Early Childhood Policy Council

Parent and Workforce Advisory Committees

Agenda and Transcript
Virtual Meeting
Monday, September 21, 2026
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Physical Meeting
1000 G Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
WestEd, 5th floor, Capitol Room

Agenda

1. **Introduction**
   - Review meeting protocols
   - Welcome
   - Review of agenda
2. **Provide Input to Draft Council Recommendations**
   - Share draft Council recommendations under development
   - Seek input from Advisory Committee members
3. **Provide Input on 2028-2030 Child Care and Development Fund State Plan**
   - Presentation on Draft 2028-2030 State Plan
   - Seek input from Advisory Committee members
4. **General Public Comment**
5. **Adjourn**

Attendance:

Parent Advisory Committee Members:

Deborah Corley-Marzett, Lissete Frausto, Mary Ignatius, Patrick MacFarlane

Workforce Advisory Committee:

AnnLouise Bonnitto, Latonda Williams, Miren Algorri, Tonia McMillian, Zoila Toma

ECPC Council Members – Guest Speakers:

Andrea Fernandez, Karla Pleitéz Howell, Sonia Jaramillo

Hosts:
Diana Yactayo, Jateri Willis, Karin Bloomer, Ramee Serwanga, Eleonora Venti Webb (SP), Estefania Buitrago (SP), Wendy Feng (CN), Xiangyao Bowler (CN)

Meeting Transcript:

1. Introduction

- Review Zoom Protocols

Karin Bloomer:
... the Zoom features with you. We'll enable these features after providing these instructions. In a few moments, we will 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:
[foreign language 00:00:37]

And now, I'll give the floor to the Mandarin colleague.

Mandarin Interpreter:
[foreign language 00:01:04].

Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:
We will 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 15 minutes at the end of each agenda item to invite written public comment. During the final public comment period, we will also invite verbal public comment.

In addition, the slides we share today will be posted on the ECPC webpage within the next week. Finally, committee 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 the Chair of the ECPC Parent Advisory Committee, Mary Ignatius.

- Welcome

Mary Ignatius:
Good morning, everyone, and welcome. I'm Mary Ignatius, Chair of the ECPC Parent Advisory Committee. And I'm joined by my amazing colleague, Tonia McMillan, Chair of

the Workforce Advisory Committee. And I just want to thank members of the advisory committees for being here today. Also want to acknowledge, we didn't realize in scheduling today that it was also Yom Kippur. And so for all those who celebrate, we apologize for having the meeting on this day, but also want to acknowledge this day. And thank you to members of the public who have joined us.

Before Tonia and I review the agenda, I want to announce that there are three vacancies on the ECPC Parent Advisory Committee. Two of those vacancies are appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, and one vacancy is appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly. And each seat on the committee is intended to represent a certain consumer experience. So for the Senate appointments, there are two vacant seats, and they are reserved for one consumer who represents a tribal organization who receives services from a childcare provider, and one consumer... Oh, I just lost my notes.

Oh, gosh. And I'm on a new computer. Okay, bear with me. One consumer is from a tribal organization and one receives services from a Transitional Kindergarten provider. And then for the assembly seat, it is reserved for a consumer who is connected to the child welfare system. So to be considered for an appointment, you need to submit an application. And if you would like to apply for one of these appointments, please go to the ECPC webpage, and at the top is a hyperlink on how to apply. And I believe someone is going to put those links into the chat. And the links are both for the Senate Committee Rules appointment page and the Speaker of the Assembly appointment page. Now, I will give it back to Tonia.

- Review Agenda

Tonia McMillian:
Thank you, Mary. So I am Tonia McMillan, and I am the Chair of the Workforce Subcommittee. Today, the advisory committee members are being asked to give input to draft recommendations that the council is formulating. At our last joint meeting on June 9th, our committee members were invited to give their feedback on the first drafts. The draft recommendations were updated based on your feedback as well as feedback from the council and public comment. Council representatives are here today to share updated drafts to your input.

And after the agenda item, the Department of Social Services will be seeking our input on the draft 2028, 2030 CCDF State Plan. Then, we will invite general public comment and adjourn at noon. So that concludes our first agenda item. We will open up the chat for 15 minutes for public comment on this item. After the public chat, we will welcome ECPC member Andrea Fernandez Mendoza to share the first set of draft council recommendations for your feedback.

2. *Provide Input to Draft Council Recommendations*

- Share draft Council recommendations under development

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Good morning, everyone. And thank you again for that warm welcome. I'm bringing to you today the draft recommendations that are based on your feedback from the last meeting and feedback from the meeting on June 9th. We also are going to take the feedback from today and incorporate it into the next draft of the recommendations. The first is the Flex Factor to Stabilize the Contract Earning Floor. A recap of our process today at the May 27th ECPC meeting and the June 9th joint meeting of the Workforce Advisory Committee and Parent Advisory Committee.

Our subcommittee shared a first draft of the council recommendation pertaining to the ECPC priority list in our 2026-'27 budget letter. Providing support for childcare policy changes that build a more resilient ECE ecosystem, prioritizing provider-centered fiscal reforms that ensure 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 shocks of fluctuating attendance. Next slide please.

Some of the key updates made to our current draft recommendation based on the feedback that we received at these meetings, our subcommittee has made the following changes to the current draft recommendations. We clarified the terminology based on much of the feedback from all of you and replaced childcare providers with center-based programs in relevant sections to eliminate any confusion that might be had as family childcare homes, FCCHs are already eligible for the maximum certified hours, and the flex factor does not apply to them.

The second change was a frame recommendation as a short-term bridge. So while there was some pushback on having it as a long-term, the most important part is that there is a bridge between how the hold harmless was calculated to what we are going to be experiencing now starting July 1st of 2026 and explicitly designate the flex factor as a short-term stability strategy, because many of the contractors that we are finding have not experienced having to earn their contract, and so this would help the transition until permanent rate reform under AB 1981 will be implemented. Next slide please.

A brief summary of the issue. Historically, childcare programs were paid based on attendance. If a child stayed home from childcare due to illness or other reasons, and it was not an excused absence, the center lost money but still will have to pay fixed costs. So some of those fixed costs are like salaries, 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 to their full contract amount if they met 95% of their attendance-based earnings. This flex factor was specific to center-based programs as family childcare homes were already eligible for maximum certified hours. Next slide please.

During COVID, the State implemented the hold harmless protection for childcare centers so that contractors would be paid the maximum amount of their contract

regardless of attendance to account for the pandemic crisis. This hold harmless protection ended on June 30th, 2026. So as of July 1st, the State now reimburses childcare centers based on enrollment rather than daily attendance. However, the enrollment-based reimbursement structure is not accompanied by a flex factor policy to support a contract earning floor. Next slide.

This shift to reimbursing childcare centers based on enrollment rather than daily attendance was a significant win and a significant milestone in improving the sustainability of childcare provision in California. Enrollment-based reimbursement provides a more predictable revenue stream that doesn't fluctuate weekly. Reliable revenue allows directors to budget for an entire year and set realistic budgets that allow for guaranteed hours in salaried positions, which are essential for long-term workforce professionalization. Next slide.

Many factors prevent center-based programs from achieving full enrollment, including Universal Transitional Kindergarten expansion, declining birth rates, staff shortages, immigration enforcement, and related fears of accessing subsidized programs. Additionally, many center contractors have only operated under the hold harmless rules and they are unfamiliar with budgeting for fluctuating enrollment. As a result, a flex factor policy is still needed in the enrollment-based payment structure to support that transition and support childcare sustainability and access. Without this policy change, childcare centers will continue to struggle with unpredictable budgets and a loss of staff, which negatively impact families' access to childcare. Next slide.

So the first part of our first recommendation for ECPC consideration is a policy. And in this policy, we urge the legislature and governor, and we know that it will be a new 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 as these funds are already allocated within existing contract allocations. Next slide.

So now we are coming to you, and we ask that if you have any feedback or thoughts on this. You were sent the drafts in your email that announced the meeting, and so you should have a copy of them. But please raise your hand, and I ask for your help in the room, if you see a hand that I don't see because of my limitations on my screen, to please feel free to come off mute or ask to be let off mute so that we can take your comments or your recommendations.

I know one of the things that was brought up in the meantime while I'm waiting for you to... One of the things that was brought up is that what we're seeing is that there is a difference between CSPP contracts and the other contracts. So some of the milestones and some of the wins for this last budget cycle did not apply to other programs. It specifically only applied to CSPP. So migrant family funding was left out, tribal funding, CCTR funding. And so, at least one of my recommendations is that there is some language built in to make it inclusive and equitable for all programs. So do I see any hands raised? Karin, do you see any on your end?

