

Shaping a Shared Agenda for Students, Families, and our Workforce

Early Learning, Child Care, and Expanded Learning Stakeholder Convening

Hosted by the Child Care Resource Center and Partnership for Children & Youth
September 30, 2021, 10:00 am - 2:00 pm

Meeting Summary

Summary	1
Resources	1
Venn Diagram Activity: Intersection and Differences between ECE and EXL	2
Emerging Opportunities and Needs	3
Context: Defining and Prioritizing the Opportunities and Needs	3
Action: Priorities for Collaboration	5
Sharing Information and Engaging Stakeholders to Solidify and Advance Shared Policy Goals	6
Next Steps	6
Participants	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Summary

The Child Care Resource Center (CCRC) and Partnership for Children & Youth (PCY) convened over 40 stakeholders on September 30, 2021 to:

- Discuss emerging opportunities and needs for Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Expanded Learning (EXL) (the Context),
- Identify short and long term policy priorities for the ECE and EXL fields to collaborate towards (the Action), and
- Identify structures, resources, and common processes to share information and engage stakeholders.

This collaborative work and event were financially supported by First 5 California. The Glen Price Group (GPG) provided meeting design, facilitation, and documentation support.

This document provides a high-level summary of this meeting.

Resources

The following resources were shared and/or referenced during the meeting:

- [Participant Agenda](#)
- [Meeting Slides](#)
- [Draft Interview Findings 9.27](#)
- [Subsidized Care and Out of School time programs 9.27.21](#)
- [Pk-3 alignment recent research summaries](#)

Venn Diagram Activity: Intersection and Differences between ECE and EXL

Participants reflected on the similarities and differences between the ECE and EXL fields and captured their notes using a Miro board (see [here](#)). The table below documents participants' input from the Miro board.

ECE	Intersection between ECE and EXL	EXL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of funding ● Licensure requirements ● Lack of a strategic plan ● Level of course work in child development needed ● Lack of an opportunity to provide input before policies are set ● Broader advocacy coalition, more family-focused advocacy ● Communication to families is siloed ● Recognition and coordination of existing community partners ● Quality measurement infrastructure ● Regulatory environment for requirements ● Widely diverse delivery systems ● Significant family engagement ● Concerns that quality factors that support child development are not being prioritized in favor of “family choice” ● Serving very young children (and all the complexities that includes) ● Lower ratios ● Funding inequities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Staffing shortages and challenges ● Unclear career pathways ● Part Time hours ● Insufficient wages and benefits ● Rate reform for equitable wages and quality programs ● Diversity in site location ● Administration of programs ● Dichotomy of schools versus the private market ● School age children ● Ratios ● Shared policy opportunities, especially with community school investment this year ● Supports parents' ability to work ● Whole family support, families use both systems ● Workforce is women of color ● Focus on child development ● Facilities needs ● Eligibility ● Prioritize serving high need communities ● Needed collaboration with K-12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Field recognition ● Staff capacitation and benefits ● Career opportunities for students ● Equitable funding distribution ● Continuous improvement process based on quality standards (vs. quality measurement) ● More narrow advocacy coalition ● Limited coursework in child development ● Family engagement may look different due to age of children served ● Prescriptive and burdensome implementation policies ● Higher ratios ● Serves older youth (13+)

Emerging Opportunities and Needs

Jessica Gunderson, PCY, presented background information from interviews and data collection efforts that led to this convening (See [resource list](#)). Eric Sonnenfeld, Assistant Administrator of Early Childhood Education in Tulare County Office of Education and Courtney Baltiyskyy, Director of Advocacy and Strategic Partnership of the YMCA of San Diego provided remarks from the local implementation perspective.

Context: Defining and Prioritizing the Opportunities and Needs

The table below shows the opportunities and needs identified based on Jessica Gunderson’s interview and data collection, a pre-meeting survey, and a brief full group discussion on September 30th. Participants were asked to review these lists and cast three votes for their top priorities. The table below indicates the number of votes each opportunity/need received during the prioritization session. The Miro board with this activity is linked [here](#).

Standards/Policy alignment	Workforce	Local Implementation & TA needs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop a mixed delivery system that is high quality, equitable, and creates a meaningful continuum of care and learning with multiple partners at the table (12) ● Slow down implementation - Find ways to give local implementers time (6) ● Facilitate bolder and broader conversations about systems-level change, equity, and approaching families and kids more holistically (5) ● Allow for local (possibly temporary) waivers to allow for blended staffing, enrollment of students, and facilities (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Build stronger policy language that ensures baseline for living wages and job quality (Joint statement/recommendations across sectors on worker conditions (wages, Professional development, benefits, career pathways)) (15) ● Establish workforce pipelines to build workforce capacity to expand programs - Expanded Learning Opportunities and Universal Preschool (9) ● Establish and enhance professional learning opportunities and career growth pathways (5) ● Provide more flexibility in staffing requirements (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implement state technical assistance - integration of programs and knowledge sharing at the state level (4) ● Provide clear best practices and models (4) ● Increase program quality (3) ● Establish better continuity of care for families with multiple children in different settings (3) ● Braid and maximizing disparate resources (3) ● Develop site-level, full-day models of Transitional Kindergarten (TK) / early grades & expanded learning programming (3) ● Ensure that one-time

