Meeting was Call Order by Barbara Tedrow, ELAC Chair, at 9:38 am

Emergency meeting so no need to go through and approve minutes so we will take care of that at the next regular meeting.

We have invited special guests today to present their bills so we can make sure that we understand them and answer questions. We will work around their availability.

Welcome and Introductions:

Committee Members (in person): Barbara Tedrow, Ray Jaramillo, Crystal Tapia, Olga Valenzuela-Zavala, Amanda Gibson, Angela Redondo, Kimberly Johns, Elizabeth Beers, Shannon Rivera

(Via ZOOM): Andy Gomm, Alejandra Rebolledo Rea

Quorum Established

Audience introductions

Barbara- guests via Zoom, presenting on SB 298

**SB 298**

Eli Lee and Sandra Wechsler with NM Now. Goal is Universal PreK within 5 years. To do that, we would like to move 4-year-olds to public PreK over the next 5 years and fund them through the public school funding formula. 3-year-olds exclusively at private centers. Important part of bill is to bring private center salary up to public school salaries so private centers don’t see the constant change of staff. Over the next 5 years we hope to see an increase in the number of 3-year-olds in PreK by a multiple of 7. Maintain 50/50 spilt of monies between private centers and public centers. $40 Million over 5 years for 3-year-old PreK for private centers. We hope that after 5 years up to 80% of 4-year-olds and 50% of 3-year-olds will be in high quality PreK. We believe our bill is compatible with Senator Padilla’s Early Childhood Department Bill.

Chairperson Tedrow- opens for questions from counsel

Amanda Gibson, Headstart- how does this bill support Headstarts that are already seeing a shortage of 4-year-olds.

Response: Under the Martinez administration, our understanding is that there was a call for a meeting for state departments and Headstart that went largely unscheduled. In states like Georgia, kids will multiple funding sources will be in the same classroom. That is where we hope to head. It will take strong leadership. There is no way to mandate cooperation between Headstart and NM PreK.

Tedrow- yes you want to braid funding but all of the children would be served under the public school system? Would you be taking 4 year old Headstart children who are already in quality system and moving them to public school and taking the money?

Response: No, our goal for 80% is to after all

Tedrow- 4 year olds will stay in private centers in the phase out plan? Or those children will be moved into the public schools?

Response: the way the bill is written those children would be phased out and moved into public schools.

Andy: Children with Special Needs age out at age 3 and we are looking for inclusive settings for them to transition into. I’m trying to vision this system where 3 and 4-year-olds are separated. Seems children would be transitioning into a private community PreK at 3 and transition again at 4 to public school setting and then transition again at Kindergarten.

Response: Are these children IDEA B?

Andy: We are IDEA C (birth- 3) but they transition into IDEA B.

Response: I will have to double check, I’m not sure. In our bill, I believe IDEA B is not touched so they could be served in either public or private system

Andy: 2nd question re alignment to SB22- are you saying that the management and the administration of the 4-year-old program would managed out of the SB22 proposed Early Childhood Department or would it be under PED?

Response: We believe our bill can be compatible of SB22 if 4 year old PreK

Andy: administration of 4-year-old programs would be administered through PED or be in the new department?

Response: They would remain at PED

Andy: Then it is not compatible

Response: Yes, that is the one amendment to SB22 that we would recommend.

Ray: essentially creating a new grade? Instead of public school starting at kindergarten, it would start at 4?

Response: Yes, in essence. It’s important that the PreK programs be appropriate.

Ray: It was very important in the original PreK act that the funding be equitable. When you say 50/50 it seems you mean 3-year-olds one way and 4-year-olds the other way. Equitable is that the funding is split CYFD and PED.

Response: We are calling for a change in how the 50/50 split occurs. We are retaining the 50/50 spilt in money but changing how it is distributed by age.

Barbara: can you join later for more questions?

Response: 15 min at 11:00am

[guests leave meeting]

Barbara to committee: suggest we review the bills and create a list of the most important questions

Olga: it’s not just the children receiving special needs services that will have the transition.

Barbara: yes, and families too. Siblings. Families drop off at multiple locations or 4-year-olds riding the bus.

Elizabeth: It removes parental choice

Barbara: 3-year-olds are not equitable to 4-year-olds. 3-year-olds won’t just materialize to take the spot of 4-year-olds

Amanda: Yes, it’s the same in Headstart. As PreK has expanded, we’ve been told there are plenty of 3-year-olds and to serve more 3-year-olds but it’s not the same. It limits the class size and it’s very hard for staff to manage a group of 17 three-year-olds. Because we have the absence of a parent on this board, we need to consider what is right for parents. The numbers of 3-year-olds and 4-year-olds listed on page 3 for Headstart is not correct, it is not a fixed number.