- Seek input from Advisory Committee members

Karin Bloomer:
I am not seeing any. Is there an advisory committee member who has their hand up? If so, please feel free to unmute and go ahead. And also in the room here, of course, as well.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
So I do see a couple of comments in the chat, and I don't know, Catherine, if you want to come off mute to give a little more input on your recommendations for comment seven, bullet one.

Karin Bloomer:
So Andrea, Catherine is a member of the public in this set-

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Oh. Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't see that.

Karin Bloomer:
That's okay. That's okay. AnnLouise Bonnitto, I see you had something in the chat. I don't know if you're open to also just elaborating verbally.

AnnLouise Bonnitto:
I can. Thank you very much. The recommendation, definitely, I think we should move forward with it. It will create, not only stability for the childcare providers and create a stable environment, but also families. Families really rely on making sure that we have those centers to bring our children. If those centers can no longer actually be open because they're not getting the funding that they need, that creates a destabilizing factor for the family. So it's really very secular.

If we don't address one thing, it will cause a problem somewhere else. In the tribal agencies like myself, we have already institutionalized paying the license, state license, not just tribal, but state licensed providers the full monthly amount as long as the child, even if they only go part-time, we will pay for the full slot as we know that that's very important for them to stay in business. And that's my comment.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Thank you. And yes, that does give context a little bit to why we need this to happen. One of the biggest factors that contractors are facing is that they're not able to enroll fully their contract and utilize all of the adjustment factors that they're able because of the scarcity of staff, because families are afraid to enroll and utilize public services. And so on top of the declining birth rate MTK, it's kind of the perfect storm.

And it's more prevalent where there is saturated care or TKs or the LAUSD or some school systems have more TK than others. And so, it is something that we've seen across the State. And seeing that there is no other comments from advisory members, I appreciate your feedback and thank you for your comments. And may I have the next slide please, because I know I'm on limited time today.

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you, Andrea.

- Share draft Council recommendations under development (continued)

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
So our next draft recommendation is to advance the rate reform process. The recap of the process to date, so at the same May 27th ECPC meeting and the June 9th joint meeting of the Workforce Advisory Committee and Parent Advisory Committee, the subcommittees shared our first draft for a council recommendation pertaining to the following ECPC priority in our '26-'27 budget letter, funding the rate reform to ensure compensation for the true cost of care at rates reflecting economic realities. Next slide please.

Based on the feedback received at those meetings, our subcommittee has made the following changes to the current draft recommendations. Tribal sovereignty. Formally recognizing that the Tribal Childcare Association of California as an active sovereign partner in planning, rate discussions, and data collection. Base rate enhancements, which will 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.

Added meaningful collaboration, added language to address friction among CCPU, the State, and stakeholders, ensuring State-imposed prerequisites do not impede implementation. Facilities as a structural barrier. Highlighted the need to address facilities gaps and licensing delays, especially in rural areas. Next slide please.

California is transitioning to a cost-based alternative methodology to set reimbursement rates, moving away from the price-based Regional Market Rate, RMR, which institutionalizes race and income-based inequities. While progress has been made, including the right of family childcare providers to unionize and the development of the cost estimation model, full implementation of the Single Rate Structure, the SRS is delayed, and it is contingent upon budget decisions and expected to take at least two additional years. Next slide.

Some of our successes that we've made to date. Family childcare providers, again, were given the right to unionize and collectively bargain with the State, leading to the formation of Childcare Providers United. The State has developed the alternative methodology cost model and is moving toward a Single Rate Structure. The State has provided funding for implementation activities and automation of infrastructure.

The State extended and expanded the Cost of Care Plus payments, a form of interim financial relief while the State works toward permanent cost-based reimbursement rate. The State also extended policies allowing providers to be reimbursed based on certified enrollment rather than on attendance alone. Next slide, please.

Despite the progress, several key issues remain unresolved. Unresolved issues include delays in statewide rate schedules, funding uncertainty, and disagreements over geographic cost assumptions. So some of those ongoing gaps include lack of workforce benefits and stability. There's a lack of structural allowances for retirement, healthcare,

and predictive pay for employees in both centers and Family Childcare Home Education Networks, FCHENs. There's tribal exclusions.

The State failed 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 expansions. Collaboration gaps. State-identified prerequisites for rate reform are increasingly viewed by providers as policy barriers rather than supportive steps. Next slide, please.

So our first recommendation for consideration is ensuring 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. Next slide.

Ensure consistent and equitable application across the mixed delivery system. To ensure the shift to a Single Rate Structure delivers on its promise of equity, the implementation plan must ensure equity across provider types, which is a policy-driven recommendation to apply the same cost-based methodology uniformly across center-based and family childcare providers with appropriate structural adjustments.

And B, incorporate comprehensive based rate enhancement, which is another policy item and policy reform that we're pushing forward, explicitly designing the base and enhanced rates to cover non-traditional hours, inclusion supports for children with disabilities, predictive pay and benefits, both health insurance and retirement. Next slide please.

C, address infrastructure and facilities. This is a policy-driven recommendation which would establish dedicated support mechanisms to help providers navigate licensing and overcome facility barriers when expanding or adapting to serve younger age groups, zero to three. Partner with tribal sovereignties, which is another policy push, formally recognize and include the Tribal Childcare Association of California as a distinct partner in State planning, rate negotiations, and data collection.

Address other legacy inequities, which is another policy push, to ensure rate setting process accounts for the race and income-based inequities of the legacy RMR system. F, keep the model current, which is another policy-based recommendation, to update the cost estimation model regularly to prevent rates from becoming outdated. And G, don't wait to increase rates, which is a policy and a budget ask to provide immediate interim rate increases to bridge the gap to the true cost of care. Next slide please.

Number three, require transparent, collaborative, and honest data in all decisions. Rates and fiscal estimates must be based on actual verifiable cost data rather than deflated or selectively presented figures. Item A, foster active co-design, which is a policy ask. Address unresolved disagreements transparently.

Ensure CDSS actively engages in meaningful and ongoing collaboration with CCPU and other ECE stakeholders, ensuring that the prerequisites for rate reform serve as building blocks rather than administrative barriers. Ensure data transparency, which is another policy push, to ensure that the methodology is documented clearly enough for independent review and explicitly communicates any changes in projections or data assumptions. Next slide please.

So that was a lot, but we do ask for you to please provide feedback on them. Some of the comments that were brought up in the last meeting that are not included in some of these changes were that people were being left out. So we're trying to make sure that all of those people are being addressed and highlighted, but I do open it up. And I see AnnLouise, you have your hand raised?

- Seek input from Advisory Committee members (continued)

AnnLouise Bonnitto:
That's correct. I have a few items, and let me look at my chat. I put it in there. So a couple of things. When you are addressing for the tribal programs, I recommend very strongly that you change it from tribal communities to tribes. It's incredibly important, okay? Because tribes are not ethnic groups, nor are they communities. They are sovereign nations. They're actually nations. So it's very important. So the partner with tribal sovereigns, it should actually say with tribes because that's indicative already.

The other part where it says formally recognize and include the Tribal Childcare Association of California. I'm a member of it, and that's great, but in it you should also include tribes and tribal agencies because not everybody belongs to the TCCAC. We don't want to leave voices out. That's happened in the past where the State has worked with the tribes, has only addressed and said, "Oh, these three tribes came, and those are the ones we invited." That leaves a very bad taste for tribes, and they will not want to be part of this. They want to be included. Other parts that I'm looking at-

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Could you slow down just a little bit because I'm trying to take notes?

AnnLouise Bonnitto:
Absolutely.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
But also, the translators are trying to keep up with our conversation.

AnnLouise Bonnitto:
I apologize. I do talk fast. I know we have limited time, so I was trying to get all my points in. I did type some of them in the chat just in case.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Thank you. Go ahead.

AnnLouise Bonnitto:
There's another part here that I was reading that talks about including transitional kindergarten, preschool, childcare centers, and you named the different ones, include tribal programs because that could be missed. And the reason I say this is, part of the work that's getting done to create a system that goes across every different type of childcare, when you have resource and referral systems under some management bulletins and also the educational code, it says that they will refer to different settings.

However, it is never stated that tribes, management bulletin back in 2010 said that they recommended. I would like to have it where tribal programs, tribes, and tribal agencies are included as part of that referral part because we're looking at the rates and reform. The data that's stated here that says that the TCCAC would partner and give data, they don't have that kind of data because tribes own their own data and tribes have to give permission to access that data.

