathway. The EDvance model includes evening class meetings as a cohort, student success advocates, and credit in the field. Ms. Olsen said, "This is absolutely necessary. We are now bringing in general education courses that are built to be ECE related."

Zoila Toma shared her perspective on improvements in the field as a long-time family child care practitioner: "I love everything that I have here, and I've been part of the transformation that I see in my industry as a child care early educator. We have the CCPU training fund that I am getting benefit from right now...retirement fund and health benefits."

She went on to discuss areas she believes need improvement:

Cost of care and rate reimbursement: "We haven't got an increase in the next two years. We just got an additional fee for child... Are we going to going to lose what we just gained these two years and then start from scratch again? ...I think that it's not fair and affects everybody, affects the families because the high cost of child care is still there."

- Meeting families' unique needs: Family child care providers need to be taken into consideration. "...We have to give the parents a choice...Right now, I see not only that three years old are just going to go to the public system. Newborns too. And many people still don't see that. My school is promoting that. There's a big banner, 'zero to five'...It is good that we are bringing this opportunity for families to go back to work and they have a place where to bring the child... So why do we have the lack of teacher when you have a whole force 40-something child care educators in California that we being working in area education? ...Why are we not being taken into consideration having experience, the knowledge and many of us are still sticking and going to college for it to get better educations."

Ms. Facih advocated a focus on quality care that provides a foundation for preschool through elementary school: “One of the issues that the school district’s facing now is kids are delayed in math and on reading. ...I think it’s very important to work on providing the services... that set up these children. When they reach the age to go to elementary school, they’re going to be all ready....”

She also described the challenges faced by providers and parents when evaluations and screenings for special needs students are out of reach. She noted providers with training and experience in caring for children with disabilities may turn families away because they don’t feel they have the capacity or skills. When parents struggle to find care and the access the right supports, the child can lose out on valuable learning and socialization time: “So having access to these evaluations on time and having them being in child care and private, it is going to make a huge difference in their lives for the long run.”

Ms. McMillian commended Ms. Facih for bringing screenings to the fore, pointing out that many young Black boys have experienced toxic stress, but they are often labeled as having behavioral issues: “And so, misreading that as something else and then just placing them in a situation or a class or an environment that they really did not need to be in that could have been discovered through a proper screening.”

Ms. Toma spoke from her personal experience as a parent and child care provider regarding the investment needed to provide individualized educational plans and screenings for each child: “...this is why I’m in the field, because my daughter didn’t have that educated teacher. They were really good teachers, but not in that area and that need that my child had that moment. That’s all she needed, that right approach. ... They need somebody to guide them and do the right thing. And we don’t have the funding for that. We don’t have the support. And this is not just in family child care. This is in the schools. This happened to me 20 years ago... It’s the slow changes and I’m happy about the progress, but we’re far away from the real change.”

Deborah Corley-Marzett shared her belief that key benefits are incentives to make this industry more attractive for people to want to come in: “This is an important part, for family daycare, home-based educators, to have a solid retirement [fund], to have a solid healthcare fund, and that training fund. For those providers or those... who are interested in going into this particular field, can continue their education.”

She also underscored that provider inclusion in Universal Pre-K (UPK) may stabilize their desire to remain: “...we have to make sure that all community providers are included in that mixed-delivery system if we want it to work. That’s a concerning issue for me....”

Patrick MacFarlane noted that the state legislature is expected to vote on school bond funding in 2024, but that the bonds are written to include Transitional Kindergarten through community college (TK–14). He raised his concern about the lack of inclusion of ECE in these bonds: “And when you’re looking at \$15 billion worth of facilities funding, I think to not include the youngest learners would be a critical mistake for the state to

make.” He also emphasized the importance of funds administration: “To have some of that funding be utilized through the Department of Social Services for infant care, for community-based child care centers would be really important, because we see that it polls really well, and if we want the bond to pass, I think that would be something to really consider.” Finally, Mr. MacFarlane, raised the importance of paid family leave: “...the more that we can do to expand access to paid family leave in the duration of the time that families have to access, it would be tremendously helpful for families in California.”

Ms. Ignatius concurred with Mr. McFarlane’s comments on investing in the earliest learners: “We can have all of these dreams, but we need the money for these dreams to happen and to consider that as a strategy.”

Ms. Ward underscored Mr. McFarlane’s observation on costs of infant care based on her experience, and also spoke to the points raised about children needing the right environment: “Yes, infant/toddler care is expensive to operate, unless you have a preschool program to help support it. Our parents that left to [go to] TK programs are trying to come back to our program because their children are having difficulty. Difficulty because the environment is not developmentally appropriate.”