Shannon: What is the plan for administrators overseeing to ensure the integrity of early childhood? What is the workforce the development plan? Teacher shortage crisis- right now we allow any adult to go into a classroom to teach without any training or licensure, is that going to happen in PED PreK programs?

Barbara: was that addressed at the hearing?

Amanda: no, they just have a budget for workforce development. $15Mil for workforce development.

Crystal: question about budget

Ray: Andy- question about federal funding. I’m concerned that we are going to be reverting federal funds from Child Development Block Grant.

Crystal: My question is why? Why do this when we have years of history of CYFD funded PreK programs providing the same or better outcomes as PreK in the public schools. Also, this would be eliminating an industry. A primarily minority, woman owned, small business industry. Asking to take 50% of the annual income and redo the budget to accommodate that. It is not possible.

Kim- concerns are increasing the wages of the CYFD staff. I also question the qualifications and training for these staff? The 3-year-olds we serve have significant needs. In my program, we have 9 SLPs, additional staff with training. These children start the day after their 3rd birthday. Are they going to have licensed teachers in these other programs? I have asked all my questions and concerns and they did not answer them. Multiple families have both 3 and 4-year-olds. How is that going to work?

Andy: From listening in to the hearing, one reason for WHY is they felt that using the funding formula was the way to take 4-year-old PreK to scale. It would become part of the district funding formula. The counsel can consider if we think, that is a good reason why or can we continue to fund through the 50/50 system that Ray mentions. Nationally, some of the states that are most successful are states with the mixed delivery system not the public school systems that provide the highest quality systems. Alabama is the highest rated state in the nation; they and Georgia have the most mixed delivery system. I think it’s good for us to make decisions based on data, not our guts. I have data from NIEER.

Barbara: leads discussion on the Frequently Asked Questions.

Alejandra (join via ZOOM)- I want to clarify that the standard alignment does exist. We have the same standards for PreK regardless of system. Also, the training and professional development are aligned. The research shows that the outcomes up to 11th grade shows no preference in one system over the other.

Shannon: I do know that there is a proposal to increase starting wages for public school teachers. I agree that it is needed, I support that. Is there a plan to increase the wages for CYFD teachers as well?

Kim: Also, what are the qualifications for the teachers?

Alejandra: in the bill there is a section that indicates that the 3-year-old PreK educators, in private programs, would be compensated based on their qualifications.

Barbara: Mariana Padilla has joined us via ZOOM. Please give us an introduction.

Mariana Padilla: Thank you for having me. I am the Director of the Children’s Cabinet with Governor Lujan-Grisham. I appreciate the invitation and look forward to meeting you and hearing the conversation today.

Barbara: Alejandra there was a question about Federal TANAF funds. Right now, it is a matching fund, we get 50 Million dollars and we contribute 50 million. So right now, we get federal monies for 4-year-olds. If 4-year-olds move to PED, would we expand 0-3 or would we turn that money back?

Alejandra: We are currently required to serve all children 0-12, which includes 4-year-old. It would change the formula if all 4-year-olds were now only needing before and after care.

Barbara: So we would also be supplanting the 3 year old funding for children

Barbara: would PED still be required to follow FOCUS? Do you know Brenda?

Brenda Kofahl (audience member): this bill does not provide any dollars to PED to provide professional development or coaching to teachers of 4-year-olds. All of the dollars go into the school district’s general fund, rather than giving the dollars to PED to use in FOCUS. FOCUS has been a large part of our success. It reduces the per child rate from 64.12 to 51.98 but also calls for increase in teacher salaries. That is a concern.

Ray (to audience member, principal Cobre School District): I would love to hear your perspective as a principal)

Michael Koury, Principal- I’m in a very small district. We currently serve both 3 & 4-year-olds in the same classroom due to the size of the community. We have been very successful as an elementary school and I say that it’s because we are feeding children into those schools who have been a part of PreK.

Elizabeth- We have a lot of bills to review today, we’ve already spent 1.5 hours on this one bill.

Barbara- Our agenda says 12. We need to stick to that. This bill popped up and it affects a lot of things. We may just need 5 minutes when they get back on the line.

Ray: We should have had this conversation 6 months ago. They did not come to us. Now is not the time for changes, we have what we have in front of us. If they want to come back to us, we can have that conversation.

Barbara (to Eli on ZOOM): Would you be willing to meet with us to hear some concerns? We will be present at the hearings stating publicly but if you want to hear them in advance, I would be open to that.