So we want to make sure we create those MOUs with the tribes, so that data can be shared because all tribal children are dually eligible to be on both programs. California does count the child counts, but there's no real mechanism for them to even learn about the state system until they work with an agency like mine where we do partner with the State, but we'd like to have that across the board, where tribes may not have the capacity.

They can definitely say, "Hey, ABC Childcare, we're in the same county. I have a child that's eligible. How can we make this happen?" So really looking into refining that language and really just making sure anywhere where you make a distinction where there's expulsion and discipline, and you name Black, Latino Nation families, you really should include tribal families too because they are also at that higher rate.

With the rate reform, one of the things that tribes run into is we use the State's rate for our childcare centers or our reimbursement plans. However, the federal government has always had an issue with the fact that the way the plan was written, or at least the way the rate methodology, it didn't really state that the counties where the tribes reside in were really inclusive of tribal programs.

So we used to get questioned, "Why are you using the State? Is it truly indicative of a good equitable system?" So changing language to that effect, I think, will make it stronger for all of us where we can use it and we can also support non-tribal childcare centers to actually be on tribal land because we can create some partnerships, but also getting that language out there.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
May I ask just a clarifying question? The respectful and appropriate title would be tribal agencies or is there another preferred way to...

AnnLouise Bonnitto:
So tribes.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Tribes.

AnnLouise Bonnitto:
That'd be tribes.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Singularly.

AnnLouise Bonnitto:

And then tribal agencies because you do have tribes that through tribal resolution give that authority to those agencies to work on their behalf, like my agency.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Okay. Thank you. I appreciate your clarification. Some great feedback. The next hand I see Deborah, would you like to take the floor?

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Yes. Thank you. Good morning. Can you go to that slide about the state doing their updates, quarterly updates, or excuse me, annual updates?

Karin Bloomer:
Sorry. That one, Deborah?

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Submit a timeline transition... No, no, not that one at all. Not that one at all.

Karin Bloomer:
Sorry.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
It's okay. Yeah, yes. It was that one. Thank you for that.

Karin Bloomer:
Okay.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Deborah, did you have a comment on that?

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
On here it says "and update it annually until the rate implementation is complete." Is there a reason why we don't have that something quarterly or twice a year? I just think annually, it's just too slow.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
I believe that was put in as annually because of the bandwidth of CDSS to be able to meet a quarterly deadline and depending on what the information that is being asked to be put out, but I will add that to the notes to see if that is a feasible request.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Because as providers continue to wait, that just makes it even more so a waste of time of continually waiting and waiting for this to be completed.

And it helps with transparency on what's really going on at that table and to inform me once a year on an update is not good enough. Providers cannot continue to wait. It's not good enough. Thank you.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Thank you. Miren?

Miren Algorri:
Hi, good morning. Andrea, do you mind explaining what predictive pay means?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
So the predictive pay piece is where... So it was one of the things that the...

So going back a few steps, so predictive pay for family childcare homes would be where they were paid based on what the... Paid in advance versus after the fact.

But with the federal cutbacks, California never implemented it so that they would be paid ahead of time.

And so we're asking to have that put back in and that's something that we are able to do so that they're paid in advance, which is predictive versus what they're reimbursed for.

Miren Algorri:
Thank you for that. And can you please... Oh my goodness, I'm looking at my notes. When we talked about funding for our children with special needs, did we mention that there's going to be funding to serve children who are dual language learners?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
That was not included in that one, but we can add that to be inclusive of that funding.

Miren Algorri:
Yes, please. And are we including transportation as part of the baseline payment?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
That is a good question and I would have to defer. I believe that was taken into consideration when they were putting the cost model together, but I'm trying to see in the room who could confirm that for me.

Miren Algorri:
Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:
Lupe Jaime-Mileham is here and can respond to that.

Lupe Jaime-Mileham:
Yeah. Transportation was part of one of the elements in the matrix. So remember there was key elements and transportation was included and is part of the cost model.

Miren Algorri:
Outstanding. So we don't see the need to include it in this draft.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Well, it was included and I... Thank you, Lupe, for confirming that. And Deborah, I also see your comment that it's prospective pay and that's how I knew it, so we will be able to adjust that.

Miren Algorri:
Thank you, Deborah, because that was my question. We always use a prospective pay term, and so I just wanted to make sure that I was understanding that it was the same. Awesome. And who is included in this definition of mixed delivery system?

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
So that would be everyone that the state has highlighted already. So family childcare homes, TK centers, family, friend, and neighbor, I believe.

And please correct me if I'm wrong, Lupe, the mixed delivery system completely. So there is a chart that shows all of the systems that feed into it. And I apologize, I don't have that handy to share, but are you looking for a population specifically?

Miren Algorri:
Yeah, because the conversation has always been where this is truly a mixed delivery system, but it turns out that there isn't a mechanism for family childcare providers to actually be a part of the mixed delivery system.

And so as we are talking about who's included, how do we find the mechanism for family childcare providers to actually participate in the mixed delivery system?

Because that is a question we have always been told, again, theory, we can participate, but if there isn't a platform, a mechanism in place, then truly we're not participating in the mixed delivery system.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Do you have any recommendations on a type of mechanism or how that would look for you?

Miren Algorri:
Well, I think that, let's say for instance, when we are told, "Oh, well, FCCHEN that is the way where family childcare providers participate in the mixed delivery system," but I looked across San Diego County where I reside and there isn't such a thing.

I mean, there are agencies participating. There are agencies who are FCCHEN participants, but they do not have the preschool component.

So if we're saying that providers are participating in the mixed delivery system, because we have, I remember when I asked a while back, and I believe it was about six counties participating, that is not an inclusive mixed delivery system.

I mean, you can check a box, but in reality, you're not serving the children across the state and you're not giving the parents family childcare as an option to meet their needs.

And also what I remember is that when I looked up those counties, they were the more affluent counties, which as we are having conversation that's parents, I'm a mother also, I believe that the need should be mitigated first in the most underserved areas instead

of meeting a need in more affluent spaces where I believe that families in more affluent places have access to more and to other resources.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Thank you.

Miren Algorri:
Thank you, Andrea. And those are my questions and comments for now. Thanks a lot.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Thank you. I have taken notes on that, so I will see what I can do to get an answer.

Miren Algorri:
Thank you so much, Andrea.

Karin Bloomer:
I'm so sorry to interrupt. Sorry, this is Karin Bloomer.

Also, just as a suggestion, as a way to support these subcommittees, in addition to hearing your elaboration verbally, if you have specific language, draft content just to help the subcommittee understand and think about what might be included, I think it's a huge help.

So even after you speak, if you can add something into the chat that's possible language to address your comments, I know that would be lovely.

Also, on a final note, I know there's several hands. We do need to move on to the next subcommittee quite soon.

So just asking for concise feedback and then additions in the chat as a way to support. Thank you.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Please, thank you. Zoila, go ahead.

Zoila Toma:
Thank you very much. Good morning, everyone. Thank you for clarifying.

I had a question. Thank you, Miren, for asking that when it comes to predicted, which is prospective pay, because family childcare, for example, gets paid almost two months behind. We provide care 30 days, and then we still have to wait 21 days later. Right now it's 21, right? I haven't completely got paid yet because of the weekends and all this, so that will probably extend it to the full month, so that's very important.

When it comes to the mixed delivery system, yeah, we are eager to see a blueprint. We are eager to see how we fit in. Our name is always there. I always see it, but it's nothing clear.

One way that I think it will work, because if a state is telling us that it's ready to take care of childcare and early education, that means that it's ready for that money to follow the child wherever they go. If they go into a center, if they go into preschool, public school, if

they go to a family childcare program, the money should follow that child. Because at this point, some schools are even taking the children right now, even newborns, mommies to be. They are enrolling in some schools so that the system is ready, the funding is there, bring it on to everybody, but I want to see a blueprint.

I want to see how we are fitting in all this, because right now also we're moving to that through cost of care. I love it. I've been fighting for this. I've been waiting, but the reality is if we don't have children in our program, what different that's going to make in my family childcare program if I only have one or two children? I'm like, right? That's still going to put me out of business and paper is going to say, "Yeah, we make more money. We're getting paid through cost of care," but in reality, we're not making money because we have no children.

So there's a lot of things that still are unclear, that we still have a lot to do and work together for.

Also, another thing that maybe to consider is I can lose a child today. I lose income. Programs don't let me know that that child, it's going to be removed out of my program. I just lose income suddenly. So maybe bringing something also like two weeks notice, just like private families do with us, I think that will help us because that's another thing. That's putting us in control of our finances. We have no control in our finances because the government tell us when we're going to get paid, how we're going to get paid, everything. So at least we can have some sort of control on our finances.

