

Chat from September 15, 2021 Transition Advisory Group Meeting

From Gina Robinson to Everyone: 03:01 PM
Pets and kids are always welcome

From George Davis V to Everyone: 03:02 PM
Good afternoon everyone.

From Maria Tarajano Rodman to Everyone: 03:03 PM
Maria Tarajano Rodman, Valley Settlement

From angela.fedler to Everyone: 03:05 PM
no

From Heidi White to Everyone: 03:05 PM
It would be helpful if everyone else could mute also

From angela.fedler to Everyone: 03:09 PM
Much better!
Thank you!!

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 03:10 PM
Thank you, Alexa!

From Lisa Hill (she/her), Invest in Kids to Everyone: 03:10 PM
So grateful for your perspective, Alexa, thank you!

From Maria Tarajano Rodman to Everyone: 03:11 PM
Such a beautiful moment hearing your voice and your point of view

From Pamela Harris (she/her/hers) to Everyone: 03:11 PM
Thanks so much Alexa for sharing!.

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 03:18 PM
As a reminder, the subgroups are all open to the public. The special education group is "seated" with named members, but also still public.
More info here: <http://www.earlychildhoodcolorado.org/subgroups>

From Leigh Pytlinski to Everyone: 03:23 PM
Before we make recommendations for which programs move to the new department, I would like to hear what the model would look like if some programs, like Head Start, CPP, and Special Education (which include their own legal requirements, standards, and evaluation tools) are NOT moved to the new department? I am a direct preschool provider who braids funding from

Tuition, CCAP, Head Start, CPP and Special Education and am concerned about meeting the needs of all of our preschoolers in a mixed delivery system that is spread across agencies.

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 03:23 PM

I have a general parking lot question - I would love to hear updates from the ECLC's listening sessions at an upcoming meeting. Would that be possible?

From Kristina Heyl to Everyone: 03:26 PM

Feedback can be shared using the form here: <http://www.earlychildhoodcolorado.org/transition-plan-feedback-form>

Feedback, including letters with recommendations for consideration, can be reviewed here: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1XLtIGBEkxD8YIK_k5MIAyeM9DJ8hF_wia41eWnhc7Xk/edit?usp=sharing

Hi Melissa! We shared the key themes from the listening sessions at the last TAG meeting; the notes from each session are available on the Engagement Opportunities page of the Transition website: <http://www.earlychildhoodcolorado.org/engagement-opportunities>

We have 2 more listening sessions for Workforce coming up on Sept 21st, and we'll be sure to report out at our TAG meeting on Sept 22nd!

From Jamie Ulrich to Everyone: 03:31 PM

The pros/cons document is helpful. Do we, as TAG members, have the opportunity to comment on this document as well?

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 03:31 PM

Thank you, Kristina! I'm looking forward to hearing what comes out of the new listening sessions as well!

From Kristie Kauerz to Everyone: 03:33 PM

Yes, I'm curious about the pros/cons document, too. Who contributed to those? And, since these meetings don't always allow in-depth deliberation, how can TAG members also make specific contributions about the pros/cons?

From colleen.olaughlin to Everyone: 03:40 PM

I think it's important to consider the legal limitations surrounding the overall goal, particularly as it relates to who decides the least restrictive environment. These requirements are specified in IDEA and must be adhered to.

From Jamie Ulrich to Everyone: 03:42 PM

Thank you.

From Kallie Leyba, AFT Colorado to Everyone: 03:44 PM

I'm sorry. When I turn my video on the sound gets choppy —I'm on my phone after another meeting.

From colleen.o'laughlin to Everyone: 03:45 PM

my internet is unstable; hence my video being off.

From Maria Tarajano Rodman to Everyone: 03:45 PM

I will try but our internet is unpredictable

From Kristie Kauerz to Everyone: 03:46 PM

I can't raise my hand...but am curious how many school districts have been engaged in these conversations?

From Jamie Ulrich to Everyone: 03:46 PM

How would the three year review be operationalized?

Camera is also off due to internet instability.

From angela.fedler to Everyone: 03:47 PM

What stance does the consortium have on this?