Eli: Thank you so much for the comments. We remain ready to meet any time. I know several people in the room have been on our email lists where we sent out updates over the last year. We would like to meet anytime.

Barbara- I will be in Santa Fe weekly. I would like to set up a meeting and send out the invite to everyone and anyone who wants to join us can

Eli: That would be great, we are here every day and welcome the opportunity to meet.

Barbara: I am ready to vote.

Andy- as a state employee, I will abstain from voting

Alejandra- the same is true of myself and Olga. We will abstain from voting.

Elizabeth- I make a motion to vote in opposition of this bill (SB298)

Crystal- 2nd

Ray- can we can do a roll call vote?

Katrina- we will record in the minutes that this is a roll call vote. Also, we want to make sure that the voice of the public is heard.

Ray and Barbara- is there anyone here that would like to stand in support of this bill?

(no response)

Barbara- is there anyone here that would like to stand in opposition of this bill?

(no response)

11:12AM- Roll Call Vote on Senate Bill 298

**SB 298:**

Angela Redondo- abstain

Kim Johns -opposed

Beth Beers-opposed

Shannon Rivera- opposed

Barbara Tedrow- opposed

Ray Jaramillo- yes

Crystal Tapia- opposed

Olga Valenzuela-Zavala - abstain

Amanda Gibson- opposed

Andy Gomm-abstain

Alejandra Rebolledo Rea- abstain

**7 in favor, 4 abstain- motion passes**

Barbara- ok, let’s move through the bills in alphabetical order

**HB134- Community Schools adding Early Childhood in Community Schools**

Beth- did we get more information?

Ray- Just to clarify for the counsel. You do not have to vote in support or no support, you can remain neutral.

Ray- Las Cruces has a community school. They are available after hours. There is a food pantry, social services, after care, there are children who have their dinners provided.

Beth- are they anywhere else?

Ray- Albuquerque and Santa Fe. It is a wonderful model. Connecting to the whole child, the whole family, the whole community.

Barbara- any other comments or questions. Open to the audience, any comments or questions

Andy- this bill is permissive to allow the community schools to include PreK. Not about if community schools are good or bad, just allowing the ones there are to include PreK in their program.

Beth- make a motion is support of house bill 134

Amanda- 2nd the motion

Barbara- roll call vote for HB 134

Angela Redondo- abstain

Kim Johns -opposed

Beth Beers-opposed

Shannon Rivera- opposed

Barbara Tedrow- opposed

Ray Jaramillo- yes

Crystal Tapia- opposed

Olga Valenzuela-Zavala - abstain

Amanda Gibson- opposed

Andy Gomm-abstain

Alejandra Rebolledo Rea- abstain

**7 Yes and 4 abstain, motion passes**

Barbara- **HB152 Transportation of children in foster care**

**HB 152**- 11:20 am

Amanda- motion to support

Crystal- 2nd

Barbara- discussion?

Beth- in theory this is amazing and worthy of support but in reality, I don’t think it’s realistic in small communities.

Alejandra- one of the things you might want to look at is the requirement for compliance with Every Student Succeeds Act. Federal law puts the responsibility of the Department and the bill is putting the responsibility at the local level.

Amanda- Motions to remove her previous motion on this bill. Motions that the ELAC remains neutral on this bill.

Kimberly- 2nds motion to remain neutral

Roll call vote on HB152 11:25am

Angela-abstain

Kimberly-yes

Beth-yes

Shannon-yes

Barbara-yes

Ray-yes

Crystal- yes

Olga- abstain

Amanda- yes

Andy- abstain

Alejandra- abstain

**7 yes, 4 Abstain- motion to remain neutral passes**

**HB173 Child and Family Databank**

Barbara- This is a mirror bill in SB202 bill. We did invite someone to be present and give us information on this bill. Is she in the audience?

(no response)

Andy- We provided information about Early Childhood Integrated Data System and how it was meeting our needs in Early Childhood. We did have some concerns about this database from HIPPA and how it dumps information from various systems into one system. We felt ECIDS is currently meeting our needs.

Ray- motions table HB 173 and SB 202

Beth- 2nds motion

**Motions passes with majority in favor**

**HB 197 Shared Services Integration Model**

Includes appropriation of $300,000.00

Ray- isn’t NMAEYC already doing this?

Barbara- is anyone in the audience that could share information on this?

Audience member- NMEAYC does have a shared model directed towards teachers. We are using shared services for all 7 of our community programs to share things such as substitutes. We partner with CYFD for things like their clearance for when they work at various programs. Ideally, it’s a one stop hub for families to answer questions about different programs and what they offer. We have been doing this 5 years. We would like to expand to other programs in our community.