That's for now. You need to move on. I'll probably make more comments throughout the conversation. Thank you.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
And please feel free to add your comments to the chat because I take all of those chat comments back as well to integrate those into our recommendations. So please feel free if you didn't have enough time to go ahead and do that. I'm going to go to Mary Ignatius and then we're going to wrap it up.

Mary Ignatius:
Just quickly, and just thank you to all of the comments that have come before me.

I wanted to just lift up during the last full ECPC meeting, we were talking about the cost model and that there are errors in the current cost model, in particular in Alameda County where they are in an incorrect region, and I think there may be other counties. I'm very close to the Alameda folks.

But I didn't really get an answer from the state as they're working on the new cost model, which will hopefully address this issue. How can we assure that this happens in time for the 2027 state plan?

And if someone from the department can just speak to a timeline or a commitment to addressing that error so we don't get locked in before it's too late.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:

Yes, and that was one of the things that I had written in our notes to integrate into this because that is an issue where some of the data is incorrect and they're placed in the wrong location or the wrong region.

So I will re-elevate that and include that in our recommendations because we also talked about how there was a system to be able to catch and correct the errors, not just identify them, but then get them fixed within a 30 day, I believe was the time period that we had talked about.

Mary Ignatius:
Okay, so we're going to add specific-

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
I'm going to figure out how to add that in so that there is a closed loop to getting it fixed.

Mary Ignatius:
Okay, excellent. Thank you.

Andrea Fernandez Mendoza:
Thank you again. Well, thank you everyone for your comments and your clarifications and your ideas. I appreciate them.

If you have not had a chance to verbally make comment, please feel free to put them in the chat and I will incorporate all of your feedback into our next iteration of the recommendations. Thank you again for your time.

- Share draft Council recommendations under development (continued)

Mary Ignatius:
Okay, back to me. Thank you so much for that conversation, Andrea, and to the rest of the committee members for your input. And now we are going to welcome Karla Pleitez Howell and Sonia Jaramillo, did I say that right, to share next and present.

Sonia Jaramillo:
You got it. Thank you.

Mary Ignatius:

Yay!

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you so much, folks. We are coming back with an overview based on the discussion we had with you all back in June and the ECPC in August. Sonia will kick it off for us and then I'll provide a summary of the proposal.

Sonia Jaramillo:
Thank you, Karla. I'm unmuted, right?

Karin Bloomer:
Yes, sound good.

Sonia Jaramillo:
Okay. So good morning, everyone. I want to start by thanking everyone for the opportunity to be here again, presenting an updated version of the previous recommendation. Our role today is to help ensure that those recommendations are thoughtful, responsive, and grounded in what California children and families are experiencing, and it now includes the additional feedback and comments.

Our particular focus continues to be the family access and the risks created by the shifting federal policy landscape. And as we approach this work, three principles have guided our review: we build on existing leadership, second, we respond to family realities, and third, we draw on our collective expertise. Each one of those principles continues to add to the work that you're going to be receiving more updates in a minute.

On slide two, let's see, this is a place where we're going to have the opportunity to ground our work by reviewing public comment and stakeholder input shared through the ECPC meetings, the historical ECPC annual reports, the Master Plan for Early Learning and Care, and the Assembly Blue Ribbon Commission report. We also consider materials from provider and workforce organizations, equity-focused early childhood organizations, research and policy institutes, and national early childhood policy and advocacy organizations.

As you may recall, this has been an intentional process. We began with a discussion with the ECPC on May 27th, followed by a joint Parent Advisory Council and Workforce Advisory Council discussion on June 9th. And then from June through August, there was a process of review of research recommendations and previous council discussions to help inform the work. The work that you're going to be hearing about includes recommendations that were presented at our August 27th ECPC meeting.

On slide three, we're going to talk about the next important steps. Our goal is to move toward alignment for our final version. We want to identify there is unity and shared understanding, answer questions and clarify the proposed recommendations, hear additions or proposed changes, and identify any areas where we may need additional information or further discussion. The comments are critical because we look at that information, and then the notes you're going to be seeing the draft is going to include that information.

Today's presentation of the semi-final draft includes additional changes and issues to consider from our August 27th ECPC meeting. Following today's discussion and public comment, we anticipate bringing the final recommendations to the full ECPC for approval on November 19th.

Today, we encourage just to think about family needs and whether or not this proposal will support those needs. As this proposal is presented, we look forward to hearing everyone's perspectives and continuing this important conversation together. Each one of you matters, so please comment, and if you can comment, note it so that we can have that information and include it in the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to be part of today's conversation, and now I'm going to have Karla continue with the points and value of information to be presented. Thank you.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you so much for that overview. Before I jump into slide four, one correction on slide two, and I'm sorry, Karin, this was my fault. There's May 27th repeated twice, but on the second column, folks, we received feedback from the ECPC on August 27th, so just a correction for folks.

And today we wanted to start with some background data and prior work reviewed. All of this was included in the memo that Karin shared with all of you last week. And rather than repeat that material by detail, we wanted to provide you with the focus on the architecture for the proposal. And we wanted to start with a really, really important point. Sonia, myself, and Nancy Strohl, who is listening, have reviewed a plethora of documents to show that California is not starting from zero, and the memo emphasizes this. We have made really, really significant progress in expanding early care and education, and we also know that there's more work to be done in California because, depending on age groups, depending on income, some of our families do not receive the same services. So I really want to emphasize we are not starting from zero, and this proposal is meant to build on the work that includes the Blue Ribbon Commission work, the master plan work, previous ECPC recommendations, a lot of the work that Andrea covered related to workforce.

So our task is really to take that accumulated work and ask: what is California building toward, and how do we create an actionable and accountable path to make sure that all our children are served and have access to early care and education?

So the proposal in front of you, if we go to slide four, perfect, this is the five-part proposal, the architecture of it. We will first cover the five big components of the architecture of the proposal, and then the following slides will give you a short overview of each of these components. So first and foremost, the proposal is saying that instead of thinking piecemeal of developing access for young children, that we really think about universal access to childcare and paid family leave for all children by the year of 2034.

Second, the proposal states that we begin with targeted universalism. That is, we begin with folks that need the most help, are furthest from opportunity, have the greatest barriers. And the proposal lists an overview of those populations that have been named over and over again, and we want to make sure to identify them here.

Third, we know that the goal is audacious for universal childcare. So the third part of this is proposing critical milestones or phases: what needs to happen by 2028, by 2030, and by 2034 in order to make sure that we are identifying progress and that we're seeing evolution to that universal goal.

Fourth, we do provide really concrete examples of the foundation that's needed to be built and action to be taken in 2027, and we want to make this really clear. This is not a proposal that's in stone. It will need to evolve depending on what we see the needs of families and children are, but the universal goal stays stable.

And then lastly, we incorporate recommendations on accountability, tracking who has access, who does not, and adjusting the path as we learn more.

So now let me give you a little information on each of the five pieces of the architecture. All this is in the memo, but I will summarize briefly here because we really want to spend some time getting your feedback.

So if we go to slide five, slide five is the first part of the architecture, the universal goal. The universal goal means that we are doing more than adding childcare slots and trying to follow the cycle of the budget. The universal goal is intended to make sure that we are clear-eyed, that it is not a few slots at a time, but that we are looking for universal access for all families, especially the families that are furthest from opportunity.

So if we go to the next slide, slide six through about eight will give you an overview of the families that have been identified as making sure that we're serving from the very start. So every child is part of the goal, but families are not starting from the same place. So reaching a universal destination really requires us to be intentional about addressing the greatest barriers first. This slide gives you an overview of the initial populations identified within the memo that you received.

Slide seven, if we go to the next slide, continues the identification of the families and children that we want to make sure we are serving within a universal system. That includes families that are experiencing mental health needs, if there's disability, involvement in foster care, housing instability. And the point is not to create separate systems for different populations; it is to make sure that whatever path we identify for universal access, that we are very clear-eyed about serving these families.

And then slide eight, you will see that the text is in red. We received a lot of additional feedback during the August discussion with ECPC of additional families that should be considered, and we need to look at geographic and systemic inequities, including rural communities, childcare deserts. Together, these slides on targeted universalism and the populations identified really give us a targeted attention in order to get to the universal goal.

If we go to slide nine, please. So targeted universalism has to be more than identifying populations. It has to influence how the system continues to be built. That means strengthening the whole system as access expands, building policies with families and providers, defining how we measure need and culturally affirming care, and tracking who is gaining access and who is not.