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Establish data systems - Family Focused to support coordination (3) ● Establish guidance and clarity about the new ELO program and how it blends / intersects with ECE (1) ● Ensure a smooth transition, transportation, and continuity of care for children (1) ● Provide more flexibility to allow for and leverage more community sites and settings - build off emergency COVID allowances (N/A) ● Ensure that as a child moves through the different developmental stages, the ECE system reflects the appropriate curriculum for that age group (N/A) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase joint professional development on child development standards, social emotional learning, and trauma informed care (3) ● Support workforce organizing - looking across systems (1) ● Ensure adequate staffing (1) 	<p>funding/spending is used effectively to create strong foundations (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Integrate planning, professional development, and coordination within existing structures (vs. creating something new) (2) ● Establish processes to coordinate public/private partnerships and community partners assets (1) ● Identify wrap around services for half-day preschool & TK (1) ● Local childcare Planning Councils (LPCs) or Resource and Referral Agencies (R&Rs) could provide 1) space for more data sharing & identify gaps, 2) systems for cross-referrals (1) ● Provide technical assistance and support related to TK Implementation (N/A) ● Develop coherent and locally responsive approaches to learning recovery (N/A) ● Updated and regular data and programing information on after school and summer should be systematically sent to all R&Rs (N/A)
---	--	---

Action: Priorities for Collaboration

In small groups, participants were asked to identify policy priorities / actions to address the identified needs / opportunities from the previous activity. Following this activity, all meeting participants were given an opportunity to review the small group notes (see [here](#)) and indicate which priorities / actions that they believed are most important. The list below summarizes the actions that were identified as most important.

Standards / Policy Alignment

Develop a mixed delivery system that is high quality, equitable, and creates a meaningful continuum of care and learning with multiple partners at the table

- Develop a more comprehensive crosswalk between ECE system and EXL system to answer the question, “What does an integrated mixed delivery system look like?”
- Aligning quality definition and quality standards
 - Ensure the needs of all children are met
 - Clarify that EXL programs are accessible for children with disabilities
- Get buy-in at the legislative level that the mixed delivery system is the structure for providing these services in California
- Create unity / simplicity across funding sources
 - For families, it needs to look like a single service
 - Families shouldn't encounter differences in services because of differences in funding streams
- Leverage policies that support workforce recruitment

Workforce

Build stronger policy language that ensures a baseline for living wages and job quality (Joint statement / recommendations across sectors on worker conditions (wages, professional development, benefits, career pathways))

- Assess the cost of quality and how that connects to wages
- Collect data on what we think is the true cost of care in all programs
- Develop a methodology or formula to equitably distribute rates regionally
- Encourage inclusion of EXL in the two statewide tables focusing on rates
- Look at examples from other states on how they've approached standards
- Consider parity in compensation instead of just parity of wages
- Shift the mindset about one-time fundes (Everything is one year. Budgets are always one year.)
- Mindset shift that this (ECE or EXL) is a career choice
- Move forward with the development of P-3 teaching credential

Establish workforce pipelines to build workforce capacity to expand programs - ELO and UPK

- Strengthen communication/coordination with IHE partners - to ensure IHEs have seats available for EXL and ECE staff
- Leverage workforce development resources, like apprenticeship to support on the job training for ECE and EXL staff

- Develop / expand / improve workforce registry system to be inclusive of both ECE and EXL workforce
- Move away from market-based systems, wage based not rate based

Local Implementation and TA needs

Establish better continuity of care for families with multiple children in different settings

- Improve coordination between state agencies involved in administering different programs
- Mandate that money stays within the community it was intended for - stronger community partnerships

Provide clear best practices and models

- Provide waivers for pilot sites (allow for increased pay, etc.)

Implement State T/A - integration of programs and knowledge sharing at the state level

- Allow flexibility in how locals use Technical Assistance (T/A) resources
- County Offices of Education (COEs) to help coordinate T/A pool to support district
- Network the System of Support for Expanded Learning, and the California System of Support with other County agencies as a nexus of collaboration because, "(Counties) are well-positioned to form cross-sector partnerships that efficiently integrate a comprehensive suite of services in local schools... through Multi- Tiered System of Support (MTSS) and a Coordination of Services Team (COST)."
- Provide resources for COEs or large districts to provide this T/A / support
- Strengthen relationships and provide coaching / personal support

Sharing Information and Engaging Stakeholders to Solidify and Advance Shared Policy Goals

Participants were asked whether they were interested in participating in a new table to continue to identify and advance shared policy goals. Fourteen (14) participants raised their hands to indicate their interest.

Next Steps

A feedback survey was shared with participants: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SY7NZ5W>

Participants

1. Adam North
2. Aleah Rosario
3. Becca, F5 LA
4. Ben Nash
5. Beth Meloy
6. Christine Thorsteinson
7. Courtney Baltiyskyy
8. Denyne Colburn
9. Diana Dominguez
10. Dion Aroner
11. Donna Cullinan
12. Donna Sneeringer
13. Eric Sonnenfeld
14. Erik Saucedo
15. Erin Gabel
16. Heather Williams
17. Jackie Wong
18. Jen Deitrich
19. Jennifer Cowan
20. Jennifer Peck
21. Jessica Gunderson
22. Keisha Nzewi
23. Kristin Schumacher
24. Malia Ramler
25. Mariana Quintanilla
26. Mary Ignatius
27. Matthew Tinsley
28. Michael Alferes
29. Michael Funk
30. Michael Garcia
31. Michael Haberberger
32. Misty Padilla Feusahrens
33. Nanette Rincon-Ksido
34. Naomi Ondrasek
35. Puneet Purewal
36. Rochelle Schmidt
37. Sarah Neville Morgan
38. Shelly Masur
39. Sierra Cook
40. Stephen Propheter
41. Tina Tranzor