From Lorena Garcia|She/Ella|CSPC to Everyone: 03:48 PM

It's good to see recommendations.

From Diana Herrera (she/her) to Everyone: 03:48 PM

May I add that the voice of the public education representors was loud and overpowering at times. We (Special Education Subgroup) did not all agree that part B should stay with CDE

From angela.fedler to Everyone: 03:49 PM

Great thank you!

From nami bhasin (she/her) to Everyone: 03:49 PM

Is there a home for prenatal care?

From Maria Tarajano Rodman to Everyone: 03:49 PM

How is language justice and language equity being addressed --- so many Spanish speaking families we work with in our rural setting feel a sense of disconnection. We are leaning in to provide support and services but as a small organization it can be challenging especially with time sensitive needs. WE are happy to help but given we are looking at this now.... please please lean into this challenge especially with special education

From Mary Alice Cohen - CDHS to Everyone: 03:52 PM

All Colorado children, families and early childhood professionals are valued, healthy and thriving.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VGld_e4xAPNe6AyndR_67EMG2Ct32Og_Y4DFAiTfOOc/edit?usp=sharing

From Alisha Gonzalez to Everyone: 04:04 PM

Is this document detailing the programs available to download on the website?

From Mary Alice Cohen - CDHS to Everyone: 04:08 PM

Here is the link to the document:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VGld_e4xAPNe6AyndR_67EMG2Ct32Og_Y4DFAiTfOOc/edit?usp=sharing

From Heidi White to Everyone: 04:11 PM

TO clarify that Head Start is federally funded directly from Feds to local grantees

From Sherri Valdez to Everyone: 04:11 PM

This is the HS Collaboration Office, not the HS or EHS programs. Correct?

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 04:12 PM

Yes

From Kristie Kauerz to Everyone: 04:18 PM

I am on the coast and having a terrible time keeping my WiFi connection:

I also want to point out that all input is valuable, but also has different flavors. The system experienced by children/families is not an exact mirror of the technical design of the system. So, for example, feedback from advocates/providers that want a single point of access MAY NOT mean all of the programs need to move into one agency. That outcome for families/children can be achieved by addressing functions of the overall, multi-agency system...not only by moving all of the programs into one agency. There needs to be careful deliberation about "by moving this, it may create new MIS-alignments because it's moved farther away from other important components/programs." The assumption that moving programs into the new department will solve the frustrating parts for families/children is not always accurate.

From Rob DeHerrera to Everyone: 04:18 PM

Is that true for any rule that exists for any program that transfers?

From Merlyn Tejada to Everyone: 04:20 PM

Link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfpml-aaVoyYfKJ3irWxHfB6cmqPHaqjDFcjk_rqhYcTjh80A/viewform?usp=sf_link

From Debra Locke to Everyone: 04:21 PM

Where is that survey at?

From Sarah Carlson to Everyone: 04:21 PM

@Kristie- Thank you for pointing this out. As a parent, I want the best possible services and support, and easy access. Who makes that happen doesn't matter to me. If it's from one agency or many who collaborate, really doesn't matter.

From Gina Robinson, HCPF to Everyone: 04:21 PM

So the higher the score the more we agree?

From Merlyn Tejada to Everyone: 04:22 PM

yes

From Cathrine Floyd, Trust for Learning to Everyone: 04:23 PM

Too late- sorry, I already did it!

From Lexie Kuznick, CHSDA to Everyone: 04:23 PM

Is there an opportunity to talk more about the pros and cons of moving the child maltreatment prevention work to the new department (and hence away from the office of child welfare)?

From Kristie Kauerz to Everyone: 04:25 PM

@Sarah!...yes! And this is what I hope we all can be deliberative about. How do we make a better system?...not just think about one

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 04:26 PM

Yes, Lexie. Will do when the group comes back.

From Jade Woodard (she/her) to Everyone: 04:27 PM

Apologies for the late question - can someone (Mary Alice?) speak to if a program currently serves a specified age range (ie - up to age 18) will that program be able to continue serving the entire age range even if it moves to the Dept of Early Childhood?

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 04:27 PM

Jade: It will, as currently drafted, but we can have Mary Alice speak to that as well.