So in addition to the universal goal and the targeted populations, these are foundational principles as we look at a universal goal for California. The phases of how we make the goal real is what we want to share next. And before going there, we do want to be really clear. We know California has tremendous assets to build from. Our families, our providers, the experience of our workforce, the existing programs, infrastructure, public investment that has already been made, those are tremendous assets that we really need to celebrate. And we also know that there are more needs to build upon. We just talked about workforce compensation. We know there are childcare facilities deserts. We've talked about infant and toddler capacity, the financing and infrastructure for this. So while the goal is universal and being audacious that that's where we want to get, we know that there are real implementation issues that we have to consider.

So the next slides and the part of the memo that you received that gives an overview on the three phases are meant to do exactly that, where we are very clear-eyed about serving highest-need families in a universal goal system for childcare, and what does it really take for us to get there?

So this slide gives you phase one. This is immediate, 2027, and it is about acting while building the foundation for expansion. It completes existing commitments and begins the capacity for workforce, cost, facilities, licensing. So this is foundational.

The next slide is phase two. And folks, as a reminder, the red text is updated language that we have received based on feedback from ECPC last month, and the blue was initial language that you saw early on in the proposal. So this slide is phase two, and phase two is about scaling. We begin sequencing expansion by income and age with particular attention to infant and toddler capacity while building financing services and continued data tracking mechanisms. Next slide, please.

Phase three completes the journey towards universal access. California sustains and adjusts the infrastructure, completes capacity investments, expands paid family leave, and moves towards universal access by 2034. In summary, here's what the proposal does. One, we start with an audacious and big, big dream on behalf of families and children and sets a goal that every child in California deserves a quality early care and education and paid family leave. And the proposal makes it clear that we start with families and children with the greatest barriers. Then you see the outline for the three phases for achieving the goals. These are not set in stone and will need to be adjusted, but we do need to make really clear what our goalposts are during each of these phases.

And critical to all this is accountability. Throughout the phases, it will be very essential that we measure on whether we are actually closing the gaps to universal childcare. So with that, we're going to move to the next slide and ask some questions of you. I know we moved through this rather quickly and it is because we really wanted to protect time to hear from you. So we will take the next five, seven minutes to hear from you. I will not respond to make sure we get as much feedback from you all. And we'll start with two questions and we'll work backwards. The last two questions on here are what, if anything, is unclear? And two, what specific change would strengthen these recommendations? After we hear back from you, we will open it up to just do a pulse check on questions one and two and do virtual polling.

So with that, let me open it up and see if there's anything that is unclear or any changes. We'll not respond. We'll collect information just to make sure that we're addressing questions coming up.

- Seek input from Advisory Committee members (continued)

Karin Bloomer:
Karla, chair of workforce advisory committee, Tonia McMillan.

Tonia McMillian:

Hi Karla. Thank you. Thank you and Sonia for bringing this breakdown. My comment is on the proposed changes, and this is in reference to culturally affirming language. I would like to see culturally affirming and culturally responsive. It's one thing to affirm it, but it's another thing to put action behind those affirmations.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
That's a great point. Thank you, Tonia. We'll upgrade.

Karin Bloomer:
Looking for other hands. Patrick MacFarlane, please.

Patrick MacFarlane:
Thank you. I have questions about the paid family leave aspect. I'm wondering if this paid family leave expansion would be through the current funding mechanism. And then I believe there's some limitations to who is eligible for paid family leave based on the current system.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Really appreciate that question. So part of the goal is to make sure that families have access to paid family leave, so that's the universal goal. The path for getting there I think would have to be more discussions within this group and/or other groups that make recommendation. But the idea here is making that a universal target, but the financing of it would need more discussions. Deborah?

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Yes, thank you. Karla, I just want to really just say something because you had said something that really sits in the minds of California childcare providers. And when you said, "California is building towards..." And there's a lot of providers, no doubt, listening in. And for those providers who are not listening in, and for those providers who already shut their doors, I'm just going to keep it real with you. A lot of providers feel like the state, where they're moving is where they're pushing providers out of the way. A lot of providers feel that way. And I think this is something that whatever the message that's going to be put out there has to make sure that family daycare providers, educators are included and feel included and do not feel as if they're being pushed out because that is literally what providers in California feel. They feel as if the state is building something that does not include them and it is pushing them out of the way.

And we need to get rid of this feeling of providers. We shouldn't have to feel this way, but I just want to say that here in this place because I talked to too many providers and this is a big conversation. Thank you.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you, Deborah. I really appreciate it. And we'll make sure that that's very, very clear. Providers are an essential part of this. Appreciate the comment. Zoila?

Zoila Toma:

Yes. One thing here, when it comes to can the statewide capacity plan include separate data and goals for family childcare, including providers retention, closures, license capacity, infant toddler spaces, and their impact of TK and public preschool expansion? I think we need to be aware of what's happening because of what I just mentioned. Also another, would family childcare provider be involved in designing the new data and technology system so we actually reduce administrative burden rather than add to it? I think that's very important, so we need to take care of that part. I love the idea by 2024, the expansion and all that, but my concern is 2024 is far away and now it's like while you are that, how we are securing family childcare, what is there for us in the meantime? Because I feel like whatever is happening, like I said earlier, it looks like our names show up in every document and everything, but if we're not seeing whoever is in charge of this is failing us because we don't have a clear pathway, we don't have a clear description, we don't know what's next, what to do, how to prepare ourself.

We need something to tell us exactly what is needed from us because family childcare, it's on. If you tell us you need to do this and you need to do it by then, we will have it ready. It's just that we don't know what to expect, when to expect it, what to do, what follows. We need all that come to us clearly. Not with gray areas, not within misinterpretation or subject to interpretation. We need clear instructions on what to expect and how to do it so we can be part of all this by 2034, and in the midst, not lose providers of closing because we're losing our children as well. Thank you.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you, Zoila. We will add the data updates and upgrades. There's a section on that on what to include. And then what we shared with ECPC on 2034, it is aligning with if we have a governor that wins in November and we have the same governor for eight years aligning it to some of that. So sharing that with the group here too. Mary?

Mary Ignatius:
Yeah, also just want to thank everyone involved for putting this document together. And I think I saw it in one of the recommendations, but it was around regulatory reform and I think this has to go hand in hand that there needs to be a significant review of regulations, especially ones that have been in place for who knows how long, that the system that we want to build towards is a system based on the realities of today's families, today's childcare workforce, today's children, and that they are reflective of that.

And then another thing I also just wanted to point out is I think, I don't know if it's a statement, but it's something about needing to get both access and wage increases to families and providers as quickly and as harmless and as seamless as possible. We've seen in some counties that have even raised money for childcare to improve access or increase wages that they then create additional hoops to jump through to get it. And that's what we want to stop doing is removing hoops. San Francisco excludes FFN providers from their program. Other counties are trying to get providers to have to do more training and more cohorts and more this and that. And we just have to stop that and recognize that this system has forced providers into poverty and that they need to just get a check on day one of whenever this system gets into place. So I think, I don't know if it's some language to capture that or it's...

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Yep. And adding it in phase one regulatory understanding and reform opportunities captured that. Thank you.

Mary Ignatius:
Thanks.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
All right. Not seeing more hands. Karin-

Karin Bloomer:
I'm sorry, in the room, Karla, sorry, Patrick again, and then I know we're down to just a few minutes for the next recommendation. Patrick.

Patrick MacFarlane:
I just think the paid family leave thing, I just wanted to address that again because in my experience using it, it being a program that is funded through employers, many folks who don't have a traditional employer are not connected to that funding. And so in order for it to become universal, there would need to be another system of paid family leave that were developed. And then were it to become universal, that would have an impact on childcare businesses in a similar way that TK has, and that could be a consequence that might not be great.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Okay. Patrick, I'll capture that with phase one, making sure that we look at opportunities and challenges with paid family leave and recommendations based on the learning. Does that address?

Patrick MacFarlane:
Yeah, thank you.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Okay. Thank you. All right, folks. Karin, I believe I have seven minutes left. Is that correct? Just so we-

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you.

- Share draft Council recommendations under development (continued)

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Yes. Okay. Folks, we're going to move on to the next recommendation. Sonia and I were tasked with both the access, so that's the universal goal that you just heard. And then the second part of the task was looking at some of the federal attacks on families regarding the safety net and immigration. So we will provide you with a quick overview on this. So the set of recommendations that you're seeing in front of you address the

protecting core supports for children and families, in particular as we look at Medi-Cal, CalFresh, and the federal early care and education funding such as CCDF and Head Start. So the recommendation is making sure that we continue to support families and children and making sure that we're looking at requirements that create unnecessary barriers for eligible families. That's the first part of the recommendation. If we go to the next slide, please.