Barbara- are you working with Rep Dow?

Shannon- is this funding just for this program in Grant County or statewide?

Audience Member- Yes, for our program. We hope to be a model to show other counties how we do it. We are trying to get this appropriation so we can send this model out into the state.

Amanda- motion to table HB197

Beth- 2nds motion

Angela-abstain

Kimberly-yes

Beth-yes

Shannon-yes

Barbara-yes

Ray-yes

Crystal- yes

Olga- abstain

Amanda- yes

Andy- abstain

Alejandra- abstain

**7 yes, 4 Abstain- motion to remain neutral passes**

**Majority in favor- motion passes**

**SB22- Creation of Early Childhood Education Department**

Beth- Why do we need this department? Do we need a law that tells us that we have to talk to each other?

Barbara- I myself support this bill because the funding would go to this department.

Andy- In the analysis that we submitted, looking at the experience of other states and one of the successes in consolidating the services that are serving children and families. There is some synchronicity of being together and looking at quality standards. Looking at our Preschool Development Grant, we wrote that together as 3 agencies and we will work on that grant together. The synchronicity and alignment are key. The data system, for example, currently we have to choose one of the three agencies.

Shannon- I want to support what Andy and Barbara says as being in support of the bill. I don’t look at it as more government. I see it as a common language amongst programs. Prenatal to age five under this department. Hopefully to reduce duplication of services or overlap in funding.

Beth- that makes sense and is exciting but if agencies within the agency are able to say no, this is our funding… is this going to be effective? We talk a lot about childcare but children don’t come by themselves. They come in dyads.

Alejandra- the bill includes Infant Mental Health. CYFD- DOH- Family Infant Health and FIT program. It’s not just the operation funding but also the

Beth- I’m ready to make a motion to support

Ray- It’s a continuum, it just makes sense.

Barbara- we will go to the audience

Kim (audience member)- I just want to remind people that long ago the Department of Aging and Long Term Services created. I think what this bill does is recognize that the first 5 years are a time of Human Development that is critical and this is a real recognition of an important part of Human Development.

Olga- we have seen success of having multiple programs together. Working together, learning about what each other does.

*Judith Lavender- Care Development and Education. Development is the glue between care and the education.*

*Sophie B, CDD- There is a whole group of children that is left out of this bill, preschool children with special needs. These children will not be allowed into this department. There is a lot of work done with inclusion and to segregate this group of children.*

Kimberly Johns- I emailed this question after the last meeting and I have not heard back.

Andy- I think if the bill could be amended to include language on the special education, that would go a long way to prevent confusion.

Alejandra- just a reminder that we do have a Children’s Cabinet that will be supporting the implementation of al programs for children, regardless of any legislation that is passed.

Crystal- do we know if they made the amendment to include ELAC?

Barbara- My agenda item was to contact Representative Dow to put ELAC back in statute. One conversation is the makeup of the counsel to include a parent, tribal representative.

Kim- do we want to table?

Michael Koury- Cobre Schools- we run a full inclusion program and the program is very successful. It would be catastrophic if these children would stop being included.

Amanda- motions that we don’t support the bill unless inclusion is included.

Barbara- do we have a 2nd to the motion.

No one 2nds

Barbara- back open for conversation.

Kim- make motion that ELAC does NOT support the bill.

Barbara- is there a 2nd?

[no response]

Beth- I would like to hear from Kip.

Kip (from audience)- I am firmly is support of this department. This would allow for better communication between departments. I have always believed that communities ought to set their priorities for the “what’s important”. This would allow one department to look at priorities and decide that. I see this as an opportunity to diminish democracy. There are always going to be pieces that lie outside of.

Barbara- so the committee is aware, I am in support of this bill. I have written op eds for my local newspaper in support of this bill and I will be supporting this bill in my role in the private sector.

Sarah Armstrong (audience member)- I feel the meat and potatoes is what is missing from this bill. We are seeing an increase of children with special needs, we have many nonverbal students. More students with special needs. We can’t leave them out.

Andy- I wonder if we can put a motion on the table to support the bill but request our committee chair to push for inclusion of preschool special ed by approaching the bill sponsors?

Beth- I would be in support of that motion.

Beth- Motion to support the bill with the caveat that the committee chairs charged to speak to the sponsors of the bill to amend the bill include preschool special education and to include ELAC as an advisory council.

Motion that ELAC is in support of SB22 with the request that it be amended to be more inclusive of preschool special education as a program under the new department and the reauthorization of ELAC as an advisory council.

Ray- I don’t think we can do this. We need to support or not as written and then push for amendment.