As a reminder, on the survey, 10 = Agree with the recommendation to move, 1 = Disagree with the recommendation to move.

From Jade Woodard (she/her) to Everyone: 04:29 PM

Thank you

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 04:29 PM

We will add a note in the form, but if you filled it out the other way, please email Sarah.shepherd@watershed-advisors.com and let her know

From Kristie Kauerz to Everyone: 04:29 PM

@Lexie...also, yes! Moving programs to the department may make sense from one perspective, but the disconnections that are created should also be considered. It may be helpful to remember that some of the Programs in OEC were already in CDHS prior to OEC's creation...and have benefitted from being inside the agency that houses complementary programs. Just because they work well inside OEC now *may* be because of their proximity to other CDHS programs, not because they're part of OEC. I would still like more discussion — from a systems perspective — about the pros/cons of moving all of OEC (at least in the short-term...this is also supposed to be a staggered process, yes?)

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 04:30 PM

Kristie and Sarah- thanks for bringing this up, I think this is our chance to push the system to a place of streamlined alignment that significantly improves family and provider experience, while also making sure that we have the experts at the table to make sure unintended consequences are considered. I don't think it's an either-or question, but rather a both/and. We can make all of these moves, serve all families even better than we could before, and avoid those unintended consequences as well. The potential for misalignments is, in my opinion, not a reason not to move something that would significantly improve the family and provider experience.

From Kristie Kauerz to Everyone: 04:34 PM

@Melissa. I will restate that moving Programs does not de facto improve family/provider experience. If you study other states' experiences, this bears out (see, for example, Washington...who ended up UNdoing it's stand-alone department because it created more fragmentation for families). You're right that it's not straightforward...but the technical deliberations are worthwhile, before moving things in a rush, then regretting it later.

From Elisabeth Lawrence to Everyone: 04:34 PM

Regarding the survey- it is scaled down and does not include Child Welfare and TANF moving? Will that be included in the future? Just wasn't sure if the opportunity to share our thoughts on those two had already passed

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 04:35 PM

TANF and Child welfare are not currently in the draft recommendation. If you have recommendations to add or adjust, please include in the comment section at the end. We would welcome any such recommendations.

From Anji Gallanos to Everyone: 04:38 PM

If family/child/provider experiences are the goal of creating this agency it would be wonderful to see how those experiences will be measured and reviewed consistently. I look forward to seeing how Colorado engages in ongoing evaluation about this process

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 04:39 PM

Same. Building on CPP, Anji.

From Lorena Garcia|She/Ella|CSPC to Everyone: 04:39 PM
I second Melissa. I believe it is important to move all OEC programs to the new department. They were put into a single department for a reason, and it works.

From Maria Tarajano Rodman to Everyone: 04:40 PM
Yes Melissa we too are hearing about supporting the whole family. We are hearing this from families and providers.

From Scott Groginsky to Everyone: 04:47 PM
ECLC advises the state, not just CDHS.

From Lorena Garcia|She/Ella|CSPC to Everyone: 04:48 PM
Thank you Scott and Elsa for this background!

From Heidi White to Everyone: 04:48 PM
Really great points, Elsa

From Carol Woods to Everyone: 04:49 PM
Yes. Angela.

From mgibson-steiner to Everyone: 04:50 PM
Absolutely, Angela

From Leigh Pytlinski to Everyone: 04:50 PM
Agreed, Angela. Almost all of our children and families will eventually be part of the -12 system.

From Shela Blankinship to Everyone: 04:50 PM
I agree as well Angela. thank you for the input

From Debra Locke to Everyone: 04:51 PM
I agree

From Rob DeHerrera to Everyone: 04:51 PM
well said.

From swrig to Everyone: 04:51 PM
agreed

From Lorena Garcia|She/Ella|CSPC to Everyone: 04:51 PM
+++ Ki'i

From George Davis V to Everyone: 04:53 PM
I believe the advisory boards are a Great way to share info.

From Cassandra Johnson BCDI-Denver to Everyone: 04:53 PM

I am wondering if it comes across as intimidating because there are a lot of experts present on the call

I want to iterate that Parents are the EXPERTS!