The second focus is on immigrant family protection in particular. The recommendations call for continued access to legal services and appropriate legal action. Here, the state has really done a phenomenal job. In our last budget, we had increase of funding for legal services, so continuing to support and making sure that that's part of what families see in 2027. And along those lines, also making sure that we have stronger rapid response and cross-agency coordination and policies. So those are more continue and support recommendations. So if we go to the last slide on this, we just want to make sure we have any, if there's anything that is missing, anything that is unclear or anything that folks would like to add to these recommendations, I will open up.

- Seek input from Advisory Committee members (continued)

Tonia McMillian:
Okay. So Karla, do you agree with the immigrant family protection? No, not there. I want to talk about the appeals process.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Okay.

Tonia McMillian:
That really needs to be addressed. For years, I accompanied family childcare providers to administrative law hearings, and I was the only one there to support those providers. But when you saw visually a provider with one manila folder and then licensing with attorneys and a mountain high stack of, I guess, cases, yeah, it's very bad.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Yeah.

Tonia McMillian:
So definitely we need to have an appeals process that is fair for early educators.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
And Tonia, to clarify, is this administrative law hearings in immigration court or licensing?

Tonia McMillian:
No, that's why I'm bringing it up because I don't see a category for that.

Karla Pleitéz Howell

Okay.

Tonia McMillian:
No, this is not immigration.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Okay. Okay, got it. So with previous looking at, and we could add some of that to some of the things that Mary also lifted up in regards to regulatory review, and we'll add some of that. Others?

Karin Bloomer:
And in the room again here, Patrick MacFarlane.

Patrick MacFarlane:
I think it's important to call out the role of technology, especially AI, in the future of these programs because it's taking over so much and the next governor and the state will have to determine how and in which ways they regulate that and that this technology either supports or undermines the current systems. And I think we should call it out so that the government is clear that this is an important topic.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Got it. And Patrick, there's some reference to AI in the universal goal proposal. So I think we've captured some of these comments already, but we'll double check to make sure that addresses future state as well. Zoila?

Zoila Toma:
I think also what we can do is maybe clear legal guidance with a single point of contact and a short continuity of care protected when families suddenly affected by immigration enforcement. I think right now we know what is happening, what we're doing, but we don't have a number that we can directly contact or direct the families to it. It would be nice to have that source of information, easy access, easy number just to help and guide for us as educators to be able to navigate that and also for the families. Thank you.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you. We will look into this unless someone in the room from the state might know, but I know Department of Justice was working on something like this, so if there's anyone that knows in the room, that'd be fantastic. If not, November 19th, we'll come back and share whether an update or information on that. Okay. Seeing none. All right, one minute left. So if we could do a polling, a visual polling for thumbs up for yes, support on universal goal targeted and the recommendations on safety net and immigration. Thumbs down if not, that way we have a sense of direction from the room. And if folks can hold up their thumbs.

Karin Bloomer:
Here in the physical room, the thumbs are up.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you. Seeing two online. Three, thank you. Deborah, Zoila, Miren, any additional comments or questions?

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Well, yeah, I guess I really do, Karla. Why don't you repeat that for me again?

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Yep, yep. Support for the recommendations, the universal goal, the immigration support and safety net.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
For those? Okay. Are you going to take back all the recommendations that we've said here?

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Yes, that's the plan to-

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
That's the plan is to take it back and-

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Yes.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
And then represent it or?

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Yep, yep. We'll come back to everyone.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
And that I'm okay with. Yeah.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you. Thank you.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Take it back and... Yeah, thank you for that.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Okay. And I see one last comment, Miren?

Miren Algorri:
Yes. As we're thinking about these process for family childcare providers when something happens, I believe that given the current political climate across the nation, that there must be statutory definitions of fraud and administrative errors. Thank you.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you, Miren. And Zoila will really be the last comment, folks. I feel, Karin, I know you all need some time.

Zoila Toma:
I love the whole idea also of making it more than just childcare or sending the families to work. I know that the leave extending it I think is very important. I know I want to maintain my job as educator, family childcare provider, but at the same time, one of my priorities is the children and families, the education. That's what we are fighting so hard also for the mixed delivery. So the families also have choices because the choice of free is when you are low income, you are barely making the minimum, barely surviving, when you have to decide from paying your rent, your food or childcare, you are going to choose for free. And you're not choosing for the best interest of your child, you're choosing for what is available to you. And the mixed delivery will bring something a little bit more different because it will give the opportunity, the families and the children, to decide what care fits the child's need, a small group, more one-on-one attention, or bigger settings.

I'm a mother and those that are parents will understand that your child thrive, learn, and develop differently. And me working 15 years in the industry, I can tell you every child is unique and we need to focus on that. My question have always been, when we decided to do universal preschool, who sat with the governor and said, "Here's the professional child development, here's the psychiatrist, here's all these special, an expert that said, 'You know what? Put every child in a box, throw them in and let's see if they thrive'"? No, we need to make sure that these children are thriving. We always emphasize the importance of our children, our new generation, the future, but at the end, we never stick to what we say because our actions speak different. So I love that we not just focusing on education or where we're going to put the children, that it have to be focusing on the family as well. So thank you.

Karla Pleitéz Howell
Thank you, Zoila. I think that's a perfect way to conclude. Folks, Sonia and I are going to walk away with this to incorporate the information you have just shared with us and make this the final proposal that comes to the ECPC's consideration in November. So with that, I will turn it back to Mary.

3. Provide Input on 2028-2030 Child Care and Development Fund State Plan

- Presentation on Draft 2028-2030 State Plan

Mary Ignatius:
Thank you, Karla and Sonia. So now we are going to open up the chat feature so members of the public can give us feedback on the draft recommendations. And while chat is open for that, I would like to now invite the Department of Social Services to lead us through a discussion about the 2028-2030 state plan.

Becky Halligan:
Thank you. We're here today representing the Department of Social Services Child Care and Development Division and the Community Care Licensing Division. Can you go to the next slide, please? It is a federal requirement as we develop the 2028-30 Childcare and Development Plan that we meet with our tribal partners, our external childcare partners, and the Early Childhood Policy Committee. Today, we're fulfilling the requirement of the Early Childhood Policy Council in addition to the November 19th meeting as well with the larger committee. We have already had five regional input sessions throughout the state, and we have two more scheduled in Riverside and San Diego where we met with our external childcare partners, and we're meeting with the Tribal Advisory Committee later this week. We'll also be presenting at the two advocacy groups annual membership meetings in October for the Every Child California and Thriving Families California and R&R Networks. Next slide, please. Thank you.

This gives you a little synopsis of the plan process. Again, input sessions. We need to submit a draft of our state plan in early February for public comment. There'll be a public hearing at CDSS in March for that draft plan. And then in July, no later than July 1st of 2027, we will submit to the Administration of Children and Families. They will have 90 days to review that plan, and the plan is effective the federal fiscal year, October 1st of 2027 through September 30th of 2020. Today's session, we only have a short time, but we're going to cover a lot of ground here as Community Care Licensing Division proposes to you some changes in recent policy in health and safety. So I pass it over to the Community Care Licensing Division.

Christina Rico:
Hello, thank you. You can go to the next slide. For today's meeting, we are going to be discussing AB 150, which was chaptered this year. It includes several changes to promote the continued health and safety of children in care. These impacts include changes to medication administration, anaphylactic policy, health and safety training requirements, mandated reporter training, emergency and disaster plans amongst others. Let's see. These changes help strengthen licensing requirements in childcare facilities to enhance overall quality and care and also to meet the childcare development block fund requirements. We will also touch on AB 262, which was passed in 2024 related to children's camps. Excuse me. That bill required TDSS to develop formal recommendations for the state legislature for approaches to regulation and oversight for children at day camps. Next slide, please.

We won't be able to cover all topics today, so we will touch on a few, but we will have a portion at the end for comments and questions, and you are welcome to comment or question on items I don't touch on. Let's see. The mandated reporter training requirements now require all providers and staff, including those who were previously exempt, to complete the mandated reporter training and renew their training every two years, regardless of their level of English proficiency. Next slide, please.

The updates to Emergency and Disaster, this bill now requires all childcare facilities to have emergency and disaster plans on file that meet the requirements listed in Health and Safety Code Section 1596.868. The responsibility will belong to the licensee to ensure their emergency and disaster plan meets the new requirements, and licensees

are encouraged to have local emergency authorities review their plans. That is encouraged but not required.