Alejandra- I think you need 2 motions. 1. To support or not support. 2. Is for the chairs to work with the sponsor to make the amendments.

Ray- I don’t think this part should hold us up. I feel the majority of this is sound. Putting early childhood in one box is

Beth- recall earlier motion.

Beth- motion for ELAC to support SB22

Crystal- 2nd

Roll Call vote to Support SB22 at 12:27 pm

Angela- abstain

Kim-no

Shannon-yes

Barbara- yes

Ray- yes

Crystal-yes

Olga- abstain

Amanda-yes

Andy-abstain

Alejandra-abstain

**Motion passes 6 yes, 1 no, 4 abstain**

Beth- new motion. ELAC chairs work with the sponsors of this bill to include preschool special education.

Ray-2nds motion

Angela- abstain

Kim-yes

Shannon-yes

Barbara- yes

Ray- yes

Crystal-yes

Olga- abstain

Amanda-yes

Andy-abstain

Alejandra-abstain

**Motion passes, 7 yes, 4 abstain**

**SB 280 Public Schools to Receive Capital Outlay**

Ray- propose to remain neutral

Amanda- 2nd

Angela- abstain

Kim-yes

Shannon-yes

Barbara- yes

Ray- yes

Crystal-yes

Olga- abstain

Amanda-yes

Andy-abstain

Alejandra-abstain

**Motion passes, 7 yes, 4 abstain**

**HJR1 Land Grant Bill**

Barbara- I reached out to Maestas multiple times to invited him to attend to explain this to us. I still find it confusing. I do not have enough information to vote on this bill.

Beth- make a motion to table bill

Amanda- 2nd

Angela- abstain

Kim-yes

Shannon-yes

Barbara- yes

Ray- yes

Crystal-yes

Olga- abstain

Amanda-yes

Andy-abstain

Alejandra-abstain

**Motion passes, 7 yes, 4 abstain**

Barbara- there are two new bills that are to drop. One for expanding the definition of preschool special ed and one for eliminating co pays.

**Break 12:34- 12:43**

Chair, Barbara Tedrow, reconvenes meeting at 12:44

For record: Andy, Ray, Crystal left during the break

**SB290- Medicaid Home Visiting Services and Council**

Amanda- there are key players missing from this list. Early Head Start is missing. Parents are missing.

Beth- my concern is that it needs to be a seamless program and never seem like it is a “poor persons” service. Alejandra, have you done an analysis on this bill?

Alejandra- it will give the responsibility of the oversight to the Human Services Department to identify standards. Right now the standards do not align with Home Visiting standards.

In our analysis we are also looking at the financial impact. Right now the way the pilot is working, we have an allocation for the startup costs that we contract out. It allows for braided funded for families that are Medicaid eligible so that if they lose Medicaid, the general funds will pick them up so they don’t lose their services. We are looking at the pilot as continuing to move forward. CYFD does the Home Visiting oversight under the Home Visiting accountability act.

*Kim (from audience) the LFC has asked for an extra 3 million dollars for the pilot project. If it were an easy way to do it, every state would do it. I think it’s a smart way to roll this out carefully and thoughtfully. I would agree that Home Visiting ought to remain with the agency that knows how to do it.*

Alejandra- there is research that shows that states that use Medicaid only to fund Home Visiting have not been as successful. The families should not feel where they are getting their funding from. Their services should be the same.

Beth- it would be a nightmare for programs if there were different outcomes.

Beth- I make a motion that at this time we do not support SB290

Amanda- 2nd

Angela-abstain

Kim-abstain

Beth-yes

Shannon-yes

Barbara- yes

Olga-abstain

Amanda-yes

Alejandra- abstain

**Motion passes 4 yes, 4 abstain**

From audience- request to make the ELAC aware of other bills related to early childhood.

*Kip*

**HB230-** eliminates requirement that a child born drug impacted is automatically referred to CYFD. Removes the punishment aspect so that women are using substances seek services for their addiction. It also pushes the state to comply with the federal addiction... remove is on hospital to report children who are born drug addicted.

**HB67-SB157** Tribal Health Counsel

Replaces Maternal and child health act.

*Audience member-* HB197 includes 3 phases to complete the planning of shared services model.

Alejandra- there will be many bills that are coming up. Would it be wise to ask for volunteers to help represent ELAC in Santa Fe so the burden is not solely only on the two chairs to be present?

Barbara- when senate hearings come up, my hope is that it will be sent to the whole counsel so that if we cannot be there someone else will be able to be there. Some hearings allow webcasting.

Motion to adjourn from Amanda

Shannon 2nds

**Meeting Adjourns 1:09pm**