

Early Learning Board (ELB)

Thursday, May 25, 2023

10:00 am – 12:00 pm

The public may attend the meeting in any of the locations specified below:

**Meeting Chair will preside at CEED Center, KCAA
2707 South King Street, Honolulu, HI 96826
Or Via the Zoom Link**

Board Members in Attendance: Justina Acevedo-Cross, Erin Henderson-Lacerdo, Ben Naki, Megan McCorriston, Mei Ou, Robert Peters (for Director Bossert), Melodie Vega, Matt Shim (for Director Fink), Kai‘ulani Laehā, Stephen Schatz (for President Lassner), Lane Tsuchiyama (ELB Institutional Analyst)

Absent: Mari Uehara, Kerrie Urosevich, Nāpua Rosehill (for Jack Wong), Rochelle Mahoe (for Superintendent Hayashi), Dayna Luka (for Director Betts)

Executive Office on Early Learning staff in attendance: Yuuko Arikawa-Cross, Chris Jackson, Stephanie Tim Sing, Kevin Kabasawa, Ashley Miura

Public in Attendance: Emma Christopherson, Angela Miyashiro, Lynette Kamekona, Kiyo Noguchi, Lauren Padesky, Ka‘ano‘i Walk

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
MINUTES:		
Welcome/Introductions— Bob Peters	Chair Peters began the meeting at 10:10 AM. He read the mission statement, then reminded everyone that regardless of in-person attendance, protocols would proceed as usual, with attendance and votes conducted by roll call. Quorum was established. Chair Peters announced that the focus of today’s meeting was SB1022 HD1 CD1. The two agenda items related to the bill were to (1)	

Early Learning Board

<http://earlylearning.hawaii.gov/early-learning-board/>

Thursday, May 25, 2023

Page 1

	determine if and how to respond to the Governor regarding the approval of the bill presented to him, and (2) Board transition planning.	
Public Comment —Bob Peters	No public comments were provided.	
SB1022 H.D. 1 C.D. 1 (Board Composition) —Bob Peters	<p>Chair Peters began by reviewing the amendments ELB made to the original bill in their request to the legislature. These changes were not included in SB1022 H.D. 1 C.D. 1, the version of the bill that has been sent to the Governor for approval. Chair Peters asked Board members whether they thought there were any positive impacts or elements that could come from the C.D. 1 version of the bill, and whether the Board found any reasons to recommend to the Governor to veto the bill.</p> <p>Key takeaways from the discussion that followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board felt that requesting a veto would not be in its best interest. • There was a general concern among most Board members that Hawaiian Medium Education (HME) would not be guaranteed a voice at the new table. • Concern was expressed that non-center-based settings, as well as specific services, would have a harder time being recognized as part of the system if they also are not guaranteed seats on the new Board. • In general, the majority of Board members felt that the Board’s current priority should be focused on transitioning to a new Board and how to pass on the current Board’s work efficiently. <p>Chair Peters entertained a motion for the Board to offer comments and recommendations about SB1022 CD1 in a memo to the Governor by June 2. (Bob/Meghan: Y—7; N—0).</p> <p>Chair Peters summarized the comments and recommendations that would be relayed to the Governor as the following:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The transition of Board members should move slowly, and that historical context be provided so that the new Board is aware of what the current Board has been working on and the direction in which it was heading.• In the future, the creation of a stakeholder Advisory Council should be considered to help inform the Board’s work.• Specific recommendations around the actual membership of the Board: consider the county representation and the potential of tempering government influence in the decision-making; HME needs to be at the table; family engagement and family choice is considered when recruiting nominees and appointing Board members. <p>Key takeaways from the discussion that followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• One of the shared concerns among Board members present was that historical growth, experience, and gained knowledge could potentially be lost with this transition. Passing on the past and current Board’s work to the new Board may ensure that the new ELB is successful.• A possible solution to this is recommending to the Governor that he introduce legislation to create an Advisory Group to the ELB next session.• Commitment to equity was also a concern discussed. While the delineation of specific members is a positive thing, some Board members worried that public entities (governmental) could be more represented or have a “louder” voice than private ones.• There was a general concern among most Board members that HME was not guaranteed a voice at the new table.• Chair Peters pointed out that the loss of representation might not be something to bring up to the Governor or the legislature because it might look like ELB is recommending yet another representative Board.	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suggestion was made that the variety of settings and early learning system components be spelled out as referenced in statute. The 2013 statute referring to a “comprehensive early learning system” which included non-center-based programs and settings, was referenced. <p>The Chair entertained a motion for the ELB to submit comments, concerns, and recommendations around the items discussed above to the Governor. Items would include: an advisory council to be created at some point in the future; inclusion of HME; some family engagement or other focus on the breadth of options for families within our community so that preschool isn’t the only type of early learning setting that gets attention; and recommendations for Board transition include historical connections, as well as balance and diversity such as the public-private nature of the Board and the different types of expertise from the members sitting on it. The motion passed (Bob/Melodie: Y—9; N—0). Chair Peters announced he would pass these comments on to the Governor and let him know that the current ELB would be willing to lend its support during the transition period.</p> <p>Chair Peters then moved to a discussion around transition and Board changes. If the SB 1022 is enacted, the current Board will still function as it has been, with its current membership (including those who are “terming out”) until new Board members get appointed. Therefore, ELB will not be adding any new members, and everyone’s terms will be extended until a new Board is in place. Once the Governor determines how he will make his appointments, Board members will have a better sense of how long they will continue in their roles. This also allows EOEL to continue doing its work. As for the transition, Chair Peters explained that ELB may need to define the transition for themselves because there appears to be little precedent to determine how to transition “properly.”</p>	<p>Board will respond to the Governor and that response will be an approval of SB1022 with recommendations, comments, and concerns. Key areas to be included have been identified.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Key takeaways from the discussion that followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Workforce Equity Subcommittee (WES) has already been looking at how to transfer the information they have gathered to the new Board, including listing policy statements the Board has internally or policy statements from other organizations, as well as naming important studies like the RAND study, or key stakeholders as resources to turn to regarding workforce issues. • The Governance Standing Subcommittee (GSS) will brainstorm ideas on what other subcommittees should do with the information they have gathered over the years. • The Capacity and Resources Subcommittee wondered about a central place to archive materials and expressed the need for continuing support of EOEL in its work beyond the public pre-K program. • Director Arikawa-Cross’s position will likely not be affected with the Board transition because the statute does not state that a new Board would select a new Director. Chair Peters will seek to confirm this. 	<p>The GSS will provide recommendations to the Board for transition protocols and processes built around existing work of the subcommittees at the Board at the June 8th meeting.</p> <p>Chair will pursue the question as to whether there will be any impact on the EOEL Director’s position with a Board transition.</p>
<p>Public Comment—Bob Peters</p>	<p>No public comments were provided.</p>	
<p>Review Agenda Outcomes—Bob Peters</p>	<p>Chair Peters reviewed the following agenda outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board will respond to the Governor, and that response will be a recommendation to approve SB1022 with recommendations, comments, and concerns. • The GSS will come back to the Board at the June meeting with recommendations for transition protocols and processes built around what has already happened in subcommittees. • Chair will pursue the question of whether there will be any impact on the EOEL Director’s position with the appointment of a new Board. 	

Closing —Bob Peters	Chair Peters closed the meeting by expressing his positive thoughts on providing a response to the Governor, and that the message the Board wants to send to the larger community is one of support for the Governor’s decision, and an amiable transition.	

Submitted by Ashley Miura and Chris Jackson