Next up, their AB 150 updated shelter in place guidance. It added procedures to shelter in place due to severe weather or other hazards as well as plans for facilities to be self-reliant for a period of not less than 72 hours immediately following any emergency or disaster. And it includes more information on these requirements. Apologies.

Next up. AB 150 also touches on relocation procedures, including but not limited to a transportation plan, communication plan with emergency personnel, and access to emergency evacuation route information and temporary shelter locations. Facilities shall designate at least two locations that can provide temporary shelter for children in care when relocation is necessary and one must be outside of the immediate geographic area.

And the next slide. I know this bill covers many items, so we wanted to open it up on any support that we can provide and any recommendations you have in implementing these requirements. We will be publishing a pin that outlines all the various requirements and different things as well as hosting a webinar next week for providers on all the topics covered. Let me switch back to Zoom to see if there's questions in the chat.

- Seek input from Advisory Committee members

Karin Bloomer:
And here in the room.

Christina Rico:
Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:
Tonia McMillian.

Tonia McMillian:
So I saw this in the chat, the question. Since you're presenting on AB 150, what are the changes that's in AB 190?

Christina Rico:
Yes. Okay. Sorry. Just my luck. AB 190 was signed Friday, I believe. So AB 190 supersedes 150. Two of the major updates related to health and safety, AB 190 delays requirements for all childcare staff to complete the 16 hours of health and safety training and 12 hours of annual continuing education to October 1st, 2027. It also updates Health and Safety Code 1597.63 related to temporary absences. It removes the requirements for family childcare home licensees to submit notice and a report to the department for each temporary absence.

So that was one of the main feedbacks we had been receiving was that reporting requirement was a large burden for providers. And so, we are updating... AB 190

updated that, and then we'll be issuing a pin further supporting the guidance on what that entails for a provider.

Tonia McMillian:
One more question and I'm done.

Christina Rico:
Yes.

Tonia McMillian:
And for the disaster plan, what you're proposing for the 72 hours following a disaster, is there going to be some kind of guidelines or something that shows what the state, what they're going to be doing within those 72 hours contact? I see that you're laying out the plans for the providers, but what role will the state be playing?

Christina Rico:
Yeah, we will make sure to document that.

Tonia McMillian:
Okay.

Karin Bloomer:
I see a few hands virtually from committee members. Deborah Corley-Marzett.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Thank you for that. First, I want to say you mentioned that there is a webinar coming up to go over this, and it will be great if the state can put that link in the chat for providers here that have not signed up for it or even heard of this. So thank you for doing that. Oh, that's the pin. But I would appreciate if the link was in there for providers who can sign up for the webinar.

I want to say that as a provider sitting here that is aware of a lot of different changes and things that are going on, but if I was a provider that wasn't informed and was sitting in on this particular topic here, I'll be scared in my boots right now because of the different changes that are going on. And to actually say that you're not going to go over all of this, that's hurtful because I want to know what's going on. And I think it should have been a little bit more detailed here for providers to be more so informed. Because to lay this out to a provider who's unaware, they're even more afraid of what's going on. So I just think it should have been more detailed for the public to hear exactly what's going on behind closed doors.

Christina Rico:
Yes. And I want to acknowledge we normally take an hour or more to do this presentation and we are given just 10 to 15 minutes. So that is why we are emphasizing please sign up for that webinar. We will be outlining all the requirements and then please keep an eye out for the pin. We will be doing that. And we've received feedback that the public has been requesting more of a series broken down by topic. And so, that

is forthcoming as well. Because there is a lot to unpack and we don't want to overgeneralize. So I apologize for rushing this important information.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
And I thank you for that. I appreciate it. And again, thank you for putting the information in the chat for providers. And I'm going to say to the providers and the parents and all, please go to that chat. Please sign up for this webinar. Please use your voice and please be present.

Karin Bloomer:
I see AnnLouise Bonnitto's hand next.

AnnLouise Bonnitto:
Thank you. So wanted to go back a little ways when we started talking about the state plan and the review. I heard the word tribal advisory committee and I just wanted to know who was on it?

The reason being is because you have three large consortium agencies in the state of California. We carry over a third, a little bit over the third of all the CCDF and Head Start tribal programs under those belts. So engaging them is also really important, because those are the ones who have the majority of the CCDF grants, grantees here in California for tribal programs.

Number two, some of the things that kind of fall in the cracks for the tribes when it comes to the mandated reporting, the emergency preparedness, all these trainings are great, all the policies to keep children safe, I agree with. However, that support for providers, not just non-licensed, not just family, home licensed providers, licensed providers, but also the tribal programs, they don't really get that information. And also, what level of support can DSS help when that happens?

Because many of our CCDF tribal programs are very mixed. It's not just tribal centers. I think people have a misconception. A lot of our agencies, what we do is we work with the state licensed providers, too. So we're in this really weird area where we're supposed to implement these things, yet there's no real support or real voice there. So really thinking about that and how to unpack it, how to support, how to ensure that those state licensed that get paid through tribal programs are still getting this access.

And also, the tribal programs that are sanctioned by whether it's Tribal Childcare Association or an actual tribal council also are able to become part of that system. Tribes who have childcare centers and/or childcare Head Starts are within school districts that are of course state funded or county funded. So sometimes that's forgotten. Those kids that go to those centers that go to those Head Starts will go to that school, that state funded school.

So we need that extra additional wraparound that it's easy to miss, it's easy to forget, but it's there. The sovereignty of the tribes definitely stands, but there has to be some sort of communication so we can come up with a plan that also helps that particular community. Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:

Thank you. Zoila Toma. And then I think there's a few more slides and we need to wrap up by 11:45 for public comment.

Zoila Toma:
Perfect. Yes, you know we already do drills, but the 72 hours self-reliance, I think it's at another level. And the webinar is a great idea because there's so many changes, but we need a specific guidance, templates and training so providers know exactly what to comply with, what expectations are.

In 15 years, I have several visits, but every analyst that come here will tell me something different. And we need something that is clear, very clear, no gray area, no subject to interpretations, because this is a big issue that we are facing. And unfortunately, when it comes to us, I feel like first, in anything that when you are looking on an issue or something, first you're innocent. With us, I feel like we're guilty until proven innocent. So I think we need to start working on that.

So I love the training, I love the webinar, but I think we need to start working on trainings and programs that will target certain areas that family childcare have hard time to interpret or understanding because of that lack of consistency when it comes to licensing in Title 22. Thank you.

Christina Rico:
We'll take that feedback back. I do also want to acknowledge there was a lot of questions and comments in the chat. We are capturing those for the input. The pin should be out within the next week or two, so it is coming. So please sign up for pins if you haven't done that already, but you should be getting that in your email. I believe we touched on the rest of them, so we'll continue on.

Karin Bloomer:
So five minutes, we need to wrap up. My apologies.

Christina Rico:
I will keep this very high level. There's a children's camp work group. I will put the link in the chat when I'm done chatting. But this is an opportunity that did pass with legislation to allow public input into policy as it's getting developed. So all of these are laws passed through the legislative process.

And so, this one specifically allows for providers to help in developing the recommendations of what these laws would look like for children's day camps. So once again, I'll put the link in the chat. So apologies for going through this very quickly, but there is currently a group dedicated to this work, and they are reaching out to early ed and childcare providers to learn what you feel is a priority in regulating children's day camps. Are there any questions or comments about this slide?

Patrick MacFarlane:
I have one comment.

Christina Rico:
Yes.

Patrick MacFarlane:
I think there could be a role that the state could play in supporting providers and camps and families just through technology. I think in my experience with my kids in childcare, with my kids in camps, with my conversations with childcare providers, something as simple as health records that you need to submit, each person does it differently. And it could be something that looks... We've got a lot of technology companies. You could work with a company that creates a standard form, standard way to submit things that could reduce the burden on providers and on camps, and then also make it more standardized and understandable for parents. I mean, you could apply that to multiple things that providers are working with licensing, but I think just access to the technology to standardize the way these things are reported and collected, I think could be really helpful.

Christina Rico:
Jotted that down. And yes, I think that could apply towards our anaphylactic and other items. Children's camps and then the anaphylactic policies are two that are still being developed. So they're very great to provide this kind of input because the state can incorporate these feedback more easily at this stage. So thank you.

Karin Bloomer:
Deborah Corley-Marzett has a hand. This I imagine will be the last comment or question.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Thank you for that. Real quick, did you say that you all are having a webinar or something going on?