From Amber Bilby - CO to Everyone: 04:54 PM

If he turns off his camera it might help

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 04:54 PM

Thanks for suggesting that Cassandra, I've been wondering the same thing!

From Maria Tarajano Rodman to Everyone: 04:54 PM

My experience in New Mexico when they transitioned to a DECE the Secretary was very intentional about advice from all sectors but in particular parent/family voice. Was critical to a successful implementation. I have since left New Mexico but my former colleagues and parents I am still connected with are very positive about the multiple and intentional pathways for communication, feedback and advice.

From Debra Locke to Everyone: 04:55 PM

I think advisory boards but it should be built to allow the community to create it

From Anji Gallanos to Everyone: 04:55 PM

Head Start has always had a great model of parent involvement in HS policy

From Cassandra Johnson BCDI-Denver to Everyone: 04:55 PM

absolutely agree George

From Betty Dalton to Everyone: 04:55 PM

I agree with George

From angela.fedler to Everyone: 04:56 PM

Yes Penny!!!!

From Karen Murphy to Everyone: 04:56 PM

Important point, George.

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 04:56 PM

Yes I would love to reiterate the importance of funding and support for this process, especially for those not paid to engage in this work already

From Alisha Gonzalez to Everyone: 04:56 PM

i agree that HS makes parent involvement necessary and so should this new department

From Debra Locke to Everyone: 04:56 PM
yes definitely

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 04:56 PM
And that advisory boards include a majority of voices not traditionally included at decision making tables. As Cassandra previously said, it can be intimidating

From swrig to Everyone: 04:57 PM
Parents definitely need to be included and listened to

From Kate Brunner (she/her) - CO to Everyone: 04:57 PM
Leveraging and connecting with community ambassadors for two way communication -- especially with underserved communities seems very important to me when it comes to this. In the library world we think about that as part of outreach -- not to sell our services to people, but so that our service is centered on community needs.

From Betty Dalton to Everyone: 04:57 PM
True Penny, also communication is sometimes not where it should be.

From Ki`i Powell, Colorado to Everyone: 04:57 PM
Good point Lorena

From colleen.oloughlin to Everyone: 04:57 PM
What do we mean by a rulemaking "committee?"

From Penny Harris to Everyone: 04:58 PM
I do believe that the early childhood regional councils could be a conduit to gaining more representation and advisement from all

From Betty Dalton to Everyone: 04:58 PM
I so agree

From Ki`i Powell, Colorado to Everyone: 04:59 PM
Nicely put Elsa.

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 05:00 PM
Lorena or Jessica (or others), could you describe the difference in the two things you are talking about for those who don't know the definition and differences between rulemaking and advisory?
Thank you :)

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 05:00 PM
Yes

From Cassandra Johnson BCDI-Denver to Everyone: 05:01 PM
i have a question in the same vein as Elsa

From Anji Gallanos to Everyone: 05:02 PM
Would a board for this agency be elected? or appointed?

From Lorena Garcia|She/Ella|CSPC to Everyone: 05:02 PM
Let's use us as an example. We the TAG are advisory. We put forward recommendations and the TWG (rule making committee) can choose to adopt our recs or not.

From Sherri Valdez to Everyone: 05:03 PM
What can be learned from the SubPAC (Policy Advisory Committee) model at CDHS? What can we learn from CDE and the State Board of Education model? And is the ECLC charged with in the Act?

From Anji Gallanos to Everyone: 05:03 PM
CPP has existing rules and statutes. It is a good frame but all of those rules for things like eligibility, funding, partnerships will need to be revised and passed through legislation - correct?

From Kate Brunner (she/her) - CO to Everyone: 05:03 PM
Cassandra has had her hand up for a bit...

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 05:04 PM
Thank you both- those are both great examples!

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 05:04 PM
Cassandra - You are next!

From Dustin Elliott to Everyone: 05:04 PM
and when frustrated often they shut down and no longer provide feedback

From Jake Barney (he/him) to Everyone: 05:05 PM
Ty -- this is fantastically put. Thank you.