Janet Zamudio shared a list of priorities for supporting providers and parents that included 1) continuing to focus on increasing pay for providers, 2) professionalizing the field, 3) assuring access to infant and toddler care, and 4) support and mentorship in building their businesses for family child care providers.

She also pointed out the impact of TK on infant care and the perception of exclusion in the related planning process: “Transitional kindergarten is decimating child care programs, especially those that are still yet serving infants. In order to serve infants and toddlers in a program that’s serving children zero to five, you have to have preschoolers. ...I know the districts are taking the lead or the LEAs [local education agencies] are taking the lead in planning this and are the ones that are leading in the space of UPK planning, ...oftentimes programs are still not invited to those decision-making tables.”

Ms. Ignatius inquired about the relationship between UPK, TK, and community-based providers, and what would be required for more equitable conversations to happen.

Ms. Zamudio noted that it might take a directive from the state, and she described the potential interplay of department directives, LEA, and the state in regards to UPK planning: “There’s a lot at stake here, but I really think that a community process in deciding who is involved in UPK planning efforts might be the way to go in terms of just understanding what community organizations and what programs and experts . . . there’s so many people in every community that should have the opportunity in planning this, but we’re not being given that opportunity necessarily. It’s still very led by the LEA in the county in terms of who is invited to participate in these planning efforts.”

Ms. McMillian pointed out that, as part of the Blue Ribbon Commission recommendations, she had suggested the creation of a specialized “infant-only

program” license. The goal of this license would be to incentivize those in the workforce interested in that specialty and also to address lack of providers for families with infants.

Ms. Corley-Marzett expressed support for the inclusion of community-based providers in the UPK and TK conversations and decision-making: “Let’s fix this. I’ll continue to bring it up until it’s fixed and everyone’s included and making the point for all providers in the state of California to be included in UPK and not excluded, at least to have an opportunity.”

Ms. Schroeder—a long-time educator, foster parent, and advocate—shared her opinion on the lack of provider inclusion in high-level decision-making and perceived under valuation of the ECE workers and populations served: “This is my 42nd year of doing this. And I actually taught a pre-K in a school district here in California for two years. And I just listened to all of this and I think, ...that underlying all of this is really this lack of inclusion. That we don’t look at children, still, as the most valuable commodity. And until we shift the foundation to this, all of these fights just continue because there’s not enough value on early childhood education. There’s not enough value on teachers.”

She circled back to Ms. McMillian’s earlier point regarding young children of color not being properly screened or assessed to discuss her experience with the child foster care population. “There’s so much research out there right now that there’s so much discrimination.... We’re doing wrong by some of the most vulnerable populations in the United States. And here we have these conversations of, ‘Can we get enough money?’ It’s crazy. It’s partly we just don’t value this work in our families and our children.”

Ms. Ignatius proposed the state consider a “declaration on the rights of children” that lays out what children in California deserve.

She summarized select past recommendations from parents, including 1) calculating the whole child care cost, 2) potential ongoing revenue sources, 3) how to get families on a child care waitlist before birth, 4) mandating that every licensed child care program accept subsidies, and 5) providing transferrable vouchers.

Ms. McMillian raised the issue of family child care providers needing to repeat the licensing process when they move: “And then we end up getting a new license number because we are not licensed, the house is licensed...Other vocations get a certificate, a diploma with a license number that follows them their entire career.”

Ms. Ignatius summarized the topics raised during committee conversation:

- Need for better outreach about services in community-based programs, including infant and toddler care.
- Creation of career pathways and appropriate compensation, especially for upward movement.
- Need for free education programs and loan forgiveness.

- Clear directives from CDSS for collaboration between UPK, TK, and the overall early education system, especially to involve family child care providers.
- Opportunity to include ECE in school bond funding.
- Desire to increase access to and extend paid family leave, including wage replacement.
- Increased availability of infant and toddler care, and improved pay for providers who focus on infant and toddler care.
- Improved special needs evaluations, including much better training for the providers serving these children.
- Importance of a family child care license following the provider rather than strictly being tied to the service address.

Ms. Corley-Marzett stated that COVID is still impacting providers who contract the virus and, therefore, the families who rely on them: “If COVID is the norm, then we need to go ahead and have something in place to fight that norm and to make providers more comfortable in being in this space.” She specifically called out the continuing need for COVID guidelines for child care providers.