Christina Rico:
Not on children's camps, but I did include their email address and their landing page on the website because they are holding stakeholder input sessions. So they will host them every so often on different topics. So they'll send out the invite and let people know the topic that they'll be discussing. So you're welcome to attend any you're interested in or all, but that would be where you'll find the contact information for the camps.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Oh, okay. Yeah, because I went there. Thanks for putting that in there. I just didn't see any upcoming meetings coming up. That's why I said that. Thank you.

Christina Rico:
They're not scheduled yet, but they should be posted soon.

Deborah Corley-Marzett:
Okay. Well, I look forward to attending. Thank you.

Christina Rico:

Thank you so much. And sorry it was such an abbreviated version, but your input is invaluable, and so please attend these webinars and other sessions.

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you. And again, my apologies. I know everyone had a tight timeframe today and did, I'll just say humbly, a magnificent job.

Just looking to Mary Ignatius, this would be the time where we'd be inviting both verbal, general public comment and chat feature. Just looking to see if that's okay to begin.

Mary Ignatius:
That is just fine to begin.

4. General Public Comment

Karin Bloomer:
Okay. Thank you so much. And so, we will be now taking both general public comment verbally, as well as we're opening up the chat feature now. And this is, of course, comments for the most recent agenda item and any item that a member of the public would like to contribute to. If you'd like to be in the queue to speak and you are attending virtually, please use the raised hand feature at the bottom of your Zoom screen, and I will call on individuals one at a time and ask you to unmute.

We ask that speakers keep their comments to no more than 2 minutes so that we can invite as many speakers to contribute as possible in the time we have. I will gently let you know when you have 30 seconds left and when the 2-minute mark is upon us. And with that, I'm going to look at the attendees panel, and I see a hand raised from Marcella Graves. Marcella, we're unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead.

Marcella Graves:
Hi, good morning everyone. My name is Marcella Graves. I'm out of Fresno, California, childcare provider over 29 years. I just want them to include us more and not keep us at bay, because it seemed like they're pushing us out, but they keep on adding more education, like the lady was saying, cohorts, all these courses we keep taking and taking. It's like we finish one course and then, oh, something else you have to take this would you have to take. But we're not getting a fair pay. We're not getting raises for the classes that we're taking and stuff like that or appreciate the work that we're doing. So I just want to include us in that.

And then also, I want to say that on some of the programs, they need to work on getting paid as far as when a parent misses a spot on a time sheet, you turn it in. Sometimes it takes three weeks for them to send it back to you. And then when you do get it back, you turn it in, you got to wait another 21 days. So it's sometimes at the end of two months to get reimbursed. So that needs to be worked on. I talked about it last year, this year, [inaudible 01:44:53] since it started and no one's fixing it and we're trying to keep our doors open, pay our employees, and I'd just appreciate if you guys can work on that. Thank you for your time today.

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you. I really encourage members of the public who do want to speak before we adjourn to raise your virtual hand now, just so we can see how long the queue is. And with that, we invite Rebecca Grasty to unmute on her end.

Rebecca Grasty:
Hello, everyone. I just want to echo some of what was said, Zoila said, Miren said, it doesn't matter how many times FCC says that the state says FCC is included in UPK, it's not. And saying it even more doesn't make it so. If there's enough funding for all 4-year-olds in PK for UPK, then there's funding to put them wherever a parent should choose for their authentic choice. And I want to address other comments in regards to family childcare providers and education, specifically ones kind of like was mentioned last meeting. We have education, we have experience, and it's still not respected. Thank you so much.

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you. I see the next hand, Tessie Ragan. Tessie, we are unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead. Tessie, you're still muted on your end on Zoom. If you could unmute. There you go. Please, go ahead.

Tessie Ragan:
Oh, can you hear me?

Karin Bloomer:
Yes, yes we can.

Tessie Ragan:
Okay. Hi, my name's Tessie Ragan. I'm located in Rosemont, California. I just wanted to continue to echo what has been said. Equity is not being represented in our system, and if we want to actually have it represented, that means that family childcare needs to be at the table from jump when the regulations are being brought up. We were brought in so late, and the only recommendation that got passed was that we had to be a part of FCCHENs.

We are now being told we have to flip our programs to infant-toddler care, which is not possible, and that means that we are not sustainable. All of the recommendations mean that family childcare will not be sustainable and able to continue when you actually need us embedded in the communities because we provide an important function for communities. I need this to be taken seriously because if it's not, you're going to lose a lot more of us. Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you. Yesenia de la Torres, we're unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead.

Yesenia, I see you're unmuted, but we can't hear you.

Yesenia, I'm so sorry. We see that you're unmuted on Zoom, but we don't have any audio from you. I'm going to go ahead and move to the next raised hand, but please feel free to try again. Maricela Mbila, please go ahead and unmute and begin.

Maricela Mbila:
Yes, good afternoon. Thank you. Can you hear me?

Karin Bloomer:
Yes, we can.

Maricela Mbila:
Thank you for allowing me to speak. Just wanted to ask more than anything, what is the oversight that the school districts are having with their TK system? Because being a UPK liaison, one of the things that I am facing that I am finding out is that some school districts are capping their parents. So meaning to say, "If you don't attend our TK system, then your child will not be able to go to kindergarten."

And so to me, some families... I meet with families, I meet with different representatives, and to me, that's unfair. Because you're not giving really the option to the family. You're already saying, "You have to do TK with us. If not, you will be placed on a waiting list for kindergarten."

So as a parent, I'm going to be like, "No, I want to make sure my child goes to kindergarten and doesn't get placed on the waiting list."

So that's why I was asking, is there any way that you guys are or that the school districts are being monitored to making sure that they don't do that to families? They don't jeopardize the opportunity for families to be able to have their choice. Because I also meet with families, and I also inform them based on our UPK mixed delivery system, I tell families, "This is the spreadsheet that the county has developed for you. These are the questions you could ask."

And the soundback is, "Thank you, but if I don't do it, I won't be able to go to kindergarten." Thank you.

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you so much. And just to note, all of this input is kept as a public record, and DSS and other agencies are taking this all in and informs the public information that they then share out. So while we can't answer specific questions, please know that this is being heard and this feedback is being taken. With that, Yessika Magdaleno, we're unmuting you on our end. Please unmute and go ahead.

Yessika Magdaleno:
Yes. Can you guys hear me?

Karin Bloomer:
Yes, we can.

Yessika Magdaleno:

Okay, great. Thank you so much. Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to provide a public comment. My name is Yessika Magdaleno, and I have been a licensed family childcare provider for more than 25 years. I want to address an important concern regarding family childcare in California mixed delivery system. We continue to hear that family childcare is an essential part of mixed delivery. I appreciated seeing family childcare included in the vision and in the language. But my question is, what does inclusion actually looks like in participating, right?

One of the primary pathways for family childcare providers to participate is through a family childcare home educational network, and I think it's called efficient. That opportunity is still extremely limited across California because it's only five programs across the whole state of California. So I wonder how will thousands of licensed family childcare providers actually participate in this new system when there is no accessibility or is not accessible pathway in many of our communities?

Family childcare providers already educate preschool-aged children. We provide continuing care, flexible hours, culturally and linguistically responsive environments. So I don't want to take more time, but I am very concerned about this, and I really want respectfully ask that the blueprint that you guys were talking about in the morning, I would like to see how family childcare providers outside of the existing FCCHENs will be included, funded, and supported in this system.

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you so much.

Yessika Magdaleno:
Yes. Thank you so much for letting me talk this morning.

Karin Bloomer:
Thank you. Okay. Yesenia de la Torres, I see that you're back. Let's try this again. If you could unmute on your end, let's see if we can hear you.

Yesenia de la Torre:
Hi. Can you hear me now?

Karin Bloomer:
We can.

Yesenia de la Torre:
Sorry. Hi, I'm Yesenia La Torres and I'm based in Stanislaus County. I'm a provider, been here for about eight years. And my comment is, how will CDS support family childcare providers, especially the small ones or multilingual, rural, and overnight programs like mine with funding templates, trainings, and technical assistance to meet the new emergency and 72-hour preparedness requirements? Will providers have reasonable implementation period before citations are issued?

And my other thing is, well, since as the providers are continuously required to complete additional training, including 16 hours of health and safety training, what funding will be

provided to compensate the family childcare providers for the training time, feeds, substitute coverage, and lost income?

Karin Bloomer:
Great. Thank you so much for your verbal public comment. With that, that concludes our public comment for today. I'm going to turn it over to Tonia McMillian, the Workforce Advisory Committee Chair, to close out the meeting.

Tonia McMillian:
Thank you all for your input and engagement this morning. Your voices and comments are essential to this process, and we thank you for your insights today and your continued dedication to this cause. And with that, this meeting is adjourned.

END OF TRANSCRIPT