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 05:06 PM
Ditto. Beautifully described Ty!

From 676320 to Everyone: 05:06 PM
Not an official TAG member so apologize if I'm not supposed to comment but... When we established the ECLC in 2007 we followed the Head Start Act that made them possible, membership was outlined and the ECLC has always been advisory, no rule making authority, policy making authority or fiscal authority. With 1304 the role was expanded and they are doing amazing work -however still advisory. In my opinion the new Department needs to have a state board of EC. Governor appointed with rule making authority fiscal authority and maybe most

importantly accountability to the public. If not this then you have an Executive Director/Cabinet member that is only accountable to the Governor's Office with little in-between. The ECLC remains and is advisory to the new governance board and they work hand in hand with diverse representation. I believe currently 13 of the 19 existing state departments have such a board. I think it would be a mistake not to recommend such a Board. Plus in 5 years we have a new Gov!

From George Davis V to Everyone: 05:06 PM
Great Voice, Thank You.

From swrig to Everyone: 05:06 PM
I agree Ty, thank you

From Tyressa(Ty) Johnson to Everyone: 05:09 PM
multi-directional accountability... yes
good point

From Jamie Ulrich to Everyone: 05:09 PM
I am not sure who made comments about the boards that currently exist in the Department, I agree we should recommend a similar structure, with stakeholder feedback and input.

From Penny Harris to Everyone: 05:09 PM
I agree, Head Start would be a great model to study for governance. There are many resources...

From Carol Woods to Everyone: 05:19 PM
Concerning regulations. Will there be an opportunity to change some of the state and county regs in regards to public school preschool programs?

From Kate Brunner (she/her) - CO to Everyone: 05:25 PM
when discussions about data unfold, are these predominantly licensed care-centered discussions?

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 05:25 PM
Potentially, Carol. Would appreciate your perspective.

From Jake Barney (he/him) to Everyone: 05:25 PM
Kate -- are you referencing licensed care homes or FFN type care?

From Kate Brunner (she/her) - CO to Everyone: 05:26 PM
I ask that because I am wondering about how informal care/FFNs fit into these systems visibility goals.

From Jake Barney (he/him) to Everyone: 05:26 PM
or family support services type data?

From Melissa Mares (she, her, ella) to Everyone: 05:26 PM
I am really looking forward to this discussion next week- thank you for sharing this information!

From Jake Barney (he/him) to Everyone: 05:26 PM
great question Kate -- I know MaryAlice is thinking about this but I agree new dept needs capacity to think about non-licensed care network.

From Megan Burch, Eagle County to Everyone: 05:26 PM
Technology should not just include application but program access as well. Families who qualify for these programs should not be forced through different systems than private pay families to record their attendance, as an example.

From Tyressa(Ty) Johnson to Everyone: 05:27 PM
thank you great facilitation as always

From Cathrine Floyd, Trust for Learning to Everyone: 05:27 PM
Good point Megan

From Tyressa(Ty) Johnson to Everyone: 05:27 PM
yes, thank you

From Jamie Ulrich to Everyone: 05:27 PM
Agreed, Megan!

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 05:28 PM
Good point, Megan. We have heard that a lot. We can add that to the language.

Please include in your reflection survey after the meeting as well.

From Ki'i Powell, Colorado to Everyone: 05:29 PM
Kristina, I don't see governance for Sept 22?

From Jessica Baghian to Everyone: 05:29 PM
It should be there, Ki'i
Typo

From Ki'i Powell, Colorado to Everyone: 05:29 PM
Thx

From Karen Murphy to Everyone: 05:30 PM
Thank you

From Tyressa(Ty) Johnson to Everyone: 05:30 PM
Thank you all so much, I apologize no camera on thank you

From angela.fedler to Everyone: 05:30 PM
Thank you all!

From Tyressa(Ty) Johnson to Everyone: 05:30 PM
and be well

From Shela Blankinship to Everyone: 05:30 PM
Thank you

From swrig to Everyone: 05:30 PM
Thank you

From George Davis V to Everyone: 05:30 PM
Thank You.

From Alisha Lacombe-Emile to Everyone: 05:31 PM
Thank You