Ms. Eigen made a related observation, voicing her concern about the lack of required health notifications for COVID exposure: “I am concerned that we do not give exposure notices for COVID. I personally got COVID the second week of school. My aide caught it too and some students. Why is it that we give exposure notices for pink eye and strep throat, but COVID is not being treated the same way?”

Public Comment (Zoom and Chat Speakers Included)

(Full record of public comment is captured in pages 32–38 of the [August 29, 2023 WAC/PAC meeting transcript](#).)

One participant commented that the fee waiver “is a good start but does not address the issue families with students with special needs are running into, e.g., school districts are refusing to provide services to TK-eligible students when they are not enrolled in TK. The result is prohibiting family choice and is a disservice to students that thrive in the smaller ratios, quality requirements, and teaching expertise of CBO (community based organization) providers (family child care, center based, etc.) ... It's really frustrating and heartbreaking and definitely I feel like not putting the children first, which is where our heart should be.”

Samantha Thompson of Black Californians United for Early Care and Education, and member of the UPK Mixed Delivery Work Group encouraged attendees to participate in the work group meetings “because I do think that there is a misunderstanding by the field in terms of how mixed delivery is being defined through the work group. And that was something that was actually discussed during last week's meeting... I think it would be very important for the field to understand how UPK mixed delivery is being defined.”

- Resources for UPK Mixed Delivery Quality and Access Workgroup are available on the [California Educators Together website](#).

Crystal Jones, family child care provider, thanked everyone for their hard work, advocacy and leadership. She commented how important it is “to come to these UPK work group meetings where we can advocate and be that public voice to say, ‘We are part of the mixed-delivery system.’ And, children start in child care before they even get to the school system. So how can we consistently be showing up to let them know we matter and we need the inclusion. And together we are a team to support all families and children.”

Sara Lynn commented on the definition of UPK mixed delivery: “True P–3, as initially defined and researched by Professor Heckman and the Heckman Equation, defines P-3 “P” as prenatal to third grade, and all of his research shows the earlier you start and fund, the greater the outcomes. California has instead decided to invest starting at 4-year-olds and define “P” as preschool—in other words leaving out infants and toddlers. I am hopeful CDSS and [the California Department of Education] can better advocate and/or inform the legislature that the focus must start at birth through third grade.”

Michelle Sanchez from San Diego asked for advice from the group on the best route and steps to starting a daycare business.

Ms. McMillian expressed excitement at Ms. Sanchez’s goal to serve children and families as an aspiring child care business provider. She pointed to the necessity of going through a formal orientation on the licensing website and follow all the steps to obtain a home license. She encouraged Ms. Sanchez to reach out to her nearest resource and referral agency (R&R) for guidance, find a mentor in her area, and connect with organizations that provide information on how to start and run a successful business.

Furthermore, Ms. McMillian took a moment to brainstorm a suggestion that the online orientation be updated to include veteran subject matter experts sharing their expertise with aspiring providers.

- Resources for new child care businesses via the Child Care Initiative Project are available on the [California Resource & Referral Network website](#).
- Resources for the child care workforce on mentorship are available on the [California Early Childhood Mentor Program website](#).
- Resources for child care providers in San Diego are available on the [YMCA website](#).

Ms. Toma recommended new child care providers take child development classes because “the approach and how to teach children now... it's very different from that time how we grow up. ...The business part, of course, it's a major thing, but that development of the children, it's a priority in this industry.”

Ms. Schroeder concurred with Ms. Toma’s sentiment, noting the value of pursuing education for oneself and being up to date on current child care practices. “It just elevates you up in status if you have, especially that two-year degree. ...And how we live with children and how we speak to families and to be so much more positive and engaging and open and outdoor play environments, et cetera.”

Ms. Corley-Marzett pointed out that in the online orientation for licensing you can interact directly with representatives such as California CCPU and seasoned providers.

Ms. McMillian shared resources with Ms. Jones, who has tried multiple avenues to advocate for herself and her program. She recommended reaching out to the [Child Care Law Center](#) and the [Public Counsel](#) in Los Angeles.

AnnLouise Bonito shared that she believes there is a need to transition “from being just people who care for children to those who lay the foundation for our society because we’re educating kids.” She also advocated for “transparency in the resources and the ability for Tribes to actually get that information because as a Tribal grantee, when I go to the state for some of the resources that are shared, if you’re not associated with a local ECE county or a school district, sometimes you’re limited from being able to access those pieces.”

Ms. McMillian thanked the public, fellow ECPC members, and Parent and Workforce Advisory Committee members for their continued dedication to this work. She informed attendees that next Joint Parent and Workforce Advisory Committee meeting is November 16, and the meeting was adjourned.